

*Mary Ann Danowitz Sagaria and
Joanne Marie Burrows*

The authors examined the perceived differences in community service attentiveness in forty-two colleges and universities in urbanized areas. Results indicate that the vast majority of colleges and universities consider community service a high priority of their mission and integral to community relations. A wide gap, however, exists between rhetoric and practice. Perceptions of internal institutional involvement and advocacy in community service differ significantly between service attentive and inattentive institutions. In addition, interest and involvement of institutional leaders are more important in creating service attentive institutions in their communities.

Internal Meanings and Markers of College and University Community Service Attentiveness in Urban Areas

Many U.S. cities are in a state of crisis caused by their inability to meet the educational, public safety, social, and environmental demands that confront them. To respond to this urban crisis, organizations such as grassroots groups, churches, local government, labor unions, and businesses have taken leadership roles. Nearby colleges and universities also represent promising resources for helping to solve urban community problems, but their participation has been more uneven than that of other sectors. The purpose of this article is to examine perceptions about internal institutional activities associated with community service and differences in service attentiveness within urban colleges and universities.

Service has been one of the three core functions of higher education since the development of land-grant and city colleges in the second half of the nineteenth century, although it is a distant third to teaching and research. During the decade of the 1990s, however, commentators both inside and outside higher education have urged colleges and universities to place more emphasis on their service mission, especially as it relates to developing effective solutions to problems confronting cities.

Higher education's service activities began to show signs of revival in the 1980s after a period of decline in the early 1970s. A 1980 study of 255 institutions belonging to the American Association of State Colleges and Universities indicated that 92 percent of the respondents recognized service as an important obligation (Crosson, 1985). Since the mid-1980s, student volunteerism and service learning have increased. The membership of Campus Compact, a national coalition of college and university presidents committed to helping students develop the values and skills of civic participation through involvement in public service grew from slightly more than 100 institutions in 1986 to more than 500 in 1996. Also, community-oriented research has increased, while education publications and national associations have given more attention to service. One interpretation of this trend is that colleges and universities recognize the need to play a more significant role in confronting the critical needs of their local communities. A second interpretation is that higher education institutions are rethinking ways by which to educate students to become committed citizens. A third interpretation emphasizes external pressures. Legislation such as the National and Community Service Act of 1993 raised expectations and created opportunities for higher education institutions to renew their commitments to service. In particular, President Clinton's early legislative initiatives went so far as to provide incentives for higher education institutions to help rebuild our local communities and to renew the ethic of civic responsibility by engaging in community-based service.

This article explores urban institutions' internal policies and practices associated with community service from the perspective of chief academic affairs officers. More specifically, two research questions guided the study: (a) What is the perceived community service attentiveness within colleges and universities? and (b) How do perceptions of internal institutional involvement and advocacy in community service differ between community service attentive and inattentive colleges and universities in urban areas?

The Concept of Community Service

Most U.S. higher education institutions include public service in their mission statements. Patricia Crosson (1988) observed that, although the meaning of public service has shifted over time, two characteristics associated with public service have remained constant from the days of the colonial colleges. First, the terms service and public service have always been used somewhat imprecisely and rhetorically. Literature on higher education, college catalogues, and college presidents' speeches frequently refer to higher education's service to society in terms of its mission to educate students, search for truth, and improve society. Service, used in this sense, is synonymous with contributing to larger social goals. Second, public service has also evolved to mean a set of programmatic relationships and also activities that link members of the campus community with organizations and groups external to the campus.

The idea of higher education service has intensified and expanded beyond the agricultural and mechanical arts emphases of the early land-grant missions to address all aspects of society. By the 1960s, the term public service denoted an obligation to help resolve a multitude of economic and social problems and included a variety of activities at the local, state, and federal levels. In short, a primary expectation of these

activities was that they would extend college and university knowledge and resources to groups and persons who typically are not part of higher education. By the 1980s the term professional service was used at times to indicate that higher education service activities should emanate from the specific resources of academic environments.

Over the past decade, many scholars and practitioners have begun to discuss professional service, rather than public service, in order to emphasize that university service activities are (or should be) rooted in knowledge, professional expertise, and specialized resources. Others continue to talk about public service but the connotation has shifted to professionally-based public service. Public or professional service is now intended to go beyond good citizenship and community knowledge, and build upon the expertise developed through research and instructional activities.

