DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 415 801 HE 030 952

AUTHOR Morphew, Christopher C.
TITLE Understanding the Acquisition of New Degree Programs. ASHE Annual Meeting Paper.
PUB DATE 1997-11-00
NOTE 19p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education (22nd, Albuquerque, NM, November 6-9, 1997).
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Change Agents; *College Curriculum; *College Faculty; *Curriculum Development; Degrees (Academic); Higher Education; Institutional Research; Motivation; Organizational Development; Program Development; Teacher Attitudes; Theories; Universities
IDENTIFIERS *ASHE Annual Meeting; Resource Dependency Theory

ABSTRACT

This study examined: first, the impetuses college faculty respond to as they propose new degree programs; and, second, whether these impetuses can be correlated with the components of either resource dependence or institutional theory. It also examined implications of "vertical extension" (whereby institutions extend their academic programs upwardly) and "academic drift" (the tendency of institutions to copy the role and mission of prestige institutions) as related to new degree programs. Institutional theory suggests that three type of isomorphic forces influence organizations: mimetic forces, normative forces, and coercive forces. Resource dependence theory proposes that the key to an organization's success is its ability to acquire and maintain resources within an interdependent model of causes or agents. Interviews were conducted with the 39 faculty at 13 research or comprehensive universities who had been active in the proposal and implementation of new degree programs. Faculty cited three major impetuses for adding new degree programs: (1) intra-university competition for stature; (2) competition for new faculty members; and (3) community need and student demand. Results support both resource-dependence theory and institutional theory. (Contains 29 references.) (DB)

Understanding the Acquisition of New Degree Programs

Christopher C. Morphew, Ph.D.
University of Kansas
Paper presented at 1997 ASHE Conference, Albuquerque, NM.

ASHE

ASSOCIATION
FOR THE
STUDY OF
HIGHER EDUCATION

Texas A&M University
Department of Educational
Administration
College Station, TX 77843
(409) 845-0393

This paper was presented at the annual meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education held in Albuquerque, New Mexico, November 6-9, 1997. This paper was reviewed by ASHE and was judged to be of high quality and of interest to others concerned with higher education. It has therefore been selected to be included in the ERIC collection of ASHE conference papers.

Understanding the Acquisition of New Degree Programs

Christopher C. Morphew, Ph.D.
University of Kansas
Paper presented at 1997 ASHE Conference, Albuquerque, NM.

> Charging "full-cost" and providing unlimited across-the-board programs are no longer viable as the basic principles of operation. Cost should be more carefully scrutinized. And not all universities need to provide coverage of all fields of knowledge; rather, some might concentrate more on what is most needed and what they do best (Kerr, 1995: 190).

Introduction

If the American higher education higher education system is to face the "hard choices" identified by Clark Kerr in the statement above, we need to know more about the forces that cause new degree programs to be added at American colleges and universities. While Kerr argues that universities should focus on what they do well, empirical evidence indicates that universities are not always content with what they do best; rather, they would prefer to become more comprehensive (Aldersley, 1995; Berdahl, 1985; Birnbaum, 1983; Neave, 1979; Riesman, 1956). This growth occurs mainly through the acquisition of new degree programs.

While there are viable theoretical explanations to explain why faculty members would propose new degree programs, little data is available to document why new academic degree programs are initially proposed. Previously, explanations for such growth have hinged on arguments that adding new degree programs was a means toward resource acquisition or an institutionalized notion of legitimacy. In an attempt to add to our knowledge on the subject, this empirical study will explore -- using qualitative data -- the emergence of new degree programs within public comprehensive and research universities in several U.S. states. The significance of this study is in its attempt to identify the impetus that faculty respond to as they propose new degree programs. Furthermore, this study will analyze whether these impetus are correlated with theories that predict the behavior of organizations like universities.

Importance of the Problem

It is clear from research on the subject that instances of academic drift and vertical extension are prevalent in higher education. Nonetheless, we know little about the causes of such university growth. Given the precarious position higher education occupies today and the

challenges that will face it in the future, it is important that we understand more about *why* universities grow over time. Toward that end, we document and apply two organizational theories below. These theories provide very different arguments for why organizations like universities change their structures and practices. In attempting to apply either one or both of these theories to the data we obtain from interviews with faculty who have proposed new degree programs, we hope to come to a better understanding of the forces that lead to the addition of new degree programs at colleges and universities.

