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Order is not pressure which is imposed on society from without, but an equilibrium which is set up from within.
—José Ortega y Gasset

I must Create a System, or be enslav'd by another Man's.
—William Blake

INTRODUCTION

These two different, yet compatible, thoughts propel this paper. In this analysis, I explore the properties of a particular, informally regulated, social system: the urban postsecondary system (UPS). In Ortega y Gasset's language, does “an equilibrium which is set up from within” exist among the colleges and universities located in American cities and, if so, what are its properties? In addition, the discussion pursues Blake’s proactive line of thought and considers policy issues. Do the patterns
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that emerge suggest the need for new or different policies to help higher education serve a largely urban, learning society more effectively?

The United States has become a learning society (Apps 1988; Aslanian and Brickell 1980; Cross 1981), which means essentially that learning throughout the lifespan has become a necessity for any American wishing to get ahead or, often, just to hold ground. The pace of change simply demands it. Recently, in his Education 2000 Plan, President George Bush made higher education's effective response to lifelong learning needs a national priority (DeLoughry 1991). The learning society has moved from scholarly concept to national policy.

Putting two facts together suggests the importance of urban postsecondary institutions: (1) More than 80 percent of students enrolled in postsecondary institutions commute (i.e., "do not live in institutionally owned housing" [Jacoby 1989, 1]), and (2) 77 percent of all Americans live in metropolitan regions with populations greater than 100,000 (i.e., metropolitan statistical areas [U.S. Bureau of the Census 1990]). These urban postsecondary institutions are where the people are, and people tend to commute when they take a college course. Urban colleges and universities are major elements in the American learning society's educational infrastructure. Their ability to serve local commuter populations is critical to achieving a major goal of the national educational agenda—providing lifelong learning opportunities. Projecting a scenario of the future in which the significance of their role does not intensify is difficult indeed.

For at least two decades, urban geographers have spoken of urban systems rather than of mere cities (e.g., Berry and Horton 1970). However, postsecondary scholars have yet to apply the system concept in studying the collectivity of institutions located in an urban region. We have begun to identify such uniquely urban institutions as the urban public university (e.g., Grobman 1988; Kinnick and Ricks 1990) and the urban small college (Robertson 1991a); we have spoken at a general conceptual level about an organization's relationship with its environment, such as an urban environment (e.g., Birnbaum 1988; Cameron 1984); we have speculated about the benefit of comprehensive urban consortia (e.g., Martonana and Kuhns 1977); and we have discussed national postsecondary systems (e.g. Boyer 1987; Clark 1983). Yet we do not have a concept for the urban educational systems in which the majority of American postsecondary students will try to meet their learning needs. Nor do we have much description of these phenomena. This study terms them urban postsecondary systems (UPSs) and begins to identify their salient characteristics and pertinent policy issues.
METHODS

Population

The UPSs of the nation's twenty consolidated metropolitan statistical areas (CMSAs) constitute the study population (Table 1). Approximately 35 percent of Americans live in these CMSAs (U.S. Bureau of the Census 1988). For statistical reporting, the U.S. Census Bureau distinguishes three types of metropolitan areas: metropolitan statistical areas (MSAs), consolidated metropolitan statistical areas (CMSAs), and primary metropolitan statistical areas (PMSAs). Definitions of these types are highly technical; however, the following descriptions provide a general idea:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>CMSA</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Enrollments*</th>
<th>Institutions**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>17,967,800</td>
<td>632,408</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>13,074,800</td>
<td>608,422</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>8,116,000</td>
<td>335,863</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>5,877,800</td>
<td>413,637</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Philadelphia</td>
<td>5,832,600</td>
<td>234,572</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Detroit</td>
<td>4,600,800</td>
<td>233,051</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Boston</td>
<td>4,055,700</td>
<td>252,619</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Dallas</td>
<td>3,655,300</td>
<td>97,757</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Houston</td>
<td>3,634,000</td>
<td>140,233</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Miami</td>
<td>2,911,900</td>
<td>113,834</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>2,765,700</td>
<td>131,851</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Pittsburgh</td>
<td>2,316,100</td>
<td>105,883</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Seattle</td>
<td>2,284,400</td>
<td>100,497</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Denver</td>
<td>1,847,400</td>
<td>78,666</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
<td>1,690,100</td>
<td>67,244</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Milwaukee</td>
<td>1,552,000</td>
<td>71,043</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Portland (OR)</td>
<td>1,364,100</td>
<td>64,655</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Buffalo</td>
<td>1,181,600</td>
<td>65,613</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Providence</td>
<td>1,108,500</td>
<td>53,681</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Hartford</td>
<td>1,043,500</td>
<td>34,861</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>86,880,100</td>
<td>3,836,390</td>
<td>529</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*For enrollments and population, \( r = .95, p < .01 \).
**For institutions and population, \( r = .95, p < .01 \).


