Faculty members live in departments, small isolated worlds within the true political domain of universities. In this chapter we will give you some perspective on the forces outside your department that affect your professional life. You need to understand these forces to operate successfully as a faculty member, because you may frequently be called on to deal with your dean, provost, president, legislature, member of the board, or member of the public in your professional activity.

CLASSIFICATION OF UNIVERSITIES

The first crucial measure you must take is of your university's commitment to research. Not all universities have a commitment to research. American universities and colleges come in a multiplicity of forms, and the missions and structure vary in important ways. The leading classification of institutions of higher education is done by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, and is termed the Carnegie Classification of
Institutions of Higher Education. Begun in 1973, the most recent classification (2000; see Table 12.1) eliminated the familiar categories of Research I Universities and Research II Universities, substituting instead Doctoral/Research Universities—Extensive (during the period studied, they awarded 50 or more doctoral degrees per year across at least 15 disciplines) and Doctoral/Research Universities—Intensive (during the period studied, they awarded at least 10 doctoral degrees per year across three or more disciplines, or at least 20 doctoral degrees per year overall). For the classification see http://www.carnegiefoundation.org/Classification/. This new classification eliminated the consideration of research expenditures, one of the main criteria for Research I and Research II universities in the previous classification. Of the 148 universities in the Doctoral/Research Universities—Extensive group, 89 were classified as Research I institutions in 1994, 37 as Research II, 19 as Doctoral I, and 5 as Doctoral II. Many feel the new Carnegie classification has lost some important information—to what extent a university is a "research university."

So How Can You Know If You Are in a "Research University"?

One definition of a research university is that it has more than $20 million of federal research expenditures in a year. The Center, an independent research center located at the University of Florida, lists all the universities in the United States that fit this criterion and classifies research universities based on various quality measures (http://thecenter.ufl.edu). There are 154 institutions that fit this criterion in the United States, 106 public universities and 48 private.

If you are at a research university, the value placed on grants and research will obviously be higher than if you are at a university or college that is not research-intensive. Many faculty today at non-research-intensive universities received their doctoral degrees from research-intensive universities. This can cause a tension between the faculty desire for participation in research and the available support for research. One colleague in a non-research-intensive university had a paper accepted for presentation at the Midwestern Psychological Association but was forbidden to attend the meeting because all faculty were expected to attend graduation. Research universities understand and wish their faculty to have a guild mentality and to function nationally in their fields by attending conferences, serving on grant panels, and being editors of journals. Universities without such an emphasis on research value teaching and local university activities. Teaching loads are higher and commitment to campus activities as opposed to national activities is valued. To function appropriately in your university you first must understand what type of university it is and the values of your university. Indeed, the most important message of this chapter is that for you to succeed in your institution you must shape what you want and need into the structure.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of institution</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Doctorate-granting institutions:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral/Research Universities—Extensive</td>
<td>• Offer a wide range of baccalaureate programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Committed to graduate education through the doctorate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• During period studied awarded 50 or more doctoral degrees per year across at least 15 disciplines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral/Research Universities—Intensive</td>
<td>• Offer a wide range of baccalaureate programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Committed to graduate education through the doctorate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• During period studied awarded at least 10 doctoral degrees per year across three or more disciplines or at least 20 doctoral degrees per year overall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Master's colleges and universities:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's Colleges and Universities I:</td>
<td>• Offer a wide range of baccalaureate programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Committed to graduate education through the master's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• During period studied, awarded 40 or more master's degrees per year across three or more disciplines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's Colleges and Universities II:</td>
<td>• Offer a wide range of baccalaureate programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Committed to graduate education through the master's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• During period studied, awarded 20 or more master's degrees per year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Baccalaureate colleges:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baccalaureate Colleges—Liberal Arts</td>
<td>• Primarily undergraduate colleges with major emphasis on baccalaureate programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• During period studied, awarded at least half of their baccalaureate degrees in liberal arts fields</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baccalaureate Colleges—General</td>
<td>• Primarily undergraduate colleges with major emphasis on baccalaureate programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• During period studied, awarded less than half of their degrees in liberal arts fields</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baccalaureate/Associate's Colleges</td>
<td>• Undergraduate colleges where the majority of conferrals are below the baccalaureate level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• During period studied, bachelor's degrees accounted for at least 10% of undergraduate awards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate's Colleges</td>
<td>• Offer associate's degrees and certificate programs, but with few exceptions award no baccalaureate degrees.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialized Institutions</td>
<td>• Offer a variety of degrees ranging from the bachelor's to the doctorate and typically award a majority of degrees in a single field</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This group includes institutions where during the period studied, less than 10% of undergraduate awards were bachelor's degrees.*