Vertical Extension and Academic Drift

Much of the research regarding the addition of new degree programs at colleges and universities has focused on the phenomena of vertical extension and academic drift. These are the terms terms used within higher education literature to describe the tendency of colleges and universities to add new degree programs. Accordingly, they present a beginning point for a discussion of what we know about why universities add new degree programs.

"Vertical extension" is a term used by higher education researchers to describe the phenomenon whereby colleges and universities make "upward extensions in their academic programs" (Schultz & Stickler, 1965: 231). Examples of vertical extension would include four-year colleges adding master's degree programs and comprehensive universities adding doctoral degree programs. "Academic drift," on the other hand, describes "the tendency of institutions, absent any restraint, to copy the role and mission of the prestige institutions" (Berdahl, 1985: 303). Both terms describe phenomena that, arguably, occur quite often in higher education; yet, little research has been devoted to their cause(s). In fact, most of the research on the subject(s) is quite dated.

Riesman's (1956) research on academic drift painted a picture of emulation where less prestigious colleges and universities followed the lead of the more successful and prestigious colleges and universities. Similarly, Jencks and Riesman (1968) argue that academic drift is a function of the increased professionalization in academia that causes a process whereby all institutions converge upon a single model of a normative organizational model. More recently, Neave (1979) documented instances of academic drift that occurred in France, Norway and Yugoslavia as newly-created institutions of higher education quickly diverged from their intended models.

Birnbaum (1983) conducted a longitudinal study of institutional diversity in American higher education from 1960-80 and concluded that institutional diversity had decreased during this

period. This, despite the fact that, during this period, the number of students, universities and academic programs grew at an phenomenal rate. Schultz and Stickler (1965) described several alarming findings that occurred from their study of vertical extension of 319 colleges and universities. For example, they found that smaller colleges and universities were more likely to undergo vertical extension than were larger colleges and universities: "an inverse relationship exists between enrollment and vertical extension" (p. 235). Their study also found that public colleges and universities were more likely than private colleges and universities to add new master's and doctoral degree programs. As a result of their study, they concluded that vertical extension, especially in the first few years of a new program, is hampered by a) an inability to recruit students from outside the university; b) a lack of understanding by faculty members and the administration regarding the resources required for an advanced degree program; and c) an inability to recruit specialized faculty members. Schultz and Stickler conclude by acknowledging that vertical extension is a costly process that results in markedly higher salaries for newly-recruited faculty and problems of faculty morale that result from the application of increased expectations upon veteran faculty members.

Lachs (1965) derides the process of vertical extension and notes that its costs are significant while its "disadvantages and dangers, on the other hand, are manifold" (p. 129). Lachs maintains that, as a result of vertical extension, less attention is paid to existing undergraduate programs and that these programs may suffer as a result. McConnell (1962) identifies a "pecking order" (p. 64) of prestige that is to blame for vertical extension. He claims that colleges and universities that engage in vertical extension do so in order to gain regional and national stature and that such program acquisition is rarely related to demand or need. Similarly, Berelson (1960) studied graduate education programs in the U.S. and noted that very few of the colleges and universities that began offering the doctoral degree during his study period (1948-1958) awarded a significant number of this new degrees. He concludes that colleges and universities may view offering an advanced degree as more important than awarding it.

Berdahl (1985) notes the existence of academic drift and argues for the importance of "protecting diversity" in the wake of this kind of growth (p. 303). Miller (1975) characterizes once-diversified public systems of colleges and universities as becoming overly duplicative and like "a tower of Babel" (p. 47) after the rapid growth of the system's smaller colleges and universities. Aldersley (1995) notes what is clearly evident in any listing of Carnegie Classification: movement within U.S. doctorate-granting colleges and universities is clearly in the direction of the Research I University. Within the Carnegie Classifications devoted to

doctorate-granting institutions, the majority of colleges and universities that changed classification between 1976 - 1987 and 1987 - 1994 moved toward the top of 'pyramid,' as they became more like other Research I Universities.