I have used population data that are most closely contemporaneous with enrollment data here.
Each MSA has one or more “central counties,” containing the area’s main population concentration. An MSA also may include outlying counties that have close economic and social relationships with the central counties. Such counties must have a specified level of commuting to the central counties and also must meet certain standards regarding metropolitan character, such as high population density. . . .

In MSAs with a population of 1 million or more, PMSA’s may be identified. Each such area consists of a large urbanized county or cluster of counties that demonstrates very strong internal economic and social links, in addition to close ties to neighboring areas; local opinion must support separate recognition of PMSA’s. When PMSA’s are defined, the MSA of which they are component parts is redesignated a CMSA (U.S. Bureau of the Census 1986, 625).

By focusing on CMSAs, this study essentially concentrates on all of the nation’s large urban systems that are highly organized around a strong central city. Seventeen MSAs—for example, Washington, D.C. and San Diego have a population over one million but do not have a PMSA and therefore are not a CMSA—as, for example, New York and San Francisco are. Although these more loosely organized metropolitan systems are significant population centers, I have not treated them in this study.

Data

Using metropolitan maps and the Carnegie directory (Carnegie Foundation 1987), I identified all of the doctorate-granting universities (Research I, Research II, Doctorate-granting I, and Doctorate-granting II), comprehensive colleges and universities (Comprehensive I and Comprehensive II), liberal arts colleges (Liberal Arts I and Liberal Arts II), and two-year colleges in each CMSA. I created twenty data subsets—one for each CMSA—that contained the Carnegie type, control status (public or private), and enrollments for each institution. Carnegie enrollment figures come from the Department of Education’s Higher Education General Information Surveys (HEGIS) and represent fall quarter unduplicated headcounts, including part-time and full-time enrollments, but excluding audits, continuing education enrollments, and participants in special programs such as advanced high school programs.

Analysis

The analysis utilized two basic frames of reference. First, I made comparisons among institutions in these twenty large cities. For example, I compared the number of CMSA institutions in the various Carnegie
types for the public and private sectors. Second, I compared institutions in these large cities and institutions in other locales. For example, I compared enrollment totals for Carnegie types for CMSA institutions and non-CMSA institutions. I derived data for non-CMSA institutions by subtracting totals for CMSA institutions from national totals, excluding specialized institutions. (See the description of the data above.) Selected findings for each frame of reference are discussed in the next two sections respectively.

**Properties of Large Urban Postsecondary Systems**

**Patterns**

A clear pattern of organization by size appears in this study's UPSs. Relatively large enrollments concentrate in relatively few institutions: about 20 percent of the institutions serve about 50 percent of the students in each UPS. In other words, in terms of enrollments, each UPS manifests an oligarchy of large institutions that, in many cases, borders on hegemony.

A simple technique produced graphs that display the percentage of a UPS's institutions that serves any particular percentage of its students. For each UPS, I ranked institutions by size (enrollments) and, beginning with the smallest, calculated cumulative enrollments for each successively ranked institution. I then transformed each institution's cumulative enrollment value into a percentage of that UPS's total enrollments. Similarly, an institution's rank within its UPS (where one is the smallest, and n is the largest) was divided by the total number of institutions in that UPS (n) to compute the cumulative percentage of institutions represented by the position of any particular institution in the ranked display. Then, again beginning with the smallest, I plotted each institution on a graph where the x axis represented the cumulative percentage of the UPS's total number of institutions (rank) and the y axis expressed the cumulative percentage of its total enrollments (size).