In studying higher education service in urban areas, we were aware of the complications associated with undertaking research when the precise boundaries of a central concept, in this case “service,” are difficult to define. However, we believe that the issues relating to higher education’s service to metropolitan areas are so important that we have to accept the complications and limitations associated with less than precise terms.

In this work we use the phrase, community service, to encompass a broad spectrum of activities associated with the development, transfer, and application of scholarship. The term is inclusive because community service activities are likely to vary considerably across institutions by type, control, and size. We chose it because it would not preclude activities such as noncredit, short-term courses in community colleges or partnerships involving universities and public school districts in which innovative teaching, action research, and prototype programs are under way. Furthermore, the term does not differentiate between paid and unpaid service activities and can thus include job-training programs developed to improve individual earnings and strengthen the local economy.

We define community service as a direct activity of a college or university that provides identifiable benefits to a community. Community service, therefore, differs from the more general and rhetorical term, public service, by focusing on more specific and proximate publics—often the local community. Moreover, it more accurately represents the kinds of public service most colleges and universities provide—activities involving individuals and communities in the immediate vicinity of the campus. Thus we differentiate between community service at the local level and public or professional service at the state, national, or international levels. At the same time, the definition of community service used in this article lacks other precise boundaries. For example, it does not delineate between an activity that might be instructional, such as service learning for academic credit, or professional service, such as short-term faculty consultation.

This definition of community service is consistent with the one used by the Corporation for National and Community Service. It moves away from traditional higher education approaches to service, in which the community is viewed as a laboratory for testing knowledge applications, and turns toward a service orientation that stresses direct community service activities, such as problem solving, intended to generate positive outcomes for both the community and the educational institution. Thus, it attaches

an intended value-added dimension for the group or community being served that we believe is both a desirable expectation and one that is congruent with demands for increased accountability of higher education institutions.

Higher Education Service in Urban Areas

Distinctions have been made between urban institutions and institutions located in urban areas. Elliott (1994) claims that location in a populated area, involvement with the community, student population, academic programs, institutional age, or origin are not enough to define an urban university. She suggests that an institution's definition must also be anchored in a mission that involves a sense of commitment to serve the community in which it is situated. Following that line of thinking, it seemed tenuous to speculate about the kind of interaction that a traditional liberal arts college or research university located in an urban area might have with its immediate geographical community. In contrast, an urban service institution that was established and derives its identification from its efforts to serve its city could be expected to have considerable interaction with its contiguous community.

Typically, scholarly attention to higher education service to urban communities has focused upon these metropolitan colleges, and universities, or city-based institutions with a focus and research purposes closely connected to a city (Elliott, 1994). As a result, other higher education institutions located in urban areas have received considerably less attention with respect to their relationships with their local communities. In fact, they are commonly treated as invisible or are neglected as potential resources or partners to assist in solving problems in urbanized areas. The present study differs from the vast majority of research on colleges and universities in urban areas by including all two and four-year accredited institutions in cities in one state in order to consider the full complement of potential higher education resources.

Conceptual Framework

Hackman (1985) and Lewis and Kallsen's (1995) research suggests that at least three factors are likely to influence an institution's commitment to a particular activity: the activity's proximity to the institution's core, its centrality to institutional subunits, and its power to attract resources. Following this line of thinking, a college or university's commitment to community service would be influenced by the extent to which administrative and faculty leaders perceive community service: (1) to lie within an institution's core dimensions, such as mission and goals, (2) to be central to specific departments or programs, and (3) to extract needed resources from the external environment.

Since this study, to our knowledge, was one of the earliest to attempt to estimate the relationship between perceptions of internal institutional activities and community service attentiveness, it is exploratory in nature. Thus, consistent with our conceptual framework, and guided by the literature on university governance and management, we selected a variety of institutional characteristics and activities that could direct attention to community service. In the area of core aspects of an institution it was judged important to have variables related to institutional mission, goals, culture, and academic programs. It was also considered important to capture the relationship of com-

munity service to financial and legal aspects such as fundraising and grants, financial aid, and federal laws. Also, attempts were made to observe indicators of student functions and services (for example, student services, recruitment, and alumni relations).