In contrast to studies that documented examples of academic drift, studies by Huisman & Morphew (1998) and Morphew (1996) show that the public universities within systems of higher education do not always "drift" towards a single model. Their research refutes the assumption that universities necessarily engage in academic drift.

The majority of research on academic drift and vertical extension identifies the tendencies of colleges and universities -- especially within public systems of higher education -- to engage in vertical extension and academic drift. And, while it provides post-hoc theories explaining these tendencies, the same body of research fails to provide empirical information documenting *why* colleges and universities add new degree programs. Some of the researchers make hypotheses, based on their findings, that cases of vertical extension and academic drift are driven by a thirst for greater prestige -- by either the department or the institution. These hypotheses seem to make sense and parallel the propositions put forward by institutional theorists.

Institutional Theory

Institutional theorists argue that, within specific kinds of environments, organizations are compelled to adopt and incorporate traditionalized, formal standards and practices "ceremonially" (Meyer & Rowan, 1977). This is the result of the adoption of an accepted, conceptualized organizational form (Zucker, 1977, 1983). Within these institutionalized environments, organizations generally adapt to the institutionalized norm by adopting practices, procedures and structures in an effort to ensure their legitimacy. In the case of colleges and universities, institutional theorists would argue that some structures arise not because they are necessary, but because they are defined as rational and legitimate (Meyer, Scott & Deal, 1980). More specifically, institutional organizations such as universities might feel compelled to offer institutionalized programs, some of which -- especially at the advanced degree level -- can add to a university's legitimacy and chances for success.

Differentiation between technical and institutional organizations is an integral part of the institutional argument. Part of that argument acknowledges that technical organizations are rewarded for outputs whereas institutional organizations are rewarded for the establishment of certain programs and structures (Scott, 1992). As institutional organizations, universities must

conform to institutional rules that are entirely different from the technical cores important to technical organizations (Meyer, Scott & Deal, 1980). DiMaggio and Powell (1983) describe three types of isomorphic forces that may influence such organizations. They are:

(1) Mimetic forces: organizations such as universities operate using uncertain technologies (teaching, research, knowledge production) and in pursuit of uncertain and symbolic goals (higher education, knowledge, enlightenment). DiMaggio and Powell (1983) argue that less successful peripheral organizations of this type that participate within a field of similar organizations are likely to model themselves after other organizations they perceive as successful. As a result of this modeling, innovation is unusual and is predicted to arise initially within more successful organizations. Rather than attempting to find their own niche with respect to practices and structures, peripheral organizations are much more likely to emulate these more successful organizations.

(2) Normative forces: DiMaggio and Powell (1983) describe normative pressures resulting from "professionalization" (p. 152). In the case of universities, normative isomorphic pressure might result from faculty membership in national or international professional associations. Advances and patterns of research and application in these fields of study are likely to contribute to faculty members' current and future research topics. Given this awareness of new areas of knowledge and the work of colleagues, faculty members at universities may seek the acquisition of new programs in these new areas.

(3) Coercive forces: DiMaggio and Powell (1983, p. 150) describe these forces as "Formal or informal pressures exerted upon organizations by other organizations upon which they are dependent and by cultural expectations in the society within which organizations function. Such pressures may be felt as force, as persuasion, or as invitations to join in collusion." Universities may receive coercive pressure from citizens who expect their local university to offer meaningful programs in adult education or to strive to become a world-class research university. Of course, for those universities operating within a public system, coercive pressure is exerted by governing boards that require specific mission statements and strategic planning reports.

Empirical research has shown some organizational practices and procedures adopted by universities serve as a means of securing legitimacy for actions taken under difficult circumstances (Covaleski and Dirsmith, 1988) or could not be explained given universities' dependence upon external resources (Tolbert, 1985). A study by Ross (1976) showed that,

while the existence of adequate resources is predictive of the acquisition of more traditional academic programs, necessary resources, taken alone, do not predict the acquisition of more innovative programs. This suggests that universities are eager to acquire a greater number of traditional programs, but are less eager to implement progressive programs. This finding is likely due to the fact that more progressive degree programs do not provide the same degree of legitimacy to universities as provided by the acquisition and maintenance of more traditional degree programs that fit within the institutionalized norm of a university.