The institutional rank-size arrays of the twenty UPSs were nearly identical. This technique of using cumulative percentages of enrollments and institutions standardizes the rank-size position of each institution in each UPS so that all institutions can be plotted together to form a composite CMSA picture. When this is done, the pattern is strikingly evident (Figure 1).

For perspective, if all the institutions in a UPS were the same size, the points could be joined to form a straight line that slanted upward. If the increase in the size of institutions were an arithmetic progression, the consequent upward line would be a slight curve. If the increase were a geometric progression, the upward line would be a bowed curve that
was almost horizontal toward its beginning and nearly vertical toward its end. The rank-size arrangement in this study's UPSs approaches this geometric progression. Consistently, these UPSs manifest a relatively large number of small institutions and a relatively small number of large institutions. As an aside, this pattern appears to mirror the distribution of quantities in other informally regulated social systems (e.g., wealth in a capitalist economy where a relatively small number of individuals accumulate large amounts and a relatively large number accumulate little). One wonders if these UPSs are simply demonstrating a naturally occurring systemic dynamic that has yet to be confirmed in diverse kinds of informally regulated social systems.

If institutional sizes are informally regulated, then perhaps institutional types are also organized. And indeed, patterns do appear. When institutions in a UPS are arranged by size as described above, the array can be divided into quartiles, where the institutions in each quartile produce about 25 percent of that UPS's enrollments. Combining all CMSA institutions is one way to discern general tendencies of large UPSs (Fig-
ure 1). Analysis of the institutions in these quartiles for all CMSAs reveals significant differences in the institutional composition of each quartile in terms of institutional control (public or private) and Carnegie type.

The first quartile comprises a relatively small number of relatively large public institutions (public = 78 percent of the 46 institutions). In fact, public schools are overrepresented in each of the top three quartiles (second quartile, public = 86 percent of the 64 institutions; third quartile, public = 77 percent of the 101 institutions). The fourth quartile contains a relatively large number of relatively small private institutions (private = 67 percent of the 318 institutions). Among all 529 CMSA institutions, 52 percent are public (n = 274), and 48 percent are private (n = 255). Clearly, public institutions predominate among the largest, and private schools preponderate among the smallest ($\chi^2 [3, N = 529] = 113.85, p < .01$).

The primate (largest) institution in this study’s UPSs is typically quite large (M = 27,536 enrollments). The most common primate institution is overwhelmingly a public doctorate-granting university. This kind of institution was the largest in sixteen of the twenty UPSs. Twelve of these sixteen were Research I or Research II universities. Among the four exceptions, one was a private doctorate-granting university (Northeastern University, Boston); one was a private comprehensive university (University of Hartford, Conn.); and two were community colleges (Miami-Dade Community College, Miami; and Portland Community College, Portland, Oregon).

The organization of Carnegie types in these quartiles is highly significant whether considering the public and private institutions together ($\chi^2 [9, N = 529] = 164.80, p < .01$) or separately (public: $\chi^2 [9, N = 274] = 59.80, p < .01$; private: $\chi^2 [9, N = 255] = 87.78, p < .01$). In these three contingency tables (Carnegie type by rank-size quartile for public and private institutions taken together and separately), the cells that drive these chi-square values so high are clearly the overrepresented doctorate-granting institutions (public and private) in the quartile of largest institutions. Doctorate-granting institutions constituted nearly half of the public institutions (seventeen of thirty-six, or 47 percent) in the quartile of largest institutions, and nearly all of the private institutions (nine of ten, or 90 percent) in this quartile.