Limitations

We recognize several limitations to this research. First, our population was limited to urban colleges and universities in one state. Second, the findings reported here are specifically restricted to the observations of senior academic administrators about their institutions, and although we conducted site interviews, those data are not presented here. Third, the measures and variables used may represent an oversimplification of the items intended to measure complex constructs such as community service or the difference between service attentive and inattentive institutions. Further, the participation of a variety of institutions and the decentralized nature of community service at some of the larger ones add potential limitations. Nonetheless, we hope this exploratory research will stimulate discussion and questions among higher education administrative leaders, faculty, and community leaders about practices within their own organizations and how to realign rhetoric, goals, and resources with community service in order to better serve our urban communities.

The Study

Fifty-five accredited higher education institutions with undergraduate enrollments were identified from Ohio's fifteen urban areas. Urban areas comprise one or more places (central place) and the adjacent, densely settled, surrounding territory (urban fringe) that together have a minimum of 50,000 persons (Census of Population and Housing, 1990). These metropolitan areas tend to have many of the problems associated with urban life and an array of social service agencies. As a result, these areas are potential partners with colleges and universities in meeting community needs. Each of the cities contains an average of 3.7 higher education institutions. The urban areas in Ohio are well suited for studying community service practices because every type of institution is represented, and there are nearly equal numbers of public and private institutions.

A questionnaire and personal letter were sent to the chief academic officers of each of the fifty-five institutions in November 1994. We chose this administrator because of the overlapping nature of the officer's role with multiple functions of a college or university. The unique institutional location of this administrative position affords a comprehensive and complex understanding of the institution and its internal and external operations. The survey instrument defined community service as a direct activity of a college or university that provides identifiable benefits to a community, and participants were asked to respond to survey items using this definition. The reports here use data from eight subscales of the mail questionnaire.

Forty-seven questionnaires were returned, a response rate of 85 percent. Of these, forty-two questionnaires, or 77 percent, were usable. The return rates for each type of institution were as follows: 43 percent (three) from the seven research and doctorate granting universities, 44 percent (four) from the nine comprehensive universities, 88 percent (eight) from the ten liberal arts colleges, 95 percent (nineteen) from the twenty-two community colleges, and 88 percent (eight) from the nine special mission institutions. There were twenty-three public institutions and nineteen private institutions.

Measures

Perceived community service attentiveness. In order to measure the service attentiveness construct and classification variable, a total scale and four subscales were created from respondents' ratings on a Likert-type instrument of one (very low) to five (very high) for the importance of community service to twelve characteristics of their institutions. Characteristics included institutional mission, institutional goals, campus culture, academic programs, student services, fundraising and grants, financial aid and scholarships, federal statutes, alumni relations, community relations, personnel policies, and student recruitment and retention.

Decision rules for developing the service attentiveness construct and classification variable were guided by logical reliability, knowledge about institutional structures and activities more than by statistical reliability and correlations among the subscales. The items constituting the total scale and the four subscales, their alpha levels if items were deleted, and the scale score are shown in Table 1. The total scale measure had an internal consistency alpha reliability of .84. The alphas, if items were deleted on the total scale measure, ranged from .81 to .84. The subscales used to classify institutions had internal consistency (alpha) reliabilities of .85 for the core dimensions subscales, .63 for the financial and legal subscales, .70 for the student and alumni subscales, and .56 for the external subscales. Although there is the potential for measurement error in the residual variance of the subscales of the classification variable, reliability scores in the .60 range are adequate for the kinds of correlational analyses conducted in this study (Thorndike and Hagan, 1969).

Differences Between Attentive and Inattentive Community Service

Institutions on classification variable subscales. In order to determine how differences among colleges on their perceptions of internal institutional activities related to attention to community service, we first classified institutions into two groups—service attentive and service inattentive. A total score on the community service attentiveness scale was calculated for each institution. Half of the institutions (21) comprised the service attentive group and half the service inattentive group. The possible range of scores was 12 to 60. Institutions in the service attentive group had scores of 39 to 56, indicating that they typically had average score ratings of highly important on four-fifths of the items. Institutions in the service inattentive group had scores from 14 to 36, indicating lower ratings on some or all of the variables.