**Survival in Academia**
and needs and wants of those above you, the governing board of your university: your president, your provost, your dean, your department chair, and the other faculty in your department. In addition, those in state institutions must also understand your state legislatures. Most faculty do not think beyond their department chairs. This is a mistake.

State Legislatures

If you are in a state institution you should follow what is said about higher education in your state. You will then understand the pressures on your board and your president and your institution and understand how you can help generate increased funding for your school. Higher education competes against many other priorities in states, prisons, K–12, and social services. Why should the legislature fund higher education in the face of these seemingly more pressing needs? You can help by demonstrating the practical value of your research to the state, by cooperating in the need to demonstrate the productivity and quality of faculty work, and by understanding political realities in your own requests. Legislators do not enjoy being treated as a bunch of uneducated idiots by faculty any more than faculty enjoy being treated as irrelevant intellectuals by legislators. As a faculty member you should speak willingly when asked by the press about your work, so that the public and legislatures can understand its importance. You should understand the issues of the day in your state to apply your knowledge usefully where it is needed. You should in general realize that states fund institutions of higher education, in which case you actually work for the state. In all types of institutions, as a faculty member you should understand and pay attention to your governing board.

Governing Boards

All universities have governing boards. If you are in a state institution, the form of your governing board is determined by the state. You may have a local board, a state-level board, both of these, or some combination. If you are in a private institution, the institution will have its own governing board. The president of your university reports to some board, and the board has tremendous power to influence policy and procedures in universities. It behooves you to read what is available about your board and to determine how what you do fits within their priorities. Many boards are quite concerned with teaching, both in terms of quantity and quality. This should give you some perspective on the necessity for measuring quality of teaching. If you were a board member, would you not care about the quality of teaching in the institution for which you were responsible? Many faculty resist the idea that teaching quality should be measured or that these reports should be available to those outside the university. However, it is in faculty members’
self-interest to demonstrate to those responsible that quality of teaching is high. All boards are interested in the financial stability of their institutions. This interest leads to a desire to know the faculty are productive and the institution is run well.

Presidents

The president reports to boards and needs to represent the university to outside constituencies. Presidents also usually have primary responsibility for fundraising and dealing with the local community. Presidents love good news and hate bad news. They receive enough bad news from the external world; internally they want to hear success stories they can use to generate funds from the outside world. This does not mean you should not complain to your president. It does mean you should go through the chain of command, which in turn means that you have to complain to a lot of people before you get to the president. In general, the best course is to send the president reports of your wonderful activities and those of your colleagues and send your complaints to your department chair.

Provosts

The provost reports to the president and your dean reports to the provost. Provosts typically determine how much money your dean will receive, and this is important in determining how much money your department will receive. You may indeed need to be involved with your provost, if you believe your college or school (dean-level) is underfunded and that this underfunding is interfering with the ability of psychology to function appropriately. This is not uncommon for psychology departments, which are often lost in the fabric of the university, misplaced for historical or other reasons. Psychology departments often have at least some portion of their faculty who require wet labs, expensive equipment, and who generate considerable amounts of grant money—functioning more like science faculty than like social science faculty. If they are in a social science college that reports to a dean without much funding, this can be an occasion for a discussion with the provost. We will say more on this later when we discuss power and money.