Granted, the large public doctorate-granting university is usually the dominant institution on the CMSA landscape. However, relatively few of them exist compared to public two-year colleges: 6 percent of CMSA institutions (33 of 529) are public doctorate-granting universities in contrast to 34 percent (182 of 529) that are public two-year colleges. These public two-year colleges are relatively large as well as frequent (M =
8,710 enrollments). A student in a CMSA, according to the statistical probabilities, will attend a public two-year college in two cases out of five: public two-year colleges = 1,585,000 enrollments, or 41 percent of the CMSA total (3,837,000); public doctorate-granting universities = 647,000, or 17 percent; public comprehensive colleges or universities = 631,000, or 16 percent; private doctorate-granting universities = 478,000, or 12 percent; private comprehensive colleges or universities = 357,000, or 9 percent; and private liberal arts colleges = 128,000, or 3 percent. Public liberal arts colleges and private two-year colleges are virtually nonexistent in CMSAs.

Policy Questions

These patterns provoke at least three policy questions. These questions are certainly not new. However, this study contributes by establishing their ongoing significance and by directing us usefully among the many issues that currently compete for our attention.

The first policy matter is institutional size. Should the curve be flattened? Does it serve a learning society well to concentrate large numbers of students in a few, huge institutions?

Colleges are getting larger, even though the wisdom of this trend has been soundly challenged (Astin 1977). In the three decades following 1950, enrollments have increased almost 400 percent, while the number of institutions has risen only about 50 percent (Study Group 1984). In nine of the twenty CMSAs, the largest institution enrolls over 20,000 students; Miami-Dade Community College is the largest of the largest with 37,532 enrollments. Seventeen of the twenty enroll over 20,000 students.

Research clearly demonstrates that student learning and development correlate positively with student involvement (Kuh et al. 1991; Pascarella and Terenzini 1991; Study Group 1984). Equally clearly, research indicates that student involvement correlates negatively with institutional size (Barker 1968; Barker and Gump 1964; Chickering 1969; Kuh et al. 1991; Pascarella and Terenzini 1991). Exemplary large urban institutions do achieve a human scale and an involving campus environment by means such as branch campuses, small learning units, and special support programs (Kuh et al. 1991). By doing so, they eliminate the access-versus-quality dichotomy which is based on the belief that broad access results from economies of scale that necessarily sacrifice some educational quality. However, these exemplary institutions are rare.

Is our society well served by mammoth concentrations of students any more than it is served by great fortunes in a few hands? What kinds of learning environments tend to occur in institutions the size of small
cities? If large institutions remain huge, what measures will make them "live" like small schools for students?

The second policy question also relates to learning environments. As shown earlier, the primate institution in a UPS is usually a public doctorate-granting university (most frequently, a research university). These institutions typically enroll, by a sizable margin, the largest number of students in a UPS. Granted, many students at these universities come from outside the CMSA, but indigenous commuter students constitute a large proportion as well. Potentially, these public urban universities can play an important role in serving lifelong learning needs in a largely urban, learning society. However, the Carnegie Foundation's 1989 National Survey of Faculty found that these universities offer few rewards for teaching (Boyer 1990; Carnegie Foundation 1991). For instance, at Research I universities, not one of the five indicators that were most widely used in tenure decisions involved teaching. In fact, teaching indicators were among the least commonly used. In contrast, at comprehensive and liberal arts institutions, student evaluations were at the top of the list. So, this large, probably at best indifferent, learning environment is what confronts the learner when he or she attempts to fulfill a learning agenda at the local flagship university. Is this situation necessary at a doctorate-granting university? Can good teaching and good research coexist at these institutions?

In Ernest Boyer's recent discussion of the Carnegie Foundation's national study of faculty, he argues persuasively for teaching excellence in all categories of doctorate-granting universities. For example, regarding Research I and Research II universities, he writes:

At the research university, original research and publication should remain the basic expectations and be considered the key criteria by which the performance of most faculty will be assessed. . . . [However] research universities also must aggressively support teaching. After all, a significant percentage of their students are undergraduates, and such institutions are clearly obligated to provide them a quality education. Is it ethical to enroll students and not give them the attention they deserve? . . . To expect faculty to be good teachers, as well as good researchers, is to set a demanding standard. Still, it is at the research university, more than any other, where the two must come together (1990, 57–58).