In the main, the two groups represent a similar mix of institutional types. Community colleges, liberal arts colleges, comprehensive universities, and specialized institutions are fairly evenly distributed between both the service attentive and inattentive groups. Only the responding research and doctorate-granting universities are located in one group—the service attentive. This would suggest that some colleges and universities of each type are perceived as involved in community service. The forms of that involvement, however, vary from activities such as research and development to service learning and educational programming for economically disadvantaged youth. It is especially noteworthy that, in addition to those institutions identified as urban service institutions, other institutions, both private and public, are perceived as having

Table 1
Total Scales and Subscales if Items Are Deleted
for Community Service Attentiveness within Colleges and Universities

Scale/Subscale/Item	Alpha if Item Deleted ^a	Alpha Reliability
Core		.85
Institutional mission	.82/.75	
Institutional goals	.82/.77	
Campus culture	.82/.82	
Academic programs	.81/.87	
Financial and Legal		.63
Fundraising and grants	.81/.62	
Financial aid/scholarships	.83/.41	
Federal statutes	.84/.54	
Student and alumni		.70
Student services	.81/.67	
Student recruitment and retention	.80/.62	
Alumni relations	.82/.53	
External		.56
State government relations	.84	
Community relations	.82	
Total Scale		.84

^aFirst number is for the total scale measure; second number is for the subscale measure.

important community service commitments that may be as strong or stronger than those of institutions chartered, in part, to serve their local urbanized area. We should note that institutions among the service attentive group may differ only slightly on perceived attentiveness to community service; however, their diverse institutional goals, programs, and constituencies are likely to mean that they are more different than similar in how they carry out community service.

In addition to classifying institutions according to their service attentiveness or inattentiveness on the total scale, we also wanted to learn more about the internal dynamics of colleges and universities and whether differentiation between attentive and inattentive institutions could be attributed to one or more internal aspects of an institution. When comparing the responses from service attentive with those of service inattentive institutions on the four subscales identified in Table 1, we found statistically significant differences on all four subscales. As Table 2 shows, service attentive institutions reported an average of high importance (16.6) on the institutional core subscale as compared to the service inattentive institutions' average of being of somewhat importance (12.9). Similarly, in service attentive institutions, community service

Table 2
 Classification Variable Subscales: A Comparison
 of Service Attentive and Service Inattentive Institutions

Dimension	Service Attentive			Service Inattentive		
	Mean	SD	N	Mean	SD	N
Core***	16.6	2.2	21	12.9	3.1	21
Financial and legal***	10.0	2.5	21	6.0	2.4	19
Student and Alumni***	11.1	2.2	21	7.3	2.6	21
External*	7.3	2.2	20	5.7	2.4	17

* < .05

** < .01

*** < .001

was assessed as moderately important (10.0) on the financial and legal subscale compared to its low importance (6.0) in service inattentive institutions. Respondents in service attentive institutions evaluated community service as moderately important (11.1) to the student and alumni subscale as compared to respondents in service inattentive institutions, who evaluated community service as of low importance (7.3) on that subscale. Finally, comparisons between service attentive institutions' assessment of community service as moderately important (7.3) to the external dimension subscale with service inattentive institutions' assessment of community service as of low importance (5.7). A *t*-test of the different levels of importance for each of the first three subscales yielded significance at the .001 level, and the fourth was significant at .05. These data indicate that the institutions described as service attentive or inattentive differ in all internal institutional dimensions, and thus reflect the interdependence of positions, policies, and practices associated with core elements of an institution and its decision-making groups and administrative units.

Perceived involvement in community services. In order to measure the construct of community service involvement and advocacy, a total scale involving four subscales and one variable was created from participants' responses on two questionnaire subscales. The first was respondents' ratings of eight groups on how frequently they discussed or advocated community service. The groups included: the governing board, president's cabinet, faculty/university senate, curriculum committee, student life committee, admissions committee, alumni committee, and student government. Each group was rated on a five-point Likert-type scale from one (none), to five (very often), to indicate how often they had discussed community service during the past 24 months.