Resource Dependence Theory

According to resource dependency theorists, the key to an organization's success is its ability to "acquire and maintain resources" (Pfeffer & Salancik, 1978: 2). More specifically, the theory describes how organizations are necessarily connected and must contend with other organizations with whom they are interdependently related. Toward that end, organizations must negotiate situations where they must cope with external demands.

Resource dependency theory revolves around the notion of interdependence. This is the idea that "virtually organizational outcomes are based on interdependent causes or agents (Pfeffer & Salancik, 1978: 40). For instance, a university is interdependent with a student because, in order for the university to be successful, the student must enroll. Similarly, a university is interdependent with a state legislature or governing board because, in order to be successful, the university must receive a budget that allows it to pursue goals. Conversely, in pursuit of the outcome of constructing a successful university, a state legislature or governing board is interdependent with a university because the university, as an organizational unit, must pursue meaningful goals for the legislature or governing board to be deemed successful.

Researchers (Pfeffer & Salancik, 1978; Tolbert, 1985; Sheppard, 1995) point out that some organizations, more than others, are quite vulnerable to demands from external organizations or claimants. Typically, those organizations that receive a) critical resources; or b) a large percentage of their resources from external claimants are more vulnerable to their demands. Tolbert's (1985) examination of the differentiation of administrative structures in public versus private universities point this out. Her research showed that, because public universities receive a greater magnitude of their resources from public sources, administrative structures dealing with public fundraising had become institutionalized. That is, because of the magnitude and tradition of public funding within

public universities, the organizational structures dealing with this type of fundraising had become normative and existed in the same form at many different public universities. Importantly, the converse was also shown to be true at private universities.

When applied to universities, resource dependence theory would predict that organizational behavior -- in terms of adopting new structures, practices and procedures -- would be influenced by internal and external claimants that could provide a critical resources to the university. Building upon Tolbert's (1985) research, the application of resource dependence theory to the behavior of public universities would produce hypotheses predicting behavior caused by demands from the public. One type of public demand would be operationalized in student and community demand for new degree programs. That is, we would expect that public universities would be especially susceptible to calls for new degree programs that would serve the public.

While Tolbert's (1985) study found significant differentiation between the sources of administrative structure in private versus public universities, a study by Kraatz & Zajac (1993) showed resource dependence theories were useful in predicting the organizational behavior or private liberal arts colleges. The study conducted by Kraatz and Zajac (1992) showed how organizational change was predicted by resource availability (as predicted by resource dependence theory) and unaffected by the variables emphasized by institutional theorists. Liberal arts colleges in the study were less affected by academic programs offered by more prestigious peer colleges and more affected by student demand for less traditional academic programs such as communications and business.

Methods

The sample group for this study consists of thirty-nine faculty members from comprehensive and research universities in seven states. Table 1 below details the distribution of faculty interviewed for this study. Thirty to forty-five minute interviews were conducted by the author at campus sites and over the telephone during 1995 and 1996. Interviews were taped and then transcribed.

Table 1. Distribution of interviews by university type and degree level.

University Carnegie Classification	Bachelor	Master's	Doctoral	Total
Research Universities	8	4	7	19
Doctoral and Master's Universities	7	11	2	20
Total	15	15	9	39

The thirty-nine faculty interviewed were chosen as part as a part of a larger process whereby degree programs introduced within the seven states during the period 1971-72 were identified using *The College Blue Book* and the *Classification of Instructional Programs*. Inquiries to the academic departments offering these new degree programs resulted in the identification of faculty members who were active in the creation and submission of program proposals. Each of the faculty members identified agreed to be interviewed for the study after being told of the purpose of the study. Open-ended questions were used in the interview. Data from interview questions regarding the impetus for the proposal of new degree programs were used in this study.

Findings

Analysis of the interviews with faculty members revealed three distinct findings that are both significant and relevant. Specifically, data from interviews indicate:

1. Faculty in research universities often cited intra-university competition for resources as an impetus for adding graduate degree programs.