He argues differently but with similar cogency for teaching excellence at the remaining categories of doctorate-granting universities. One could take the position that doctorate-granting universities have a unique and demanding agenda—i.e., the creation and dissemination of new knowledge—and therefore should be excused for a lack of emphasis on
teaching. However, given the immense size of these institutions’ undergraduate populations, that position seems ethically indefensible.

Encouraging teaching excellence without rewarding it extrinsically (e.g., with tenure, promotion, and merit pay increases) actually demoralizes faculty (Rice and Austin 1990, 33). The question then becomes: How can systems that explicitly reward superior teaching be established at doctorate-granting universities? More fundamental, and less a policy than a measurement issue, is a second question: How can teaching be effectively evaluated so that teaching indicators can take their place beside traditional research indicators in reward systems?

The third policy question involves the coordination of institutions in UPSs. Public two-year colleges enroll over 40 percent of the students in CMSAs. Education breeds education (Aslanian and Brickell 1980, 1988), and this large enrollment figure for two-year colleges means that CMSAs have a sizable pool of potential transfer students. Recognizing the need to preserve institutional standards, mission, and program uniqueness, can the linkages between public two-year and four-year colleges be improved to facilitate students’ movement among UPS institutions? More broadly and more importantly, how can the many kinds of relationships—for example, not just student transfers but resource sharing—between all UPS institutions, both public and private, be improved so the UPS becomes a more highly organized and functional system?

Of course, we have heard pleas for interinstitutional cooperation before. The consortium movement has been with us for over six decades now. The rapid expansion of student populations after World War II propelled that interest into the 1970s (Martonana, Messersmith, and Nelson 1961; Moore 1968). Economic contraction drove the same movement in the 1980s and 1990s (Neal 1988b). Over the years, these cooperative efforts have had mixed results for some very good reasons, not the least of which are the high values placed on autonomy and competition in American culture (Martonana, Messersmith, and Nelson 1961, 37; Neal 1988a; Neal 1988b, 20–21; Patterson 1974; Stauffer 1981).

However, the issue being raised here is different than the formation of voluntary consortia on an institution-by-institution, program-by-program basis. In the past, urban postsecondary systems have been regulated informally. To what extent can they or should they be regulated formally? Should postsecondary coordinating authorities be created for urban regions similar to agencies that coordinate the activities of the various city and county governmental units operating in a metropolitan region? In addition to a State Educational Coordinating Commission, perhaps policymakers should create Metropolitan Educational Coordinating Commissions. Because the overwhelming number of postsecond-
ary students in a learning society will be commuter students who live in big cities, perhaps the most important frame of reference for policymakers is the urban system rather than the state system.

**Big City vs. Out-State Comparisons**

**Patterns**

How do CMSA institutions differ from institutions in other locales? Some of these non-CMSA institutions are in large cities that lack a PMSA and therefore do not qualify as a CMSA. However, by and large, non-CMSA institutions are located outside metropoli in medium- to small-sized settlements. Analyzing the contrasts in the composite pictures for CMSA and non-CMSA institutions produces some revealing patterns.

The first pattern involves institutional size. Enrollments at public non-CMSA institutions are larger than private non-CMSA institutions for each Carnegie type, just like CMSA institutions. The 19 percent (529) of the nation’s institutions that are located in CMSAs enroll 32 percent (3,837,000) of the nation’s students; 81 percent (2,218) of the institutions are situated outside of CMSAs and serve 68 percent (7,997,000) of the students. Contrasting the average size of CMSA and non-CMSA institutions by Carnegie type shows that CMSA institutions are consistently larger: public two-year, CMSA = 8,710 enrollments, non-CMSA = 3,320 enrollments; private liberal arts, CMSA = 1,110, non-CMSA = 970; public comprehensive, CMSA = 11,070, non-CMSA = 6,370; private comprehensive, CMSA = 4,100, non-CMSA = 3,210; and private doctorate-granting, CMSA = 10,860, non-CMSA = 8,460.