The second was respondents' ratings of their perception of service involvement on a five-point-scale from one (none) to five (very high) for fourteen campus individuals, groups, and offices. These included the chief academic officer, chief student affairs officer, deans and senior academic administrators, community service advisory board, faculty members, community service/service learning coordinator, advancement/de-

velopment office, admissions office, alumni office, campus ministry, continuing education and external degree programs, financial aid office, student affairs staff, and student leaders. Decision rules for constructing the involvement and advocacy variable were guided by similar criteria as those for the community service attentiveness construct.

The items constituting the total scale, the four subscales, and the one variable for institutional agents' community service involvement and advocacy, their alphas if items were deleted, and the scale reliabilities are shown in Table 3. The total scale measure had an internal consistency alpha reliability of .84. The alphas, if items were deleted on the total score measure, ranged from .86 to .91. The subscales used in this study to assess institutional involvement and advocacy had internal consistency (alpha) reliabilities of .90 for the student support offices and academic policy groups' involvement measure, .77 for the students, student life, and outreach involvement, .74 for the institution-wide and academic administrative leaders' involvement, .52 for the senior student affairs and development staff involvement. Similar considerations for the adequacy of the measures in the variable to classify institutions apply to the advocacy and involvement scale and subscales.

Results

In order to answer our second research question (How do perceptions of the internal institutional activities related to community service differ between community service attentive and inattentive colleges and universities in urban areas?), we compared responses of attentive and inattentive institutions on the four community service involvement and advocacy subscales and the one faculty variable. It was our premise that because of the shared nature of internal governance in higher education, the frequency with which campus policy and functional groups discuss community service may indicate the group's level of commitment to community service.

The mean ratings on the scales indicate that no campus constituency or group was perceived as highly involved in community service. Student support offices and academic policy groups were viewed as highly involved in community service at only one institution. The same was the case for students, student life units, and outreach offices. Institution-wide and academic leaders were considered highly involved at only eight schools (19%). At ten institutions (24%), senior student affairs officers and development offices were viewed as highly involved in supporting or maintaining campus community service efforts. Individual faculty members were perceived as the most involved with community service, with seventeen institutions (42%) rating them as highly involved in community service.

As Table 4 shows, the community service attentive and inattentive institutional groups differed significantly on three subscales. Service attentive institutions were perceived as having more involvement on the student support offices and academic policy group subscale (18.8, or low involvement) than those of inattentive institutions (13.8, or almost no involvement). A *t*-test of the different levels of involvement yielded significance at the 0.01 level. Also, service attentive institutions were assessed as having more involvement on the senior student affairs and development subscale (7.1, or moderately involved) as compared to service inattentive institutions (5.4, or no in-

Table 3
Total Scale and Subscales if Items Are Deleted
for Institutional Agents' Community Service Involvement and Advocacy

Scale/Subscale/Item	Alpha if Item Deleted ^a	Alpha Reliability
Student Support Offices and Academic Policy Groups		.90
Service advisory board	.88/.90	
Admissions	.87/.87	
Alumni relations	.86/.87	
Financial aid	.87/.89	
Senate	.87/.88	
Curriculum committee	.87/.89	
Admissions committee	.86/.85	
Students, Student Life, and Outreach		.77
Chaplain	.88/.65	
Continuing education	.91/.91	
Student affairs staff	.87/.61	
Student Leaders	.87/.59	
Student life committee	.87/.64	
Alumni committee	.87/.65	
Student government	.87/.61	
Institution-wide and Academic Administrative Leaders		.74
Chief academic officer	.88/.79	
Deans	.88/.67	
Service coordinator	.88/.74	
Governing board	.88/.65	
President's cabinet	.88/.60	
Senior Student Affairs and Development Staff		.52
Chief student affairs officer	.88	
Development/advancement	.88	
Faculty	.88	
Total Scale		.84

^aFirst number is for the total scale measure; second number is for the subscale measure.