2. Faculty cited increased competition for new faculty members as impetus for adding new graduate degree programs.

3. Faculty in comprehensive universities often cited community need and student demand as impetus for adding new degree programs.

A discussion of these findings -- including responses from faculty -- follow.

1. Intra-University Competition for Resources

First, data from the interviews support the theory that, especially within research universities, graduate degree programs are acquired for reasons other than student demand. Faculty members within RU I universities very often spoke of the desire for new graduate degree programs as a means of "keeping up" with their university colleagues in other disciplines. In fact, faculty members stated that they proposed new graduate degree programs without concern for whether their was a need for the program in question but

because of the perception that research universities were where innovative programs should occur, regardless of need or academic area.

> There was a sense that if you were going to be an equivalent and key player around here, you were going to have a doctoral program...We had to assemble data to show people that the graduates would be employable, I guess that is back in there somewhere.... yes, we could justify the need for it but the justification for it in the sense of getting the quantitative data came after the decision, rather than before the decision...what I am trying to convey is that this was not this kind of rational, decision-making process where you go out and do a market analysis, saying oh yes, we need one of this. It really was people's belief that we needed this...that there was an emerging group of ideas that we could be on the front edge of...if we were in a position of saying who is going to hire these people, that would have stopped it right there, but that was not the reason we wanted the program [faculty member at research university].

The premise that disciplines/academic departments without graduate degree programs existing within research universities will be unable to compete successfully for resources is not always based on assumptions. Sometimes graduate degrees are proposed because of a perceived history of substandard treatment. One faculty member explained his department's desire for a graduate degree program as a by-product of perceived mistreatment by a discipline with a graduate degree and more resources.

> Let me tell you what little I know about this and you will be intrigued. We were a department of philosophy and religion and philosophy had about twelve faculty and we had four...So we really wanted to become a department because religion was going to go nowhere and philosophy was going to take all the goodies and had been doing it for about twenty years [faculty member at research university].

Similarly, the coordinator of a degree program which had recently lost accreditation because of a student/faculty ratio deemed too high by the accrediting agency lamented his situation in a discussion with me. Because his program was not able to offer a graduate degree -- previous scope limitations made by the statewide governing board do not allow it -- he claims his program's needs are being ignored by university administrators. He complained that he was unable to get funding for more faculty positions, even though the accrediting agency had specified that a lack of faculty lines was the cause for the loss of accreditation. The coordinator believed his program had been lost in the university's emphasis on graduate programs, research and sponsored funding.

Most often, faculty members painted their department's desire for a graduate degree in a pragmatic light; given the current system of resource allocation, only those disciplines offering graduate degrees could hope to acquire important faculty lines, lab facilities, etc.

> ...it's not that we should offer the Ph.D. for the benefit of our discipline. There are too many Ph.D. programs around already so that's not the reason though I guess we could contribute a little. We are not stupid in thinking that [our university] has something great to contribute at the Ph.D. level, I think we have something significant to contribute at the baccalaureate level but in order to live in this university society that we're in where almost all other departments have a Ph.D., we're gonna have to have a Ph.D. or we'll get squelched and squashed [faculty member at research university].

This statement and similar statements made by faculty members in research universities are indicative of an attitude of intra-university competition for resources and prestige. Rather than looking elsewhere -- to other universities and other degree programs -- and attempting to emulate innovative programs being offered outside their university, faculty members at research universities are increasingly concerned with their ability to secure faculty lines, retain and improve office spaces and seem legitimate stakeholders in the eyes of other departments and the central administration. They report that their role within the university is threatened if they do not offer an advanced degree like the majority of other departments. This belief is reinforced by mission statements, strategic plans and administrative behaviors that emphasize the role of research, sponsored funding and graduate education -- and simultaneously de-emphasize the importance of teaching and undergraduate education -- at research universities.

This intra-university competition for resources was cited often in the cases of new graduate degree programs within research universities but was not as evident in interviews with faculty members at comprehensive universities. More often, the reasons cited by the faculty members at these universities were related to demand or, as will be discussed below, faculty recruitment or desire.