CMSA institutions are larger than non-CMSA institutions with one notable exception: public doctorate-granting universities, CMSA = 19,610, non-CMSA = 19,880. Unlike any other category, public doctorate-granting universities located outside of big cities are slightly larger on the average than those located in big cities (bearing in mind that this finding includes the impurity in the non-CMSA data of institutions from the seventeen large MSAs that do not qualify as CMSAs).

Second is the pattern of institutional types. In the private sector, big cities appear to attract relatively large, doctorate-granting institutions. Contrasting private CMSA and non-CMSA institutions by Carnegie type reveals a significant overrepresentation of private doctorate-granting universities in CMSAs both in terms of number of institutions ($\chi^2 [3, N = 1,265] = 164.47, p < .01$) and enrollments ($\chi^2 [3, N = 2,508,000] = 375.37, p < .01$).

In the public sector, metropoli breed large two-year colleges but not necessarily the largest doctorate-granting universities in the state system.
Contrasting public CMSA and non-CMSA institutions by Carnegie type shows that enrollments in CMSAs are significantly overrepresented in two-year colleges and significantly underrepresented in doctorate-granting universities ($\chi^2 [3, N = 9,326,000] = 163.73, p < .01$).

**Policy Questions**

These patterns suggest an interesting set of public policy questions related to resource allocation. In eighteenth and nineteenth century location decisions, American officials often chose to decentralize public resources. Frequently, the state capital was located in a small town rather than the state’s largest city. So were the major public universities. In the past, students temporarily moved to a campus town to attend the major public university where the state’s higher education resources were concentrated. But in a learning society, lifelong learning predominates and commuter students far outnumber residential students. Educational resources need to be concentrated where people are concentrated. Urban community colleges—built largely since World War II (Cohen and Brawer 1989)—have certainly responded to this need. Their responsiveness to the local metropolitan region makes sense because local impetus generated them and a local tax base subsidizes them.

However, the allocation of resources in state four-year systems can cause great concern. In the state pecking order, the urban university may be much lower than the state’s dominant research university located out-state. But the urban university is where the overwhelmingly largest concentration of people are. The dilemma is clear.

To what extent should public resources be concentrated away from population concentrations? What are the most appropriate roles for a state’s urban and non-urban universities in a learning society? Which roles are more important, if any? How should resources be allocated among these very different kinds of institutions? Will this allocation pattern represent a change from past patterns and require special change strategies?

**CONCLUSION**

*New occasions teach new duties.*
—James Russell Lowell

The “new occasion” of perhaps the greatest significance for American higher education is the emergence of the learning society and the “new duties” it entails. A social institution exists to meet the needs of human groups, and the institution’s purpose must evolve with its changing so-
ciety. Otherwise, the institution may cease to exist, or its significance may diminish substantially. If colleges and universities—as social institutions—are to play a central role in the learning society, their missions must include serving lifelong learners.

These lifelong learners will tend to be commuter students. Typically, they have professional, family, and community responsibilities that exist simultaneously with their learning projects and that prevent them from being residential students (Rhatigan 1986; Robertson 1991a and 1991b; Schlossberg, Lynch, and Chickering 1989). Previously, four-year colleges and universities primarily enrolled young adults who lived on campus, and community colleges served complex commuter populations. Now, these commuter students are common regardless of institutional type.

The new American college student—whether traditional or nontraditional, dependent or independent, full-time or part-time—most commonly attends a geographically proximate institution (Jacoby 1989). The attention of postsecondary scholars and policymakers should focus on locations where these commuter students live in major concentrations—that is, cities, especially large cities. These metropoli are best viewed as complex, dynamic systems with various subsystems. One of these subsystems is the urban postsecondary system. This concept appears to be a beneficial unit of analysis for postsecondary scholars and policymakers.

As a beginning, this study has identified some fundamental properties of large urban postsecondary systems and has targeted some critical policy questions. The findings indicate further work using this unit of analysis on both fronts—elaborating systemic properties and developing policy recommendations. With this knowledge, American higher education can respond effectively to its evolving learning society and can remain vital as the twenty-first century approaches.
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