vement). A *t*-test of the different levels of involvement yielded significance at the .001 level. Moreover, the two groups differed significantly ($p < 0.05$) on their faculty's advocacy and involvement with service attentive institutions rating the item 3.6 (moderately involved) and service inattentive institutions rating the item 3.1 (moderately involved). The service attentive and inattentive institutions, however, did not differ significantly on their students, student life, and outreach subscales (19.6, or low involvement and 16.6, or low involvement, respectively). Nor did the two groups of

Table 4
 Institutional Agents' Community Service Involvement:
 A Comparison of Service Attentive and Service Inattentive Institutions

Institutional Agents	Service Attentive			Service Inattentive		
	Mean	SD	N	Mean	SD	N
Student Support Offices and Academic Policy**	18.8	5.6	20	13.8	5.0	20
Students, Student Life, and Outreach	19.6	6.5	20	16.6	5.1	20
Institution-wide and Academic Administrative Leaders	16.8	3.7	20	14.5	4.3	20
Senior Student Affairs and Development Staff***	7.1	1.7	20	5.4	1.5	20
Faculty Members*	3.6	0.7	20	3.1	0.8	20

* <.05

** <.01

*** <.001

institutions have statistically significantly different ratings on the institution-wide and academic administrative leaders' subscale (16.8, or low involvement and 14.5, or low involvement, respectively). The quite similar ratings suggest that groups such as student leaders, student affairs staff, and continuing education/external degree program staff are viewed as moderately involved at both types of institutions.

Discussion

This section returns to the two research questions guiding the study: first, what is the perceived community service attentiveness in colleges and universities in urban areas? Second, how do perceptions of internal institutional involvement and advocacy in community service differ between community service attentive and inattentive colleges and universities in urban areas?

Community Service Attentiveness

Community service is perceived to be an important part of the mission of more than three-quarters of the colleges and universities studied, and is integral to the community relations of these institutions. This finding is consistent with observations about higher education service over. Although comparative data are unavailable for institutions similar to those in this study, our findings suggest that community service is integral to the mission of the majority of institutions studied. Therefore, far more education resources may be available to cities than just those of urban service institutions or "urban universities."

The question of how closely actual community service delivery follows mission rhetoric is yet to be answered. It would be easy to agree with Zelda Gamson's (1997) claim that "Most of the commitment to community service on the part of colleges and universities is lip service" (p. 11). For example, a sizable gap exists between the institutions (45 percent) in which community service is perceived as highly important to the mission, goals, culture, and academic programs and those in which institution-wide and academic administrators are perceived to be involved with and advocates for community service (19 percent). One interpretation of this finding is that greater stated institutional attentiveness (or louder rhetoric) does not necessarily translate into high levels of involvement on the part of faculty, staff, or students. The moderate to low involvement of various academic leaders and campus constituencies in community service further corroborates antecedent work that affirms the limited rhetorical value of community service (Crosson, 1985). However, the fact that slightly more than half of the institutions that perceived community service as highly important to the mission, goals, culture, and academic programs also reported considerable faculty, student, and administrative involvement suggests that some colleges in this study are indeed incorporating community service into their activities. This raises important questions about what benefit and/or value those colleges and universities attach to community service in order to sustain a commitment.

Differences Between Service Attentive and Service Inattentive Institutions

The limited research on urban higher education service has traditionally focused on "the urban university." This term describes an important but specific subset of institutions that has an explicit mission to serve a particular central city area. Our study casts a wider net in terms of institutional type by including all colleges and universities located in one state's urbanized areas. While the majority of institutions studied were liberal arts and community colleges, the institutional diversity among institutions classified as service attentive indicates that all kinds of colleges and universities in urban areas are perceived as sharing a commitment at least at the level of rhetoric to help solve concrete, immediate, real-world problems in the communities in which they are located. The differences among their institutional missions, control, finances, and student populations are manifested, however, through different service goals, such as developing responsible citizenship, making undergraduate education more practical, and educating the local community. For some institutions, such as liberal arts colleges and research universities, the high importance of community service may, in part, reflect the sharp increase in service learning and volunteerism reported nationally and reflected in their participation in Campus Compact.

Our findings do give rise to optimism. The common operational features of community service attentive institutions may also reflect greater college and university involvement in urban communities—or at least potential for such involvement—than has previously been acknowledged. Our data indicate that at least some institutional governing boards and presidents' cabinets are interested in and are discussing service. Therefore, in addition to those institutions that are already community service attentive, others may be positioned to act quickly on matters directly affecting the actual delivery of community service, such as finances, faculty rewards, and curriculum.