2. Recruiting and Retaining Faculty and Graduate Degrees

> Now, we are a doctoral granting I institution and we would like to be a research II university. These are Carnegie Classifications...We also had good support from the state in terms of funding, getting the funds we needed for this program; but at the state level, you have to compete with all the universities. At the top, there are five major universities, we are competing with them. We are competing with some major schools [faculty member at comprehensive university].

Institutional theorists have proposed that normative forces resulting from increased professionalization play a role in increased isomorphism among universities. That is, as faculty forge discipline-based, inter-institutional professional relationships, new research findings, methods and perspectives will be shared, which will in turn lead to similarity among current and future degree programs. Data from interviews document this phenomenon. Moreover, the data show that increased competition for sponsored funding and external research dollars is a primary factor in the acquisition of graduate and interdisciplinary degree programs as a means of recruiting talented, research-oriented faculty.

Faculty used terms like 'upgrade' and 'quality' in interviews as they referred to the acquisition of graduate degree programs and the faculty these new programs would attract. While the pursuit of external funding is expected to rise when graduate degree programs are added to a university's offerings, the quality and prestige of the entire department is expected to increase also as faculty with more specialized training from 'better' universities are lured to campus. In an interview with a faculty member who was discussing her department's newest doctoral degree and the subsequent 'improvement' of the program, I asked her if she would describe improvement as being equal to adding a doctoral degree. She responded with:

> I think it is because of the quality of faculty that you can attract. My own situation, when I was thinking about [this university] and I was thinking about coming here as a place to work, I knew they did not have the Ph.D. program but they did have discussions with me that "we are moving toward this and want you to be a part of this." And so, it was part of my decision to come here over other opportunities. I think the dean saw a Ph.D. critical to his plan of raising the overall quality of the school [interview with faculty at research university].

When I asked about the benefits of offering a graduate degree program in terms of recruiting faculty, I was told:

> It makes us look like a more viable counseling program in the generic overall sense...it gives us the impetus, it gives us the look of a university on the move in terms of developing new programs that are meeting the needs, it demonstrates that we are growing not only in numbers but in program diversity and quality [faculty member at comprehensive university].

The same question yielded similar responses from other faculty, including:

> I believe it has made it easier to recruit faculty. Frankly, the quality of faculty we have been recruiting since the new program is a lot higher on

> average than before. I think that is a direct result of having the doctoral degree [faculty member at comprehensive university].

The acquisition of a graduate degree was often described as the result of an evolutionary process that occurred as highly-trained, specialized faculty members worked together. Faculty members interviewed addressed the rewards (e.g., graduate assistants, research assistants, lighter teaching loads, etc.) of working within a department offering a graduate degree program and noted that, because most or all of the faculty members had been trained at universities with graduate degree programs, they embraced the idea of graduate training.

> One goal was the expected natural goal of computer science or any program or faculty member at a university to have their own graduate program whether there was any demand or not. I don't think that was the overwhelming desire but certainly if you had a group of 10-15 Ph.D.s in computer science sitting around at a university with a bachelor's degree program, the idea that "gee why don't we have a graduate program" has got to come up at some point [faculty member at comprehensive university].

These findings make sense as a function of the fact that -- relatively -- a greater percentage of faculty members at comprehensive and research universities hold doctorates today. Whereas many comprehensive -- and even some research universities -- employed faculty without terminal degrees prior to 1980, today the vast majority of faculty have received doctoral training prior to taking a faculty position. As a result of this immersion in specialized training, it follows that these faculty members are more likely to desire the trappings of graduate degree programs.

> Like our ads now, we say we have a successful undergraduate program but growing graduate programs. Otherwise, people with Ph.D.s say "Well, if I will come to [this university] all I will do is teach undergraduates or 100-level courses. So, they ought to know that we have graduate programs. And, with the graduate program, we have what they call teaching assistants, we can have research assistants and they can help the faculty do research [faculty member at comprehensive university].