Deans

The dean is an important person for any faculty member, and it pays to know him or her personally if possible. Deans have many demands on their time, but they will process your tenure and promotion document, they are responsible for allocating your department’s budget, they appoint your department chair, and they care about what you do. The general rule of fitting into the priorities of others holds with particular force in the case of your dean. Your dean should be worrying about fitting into the priorities
of the provost and president, but you need to understand the dean’s unique perspective as well. It is also wise to understand how much flexibility the dean has. This will tell you where power really lies on your campus. Does your dean have total authority to allocate departmental budgets? If not, who does? That is the person with true power over your department. Whoever that person is, you need to understand the basis for departmental budget allocation. That process may take into account credit hours taught, grant money brought in, quality of department, or other factors that are important for your university. Sometimes the process is also a matter of personal patronage and relationships. If the latter, it pays to have a personal relationship with the dean. This is not that difficult, but you must first assess the relationship of your chair with the dean and be sure you do not overstep your bounds. Personal relationships with any administrator are easy to establish by sending the administrator reports on your work in the press, or from other sources, or just sending pictures and easy to understand reports of your work. Invite senior administrators to your lab or to parties at your house. Faculty are often afraid to do this, but administrators like faculty and are flattered to be considered. Administration is a lonely job, and administrators like to see and hear about the work of faculty, which is after all the thing they are all working to support. Assuming your chair does not object, invite your dean to events and keep your dean informed, always copying your department chair on anything you send to the dean, and always invite your chair to any event where the dean is invited.

Department Chairs

Department chairs make the day-to-day decisions that affect your life—they are critical in your tenure and promotion, in your space allocation, and in the support you receive. You must have a good relationship with your department chair. You must understand the values of your department and how resource allocations are made. The possibilities are much like those we discussed for dean. Your department chair may allocate resources based on credit hours generated, grant money brought in, or some other objective factors. You should ask. Alternatively, you may be in a patronage system, where your relationship with the department chair is key. Or most common, the system will be some combination of these. You need to figure out what the rules for money allocation are. Talk to senior faculty, but more important watch how money is allocated.

STRUCTURE OF THE UNIVERSITY

Universities are typically organized into departments within schools or colleges. Departments typically represent faculty guilds and have their
own rules for evaluating quality and productivity. The English department has its standards and methods, which are not the same as the physics department, which are in turn not the same as psychology's, and so on. We all know teaching loads vary by disciplines on a campus, but across the nation teaching loads for a particular discipline in a research university are fairly standard. This is because competition for faculty and students is within discipline at the graduate level—psychology departments compete with each other for the best faculty and students, not with other departments within the university. Deans, provosts, and presidents understand this structure. Faculty often do not. Thus faculty members in a psychology department may complain that their teaching loads are higher than those in the physics department and that they teach more credit hours. This is undoubtedly true, and it is true across the country. It is also irrelevant. Physics departments contribute to universities mostly by research and grant money, psychology departments as a whole contribute by producing credit hours and by bringing in grant money. The appropriate comparison group for your psychology department is other psychology departments in the same type of university, not the physics department in your university. In the framework of a university, psychology is also not at the very core. You cannot have a university without an English department but you can have a university without a psychology department.

Psychology departments, however, have a possibility of participating beyond their own department by interdisciplinary work with other units on campus. Indeed, psychologists can do this almost more than any other discipline. Psychology overlaps with sociology, political science, management, biology, mathematics, and many other disciplines. Depending on the priority given interdisciplinary work on your campus, this can give you leverage with the upper administration. Although your department may be housed in a college that receives little money, you as a faculty member could form or participate in an interdisciplinary center that could be forward-looking, generate lots of grant money, attract students, and bring fame and fortune to your university. It is well worth your while to keep your eye on interdisciplinary opportunities, particularly those well-funded by federal agencies, and start a center or institute on your campus in any fruitful area.