Alternatively, governing board and cabinet interest may reflect merely the rhetorical value of an explicit community service commitment.

A disappointing finding is the observation that neither student support offices or academic policy groups in community service attentive or inattentive institutions have much interest in community service. This is consistent with the gap between the perceived importance of community service to institutional mission, goals, culture, and academic programs and the perceived level of advocacy and involvement in community service of academic and institution-wide leaders. However, it may suggest that the strong service learning component, particularly at liberal arts colleges, has not attracted the attention and/or support of administrative decision-makers and that student affairs staff have little engagement in the area. This involvement gap, along with faculty members' relatively high level of perceived service involvement, may reflect the decentralized nature of teaching in higher education and higher education's traditional reliance on individual interest and effort to carry out service activities. Most importantly, it may mean that community service activities are occurring because groups of faculty members or individual faculty members are committed to these activities rather than because there is institutional support.

Not unexpectedly, our findings reaffirm that the efforts of individuals who typically are entrusted to carry the community service banner—presidents through their rhetoric, and community service coordinators, and chaplains/ministers through their labor—alone are insufficient for greater community service attentiveness. Involvement of deans and senior academic administrators must be linked to the work of faculty members in community service. Senior academic administrators are critical for institutionalizing community service by means of facilitating research and development partnerships, by melding courses and community service, and by incorporating community service into the faculty reward system. Our study indicates that less than one percent of the responding institutions specifically include community service in their faculty personnel decisions such as hiring, promotion, tenure, or salary increases.

The importance of involvement of institutional advancement/development staff members in community service suggests that institutions may be relying less on their operating budget than external resources to support community service when it is not enmeshed with the instructional and research activities. Also, several of the public institutions in the study have experienced serious budget reductions and are now largely dependent upon institutional advancement funds to encourage innovative activities including new forms of community service.

In short, community service in urban areas is important to the mission of most colleges and universities in those settings. Community service attentiveness, however, is more closely linked to institutional leaders, faculty, and staff involvement than to a particular kind of college or university. Furthermore, senior academic administrative leaders are insufficient, in themselves, to support a strong service orientation on campus. Institutional commitment to community service requires the support and involvement of leaders and participants from all parts of a campus community, specifically individual faculty, student support offices, academic policy groups, senior student affairs officers, and development staff. Lastly, work is needed to understand and bridge the gap between institutional rhetoric and community service practice.

Suggested Readings

- Census of Population and Housing, *Guide, Part b./Glossary prepared by the Bureau of the Census* (Washington, DC: The Bureau of the Census, 1990).
- Crosson, P. H., *Public Service in Higher Education: Practices and Priorities*. (Washington, DC: ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education, 1983).
- Crosson, P. H., *Public Service at Public Colleges: Mission and Management*. ED 303065. (Washington, DC: American Association of State Colleges and Universities, 1985).
- Crosson, P., *The Study of Service in Higher Education*. Paper presented at the 1988 meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education, St. Louis, MO. ED 310706.
- Elliott, P. G., *The Urban Campus* (Washington, DC: Oryx Press, 1994).
- Gamson, Z. F., "Higher education and rebuilding civic life," *Change* 29 (1, 1997): 11-13.
- Hackman, J. D., "Power and centrality in the allocation of resources in colleges and universities," *Administrative Science Quarterly* 30 (1985): 61-77.
- Lewis, D., and L. Kallsen, "Multiattribute evaluations: An aid in reallocation decisions in higher education," *The Review of Higher Education* 18 (4, 1995): 437-466.
- Thorndike, R. L., and Hagan, E., *Measurement and Evaluation in Psychology and Education* (New York: John Wiley, 1969).

NOTE: An earlier version of this paper was presented at the Association for the Study of Higher Education Meeting, Orlando, Florida, November, 1995. The authors wish to thank Drs. Helen M. Marks and Emmalou Norland for their helpful comments on this article. Support for this research was made possible, in part, by a grant from the Ohio Board of Regents Urban Universities Program to the first author.