3. External Demand and Comprehensive Universities

While resource dependence theory would predict a relationship between the acquisition of a new degree program and the demand for such a program, previous empirical research on academic drift and vertical extension did not argue for the existence of such a link. Nevertheless, the data from this study indicate that faculty members often reported that community need and student demand were two of the reasons the new degree program was proposed and acquired. Interestingly, the data also documented differences by institutional

type. Specifically, data from interviews indicated that faculty at comprehensive universities were more likely than faculty at research universities to: a) conduct a survey or other empirical means of measuring demand prior to proposing the new degree program; b) cite the employment prospects of graduates as an impetus for the new degree program; and c) cite business/community demands as an impetus for the new degree program.

> There were two things. One was student demand...We have Whirlpool, we also have Zenith, a maker of computers and electronics. So there are some companies around here that very much needed some graduate-level education for their employees, so that was why we started the M.S. program ten years ago [faculty member at comprehensive university].

Faculty members at comprehensive and research universities cited both the employment prospects of graduates and the needs of the local business community. More so than in RU I universities, faculty from comprehensive universities in this sample talked about the university's role as part of the community. They often cited the university and community's interdependence.

> Especially in the largest metropolitan area in the state with substantially the most technical business community in the state, there has got to be significant demand for the program and in fact that is the primary reason. That's got to be the primary reason why the program was started. There were no other master's program in [the discipline] in Omaha, in fact the only other graduate program in [the discipline] within the state was at UNL, which of course is 60 miles away and there was a reasonable amount of students who got their bachelor's degrees here and lived in Omaha and commuted on a regular basis to Lincoln to pursue master's or Ph.D. degrees [faculty member at comprehensive university].

Moreover, faculty members in comprehensive universities and RU IIs, when citing impetuses for new degree programs, talked about the career desires of prospective students and their departments' ability to meet those demands.

> Yeah. I am a student, I am interested in the corporate accounting area. No problem. Come into our accounting program. I am a student interested in commercial banking. Go to KU, there is nothing here. I am a student interested in investment banking, brokerage business, the insurance industry, it was pretty much if I wanted to pursue those interests, I had to go somewhere else. So, we were losing some potentially talented students by not having those types of career options available to them [faculty member at comprehensive university].

It is important to note that student and community need were *never* cited in interviews with faculty members at RU I universities. In fact, in two of the interviews at Wayne State University, faculty cited the needs and support of the local professional community. In other interviews with RU I faculty however, community /business or student demand was not mentioned as an impetus for the new degree program in question. What was most

significant about the responses of faculty members at comprehensive universities was the preparation and foundation commonly laid for a new program. Faculty members talked about surveys, meetings with business leaders and community gatherings as impetus for new programs; that kind of community-university interaction was not cited in any of the interviews conducted with RU I faculty.

Finally, another example of the mentality commonly found in interviews with comprehensive university faculty.

> At that time there was only one other program in the state and [flagship university] was it and they're about 180 miles from here and the huge southern part of the state had alot of institutions, junior colleges, senior colleges, tech schools, private colleges and no place at all for them to get trained people for the student services area and had to simply grab people with bachelor degrees in whatever area they could find and train them for the job. So, we did a rather extensive survey and virtually all of the senior colleges, junior colleges and vo-tech schools in the southern half of the state and then in [the next state] also, which was near us. And, I think we surveyed something like 50 or 60 institutions encompassing all of those categories at that time and one of the questions we asked was: "If trained people were available now, what type would you want, what kinds of skills are you looking for, how many are you looking for, immediately, and over the next five years?" [faculty member at comprehensive university].

Certainly faculty members at RU I universities in centralized systems had to substantiate demand for new degree programs just as their system colleagues did -- the requirements for new degree programs are not different by university type. Yet, faculty at RU I universities were not as likely to cite student demands or their efforts to measure such demand when they were asked about the impetuses for the new programs.

References

Aldersley, S.F. (1995). 'Upward drift' is alive and well: Research/doctoral model still attractive to institutions. *Change, 27*(5), 50-56.

Berdahl, R.O. (1971). *Statewide Coordination of Higher Education.* Washington, DC: American Council on Education.

Berdahl, R.O. (1985). Strategy and government: U.S. state Systems and institutional role and mission. *International Journal of Institutional Management in Higher Education, 9.* 3, 301-307.