POWER AND MONEY

The most important principle to understand is that power is money, which can also be expressed as money is power. In universities, faculty generate money by teaching (via tuition and state funding, sometimes) and by research (grants). Teaching is a local market. Depending on how your university receives money for teaching and how it allocates money based
on teaching, generating credit hours can be important as a source of power—or not important at all. If you are in a university that is not funded for enrollment, or that does not allocate budget based on enrollment, teaching may be not be a source of power. Practically all faculty teach, and most faculty members teach well. Knowledge of your teaching ability is customarily limited to your own university, and there is no national market for good teachers. This means the extent to which teaching a lot of credit hours or teaching well matters is dependent on how your university values these activities. Research talent is rare, however. Some faculty do no research, others do only a little, and only some do it very well. The market for research faculty is national, and your productivity and quality in research is demonstrable and known on a national market. Competition for the best research faculty is intense, and faculty who generate large amounts of grant money are powerful on campus. In the future, faculty members who can generate large amounts of income for a university via distance learning products or patents and licenses will also be powerful. This coincides with the general principle of fitting what you can do into your university’s priorities. Because all universities need money, if you can generate money for your university you will be valued.

If you teach a lot of credit hours but do not receive rewards for this, you should probably reexamine this activity. If your department teaches a lot of credit hours but is not rewarded for this activity, your department chair should be discussing this with the dean. If your college teaches a lot of credit hours but is not rewarded for this activity, your dean should be having a conversation with the provost. This is because you are indeed generating revenue, which is important to any university.

**POWER WITHIN DEPARTMENTS**

Consider the case of a colleague at another university. We call her Janet. Janet was five years out of graduate school. When she finished her degree, the job market was, shall we say, soft. Janet was more fortunate than many of her friends, though, and got a job at one of the better schools, the only woman psychologist hired in its 60 or so years. Perhaps because she appreciated her fortune, Janet did not worry much about the details of the offer when she accepted it. Two details she should have been concerned about were the department’s provision for summer salary and convention travel money. Both, it later turned out, were available and both were critical to Janet’s future. Janet built up a fair-sized debt in school. When she neared the end of her first year, she asked about summer support so she could devote herself to research. The department head, leaning back in his chair, told her the department had committed its summer research budget already and
had assumed she did not need any because she had not said so when she was hired. "But," said the head, "if you want to teach, we could at least get that for you." Janet took the teaching offer and, of course, abandoned much of the research she had planned.

The next few years saw similar exchanges. Each time there was some reason Janet could not get what she needed. Her most recent "surprise" came when she sought funds to go to a special conference in her research area. Again she went to her department head. He explained that the department's travel policy was to cover the complete expenses of one trip per year per faculty member and that she could choose any conference she wanted to attend in the United States. "Well," Janet interrupted, "I would like to go to the APA this year, because I'm going to present a paper. But I also need to go to this special conference, because it's very important for my work." Again, the department head told her the policy and pointed out that although he normally had some discretionary funds, they were committed already. "I wish I had known this earlier," he said as Janet left.

Janet was quickly behind in her work relative to colleagues who had entered the department with her. And comparisons between her and her colleagues were never more than a whisper away, whispers she heard clearly enough to realize she might not be promoted with them.

Janet's problems arose from her department's ordinary politics. Where is the power in this situation? The department head? Let us explore what makes the department head powerful. First is the fact that Janet, like others in her department, wants a particular resource. Second, neither Janet nor the others have what they want. Third, the department head temporarily controls its allocation, with discretion to dispense it any way he wishes. These conditions are necessary and sufficient for the creation of the department head's power. You want something and somebody else has the freedom and capability to provide it that you lack. If any of these were not true, there would be no power. If Janet and the others cared not a hoot for summer and travel moneys, the head would reign over an empty realm. If these funds were nondiscretionary and had to be allotted according to some incontrovertible standards, the head would be reduced to a keeper of books, tallying requests and dispersing funds.

In short, the department head is powerful because of the role his position plays in the department. Power concentrates into his position precisely to resolve conflicts of the kind embroiling Janet. Departments are not the same in this regard. Some do not concentrate power as much, and permit their heads little say. In universities, there are two types of departmental administrators. One is called a head; the other a chair. The choice of words is probably not accidental. A head is appointed with no fixed term. Its occupant authorizes all departmental educational, budget, hiring, promotion, and salary decisions. It is a powerful position and much
like headships at other universities. The chair position, in contrast, has a fixed term. Its resident is obligated to attend to the advice of the elected "executive committee" of a department. This position does not concentrate power in the administrator but leaves it with the faculty.

How much power concentrates into organizational positions—chairs, heads, deans, grant administrators, committees—will depend on the extent of an organization’s conflicting interests. The chair administrative form we described, for instance, arises when faculty are unable to resolve their conflicts into directions that all interests will support. Through an elective process, the contestants ensure their points of view will be represented in the executive committee where they can bargain and negotiate with one another. Often they shuffle back and forth between positions because no group is able to convince the others of its greater merit. This form arises in fields with less agreed on paradigms. It is more common in the social sciences; more rare in the physical sciences.

When power concentrates into formal positions, as it does in most academic departments, the concentration serves the needs of dominant interests in a department. A head can move a department in particular directions with vigor, neglecting some interests at one point in time and others at another. A department head, however, cannot long get away with consistently neglecting major interests in the department. Anyone who has seen a department head roll when it displeases critical faculty knows how trepidatious tenancy can be.

Power in a department, then, rests with a department’s faculty, or at least some of them. Where, then, was the power in Janet’s situation? To find out, Janet talked to associates about what else was going on in the department and who was getting the funds she needed.

The story quickly got sorted out. The department had been building its cognitive psychology group for the past few years and the money that Janet was not getting was going to newer faculty in these areas and, in some cases, older faculty. This happened with enough frequency on enough issues that a reasonable statistician would conclude it was not random.

At first Janet got annoyed. Later she thought about why the department head was leaning toward the cognitive group just then. The group was growing; its faculty were building a graduate program and were starting to fund it with a few large grants. The departmental budget had barely been keeping pace and, although the overall doctoral program had grown slightly, government cutbacks hurt the social, clinical, and experimental groups severely in the past two years.

Annoyance drifted to depression as Janet realized that what was going on was more systematic than a few unlucky lost opportunities. Although the head was powerful, his power only mirrored the faculty’s. Yet it seemed all faculty were not equal. The cognitive group, as Orwell would have it,
were more equal. Decisions reflected their interests the most. Why? Because the doctoral program of the rest of the department depended on the cognitive group's larger coffers. Although the details in other departments may differ from those in Janet's, the general situation is typical. Power organizes around those subgroups (departments, disciplinary groups, or individuals) in an organization thought to contribute its most critical resources.

Janet's situation shows us organizational power is not a personal quality of the fortunate or greedy. It is situational. The cognitive faculty were powerful not because of any particularly charming qualities they possessed. They were powerful because they contributed what the department needed just then. Their role was one of circumstance more than deliberate. It followed a few decisions of U.S. presidents and a developing industry in computer intelligence.

Ultimately, power in academic institutions originates outside them. We can see this easily in the growth of the physical sciences following President John Kennedy's decision to go to the moon, and in the growth of the social sciences following Lyndon Johnson's decision to end poverty. We can see this also in our own universities. Departments in universities, and the areas within them, represent different disciplines, each somewhat separate from the others. Each discipline has its own sources of funding, its own markets for faculty and students, its own journals, and its own definitions and markets for prestige. Although some intellectual strands link them, and although they compete at some level for funds, students, and public attention, disciplines for the most part operate independently. These facts form the bases for the distribution of power in universities and departments.

Departments are rarely equal in their power. Some command larger shares of resources, have an easier time getting their people hired and promoted, have lighter teaching loads or more teaching assistance distributed to them. Different groups dominate in different universities. Prestigious private universities are more likely than prestigious public universities to have outstanding law and business schools, and prestigious public universities are more likely to have outstanding engineering and agricultural schools. These differences reflect the historical flow of resources into the institutions. In a similar way, the distribution of power among and within departments results from the way resources come into them and the roles they play.