Berelson, B. (1960). *Graduate Education in the United States.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

Birnbaum, R. (1983). *Maintaining Diversity in Higher Education.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Covaleski, M. & Dirsmith, M. (1988).An Institutional Perspective on the Rise, Social Transformation, and Fall of a University Budget Category. *Administrative Science Quarterly,* 33, 562-586.

DiMaggio, P.J. & Powell, W.W. (1983). The iron cage revisited: institutional isomorphism and collective rationality. In P.J. DiMaggio & W.W. Powell (Eds.), *The New Institutionalism in Organizational Analysis.*

Huisman, J. & Morphew, C.C. (1996). Accounting for program diversity: Perspectives on American and Dutch higher education. Paper Presented at Annual Meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education, Orlando.

Huisman, J & Morphew, C.C. (1998, in press). Centralization and diversity: Evaluating the effects of government Policies in U.S. and Dutch Higher Education. *Higher Education Policy.*

Jencks, C. & Riesman, D. (1968). *The Academic Revolution.* Garden City, NY: Doubleday.

Kerr, C. (1995). Hard choices. *The Uses of the University.* Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.

Kraatz, M. S. & Zajac, E.J. (1992). *Technical and Institutional Influences on Organizational Change and Performance.* Unpublished Paper, J.L. Kellog Graduate School of Management, Northwestern University.

Lachs, J. (1965). Graduate programs in the undergraduate college. *Journal of Higher Education.* March. 121-130.

McConnell, T.R. (1962). *A General Pattern for American Public Higher Education.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

Meyer, J.W. & Rowan, B. (1977). Institutionalized Organizations: Formal Structure as Myth and Ceremony. *American Journal of Sociology,* 83(2), 340-363.

Meyer, J.W., Scott, W.R. & Deal, T.E. (1980). Institutional and Technical Sources of Organizational Structure Explaining the Structure of Educational Organizations. Institute for Research on Educational Finance and Governance, No. 79-A9.

Miller, J.I. (1975). Evaluation and political reality. *New Directions for Institutional Research, 5,* Spring, 47-54.

Morgan, R.L., Hunt, S.E. & Carpenter, J.M. (1990). *Classification of Instructional Programs.* Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics.

Morphew, C.C. (1996). *Statewide Governing Boards: A Longitudinal Study of Seven Public Systems of Higher Education.* Unpublished Dissertation: Stanford University.

Pfeffer, J. & Salancik, G.R. (1978). *The External Control of Organizations.* New York: Harper & Row.

Neave, G. (1979). Academic drift: Some views from Europe. *Studies in Higher Education, 4*(2), 143-159.

Riesman, D. (1956). *Constraint and Variety in American Education.* Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

Ross, R.D. (1976). The institutionalization of academic innovations: two models. *Sociology of Education, 49*(April), 146-155.
Schultz, R.E. & Stickler, W.H. (1965). Vertical extension of academic programs in institutions of higher education. *Educational Record*, Summer, 231-241.
Scott, W.R. (1992). *Organizations: Rational, Natural and Open Systems.* Englewood, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
Sheppard, J.P. (1995). A resource dependence approach to organizational failure. *Social Science Research, 24,* 28-62.
Tolbert, P.S. (1985). Institutionalized environments and resource depedence: Sources of administrative structure in institutions of higher education. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 30,* 1-13.
Zucker, L. (1977). The role of institutionalization in cultural persistence. *American Sociological Review, 42,* 725-743.
Zucker, L. (1983). Organizations as institutions. In S. Bacharach (ed.), *Research in the Sociology of Organizations, 2,* 1-47. Greenwich, Connecticut: JAI Press.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

NOTICE

REPRODUCTION BASIS

☒ This document is covered by a signed "Reproduction Release (Blanket)" form (on file within the ERIC system), encompassing all or classes of documents from its source organization and, therefore, does not require a "Specific Document" Release form.

☐ This document is Federally-funded, or carries its own permission to reproduce, or is otherwise in the public domain and, therefore, may be reproduced by ERIC without a signed Reproduction Release form (either "Specific Document" or "Blanket").