In one typical research university, the University of Illinois, the most powerful departments come from the physical sciences. It does not take much to see this. Most of the important committees in the university are peopled by faculty from the physics, mathematics, and engineering departments. The only well-represented behavioral science department is psychology. Curious about the dominance of these groups, a colleague and one of the authors of this chapter (Salancik) studied 13 years of the university's history, examining the budgets, grants, teaching loads, academic rankings
(ACE ratings), and such, of more than half of the departments in the university. The departments on key committees were allotted larger portions of the state budget relative to other departments and disproportionate to their teaching obligations to undergraduate or graduate students. The budget of one physical science department, for instance, correlated .73 with its 13-year growth in its undergraduate teaching, whereas a comparable correlation for one social science department was -.64. Allocations to the powerful were also disproportionate to their academic rankings, despite frequent claims that the limited funds of the university should go to the “better” departments. In these 13 years, a top-ranked psychology department was not quite worth as much as a top-ranked electrical engineering department.

It is not difficult to figure out what was accounting for the budget decisions. One need remember only that power distributes along the lines of critical dependencies. The University of Illinois is a major research institution. Research and graduate education are its primary goals. Talk about them invades every meeting and colors every issue requiring organizational attention. Recognizing this, it was easy to deduce that the most critical contributions the departments made to the university were the resources needed to run large-scale graduate programs. These did not come from the state of Illinois in the amounts required, either. They came from grants.

Grants are important in universities for two reasons. The less important reason is that they fund research. This, however nice for faculty and students, benefits mainly the department getting the grant, not the university as a whole. Grants would not be a basis for power in a university if that were all they did. The second, and more important, role of grants is that they contribute discretionary money in the form of overhead rebates.

Overhead funds play a key role in maintaining quality in educational and research programs throughout a university. They accumulate into piles of money available for activities unjustified by other budgetary categories. Their greatest value is that they are discretionary. They benefit research by providing seed money to projects awaiting grant support or groundwork for frontier areas that have not attracted government or foundation attention yet. They benefit teaching by funding innovations beyond the reach of the normal educational budget.

Discretionary funds also play a big role in managing a university. They can be critical in attracting and keeping talented faculty and students. A smart department head can promise the wavering support for special projects or summer research, competing more effectively than without such funds. And when the discretionary funds in one department are used up, a head in good standing with campus administrators can petition to dip into their much larger discretionary piles. The University of Illinois at one time amassed a million dollar funding and equipment package to attract the inventor of magnetic resonance imaging. Fifteen campus units cooperated,
and much of the support came from discretionary money. Funding a major investment of this nature reflects not only a department that has already contributed overhead but also an investment that the university sees as likely to recover overhead in the future.

With grants generating such critical discretionary funds, it was not surprising to find a department’s power was proportional to its contributions to the overhead pool. The major predictor of the differences between the power of departments was the grant money they provided. Seventy percent of the variance in power measures was associated with contract funds, and power in turn was the major predictor of state budget allocations. What this meant is that the small fractional discretionary funds provided by some departments promoted their control of the rest of the budget. With only slight hyperbole, 10% of the resources determined how 80% of the budget was spent!

One cannot simply extrapolate these results to other institutions. Universities differ in their goals, and more important, in the factors affecting their survival. For the University of Illinois, the quality of its graduate and research programs is important, and not an easy task given the constraints of its environment.

Other universities organize around other resources. The one generality is that power plays a role in every university and derives from the critical resources that shape that institution’s success and ultimately its survival. Private schools, lacking the subsidies of a state appropriation process, operate differently than public universities. They survive by accumulating endowment, which depends on their graduates’ wealth and willingness to part with it as they age. Not surprisingly, private schools pay a lot more attention to their undergraduates’ experiences. They want their students to leave with warm feelings and fond memories. And this affects their decisions as much as grants do at the University of Illinois. It just affects them in different ways.

CONCLUSION

Money is key in understanding power and influence. Most academics prefer not to think about money, believing if they have a good idea it should be funded. However, those who run universities are confronted by many good ideas and must choose among them. To choose they must maximize the quality of the entire institution. The best way to have your idea funded is to understand the context in which you and your institution function.