Published online in Wiley Online Library
(wileyonlinelibrary.com) • DOI: 10.1002/aehe.20009

Defining Institutional Diversity

THE AMERICAN SYSTEM OF HIGHER EDUCATION has historically exhibited greater levels of diversity of institutional types than any other country. A range of institutional types, from community colleges to liberal arts colleges, research universities, historically Black colleges, and proprietary colleges, exist within the U.S. system. e system contains a vast array of institutions that serve a variety of needs for the nation. Observers of higher education generally acknowledge the necessity of institutional diversity to support a system of colleges and universities that proves exible, responsive, and adaptable for a range of purposes. e vast educational aims that higher education seeks to address would prove impossible for any single type of institution to achieve. e level of institutional diversity present provides postsecondary options for students seeking programs from career training to advanced research degrees. Students can enter the system from multiple entry points suitable for various student achievements and abilities as well as personal circumstances. Without su cient institutional diversity, students would be unable to attend a program, degree, and setting that matches their educational abilities and goals.

Colleges and universities with di erentiated missions increase the e ectiveness and e ciency of higher education (Morphew, 2002). Moreover, the success of individual institutional types shows the importance of encouraging institutional diversity. American research universities serve as a key national resource and dominate higher education globally in terms of research knowledge production and dissemination (Cole, 2009). Community colleges provide tremendous opportunities for students to gain access to higher education

for general and vocational education. Minority-serving institutions o

meaningful measurement of institutional diversity results from the term holding different meanings for different groups (Codling & Meek, 2006). However, my primary goal with this monograph—to better explain external institutional diversity in the context of higher education— requires a working de nition of institutional diversity. Over the course of the development of American higher education, institutional diversity as an idea constantly evolved, and many in higher education debated the meaning and signi cance of the concept (Aldersley, 1995; Huisman, 1995, 1998; Huisman et al., 2007; Huisman & Morphew, 1998; Morphew, 2000, 2002, 2009; Neave, 1979; Riesman, 1956; van Vught, 2009; Zha, 2009).

Institutional diversity represents one of the great and unique features of the American higher education system and serves as an in uential foundation of the system's historical success (Trow, 1979). Indeed, many scholars argue that institutional diversity embodies a signi cant ideological aspect and represents one of the most signi cant strengths of the U.S. higher education system (Birnbaum, 1983; Morphew, 2009). American society demands a range of requirements for higher education to ful ll from reaching di erent student populations, providing a variety of academic elds and degrees, and multiple entry points into the system. No single institutional type could possibly meet all these goals. e presence of institutional diversity within higher education provides an adaptive and responsive system to meet these various requirements. However, a steady homogenization or a move toward similarity of types of institutions within higher education over the past 40 years both in

e diversity of institutions within American higher education constantly changes as a result of internal and external pressures on institutions. Critically, internal dynamics within colleges and universities determine the level of diversity along with larger environmental and system changes within society, government, and globalization. e growth of online education and for-pro t institutions represents one of the areas of greatest growth of colleges in the United States in recent years. e largely unmet educational needs of adult students presented an opportunity for new higher education o erings and institutions to enter the marketplace. New institutions such as the University of Phoenix, DeVry, and ITT began o ering a variety of degrees and certi - cates while capturing the attention of many across higher education (Winston, 1999). Traditional colleges and universities failed to fully address the needs of this population, creating an environmental condition that encouraged the development of new institutional types and led to an increase in institutional diversity in the higher education system. A number of issues within higher education can either expand or contract institutional diversity depending on various stakeholder reactions. For example, declining enrollment as a result of reduced demand may cause program or institutional closures. The need for additional enrollment could instead lead to the implementation of new enrollment management strategies (Holley & Harris, 2010) or the establishment of new programs to reach new students. By the same token, state nancial cutbacks might result in reduced program o erings, leading institutions to focus on various niche programs and markets. Institutions may respond by creating programs with self- nancing business models or reaching out to student populations that the institution traditionally fails to serve. e responses of campus leaders from administrators to faculty profoundly in uence institutional-level dynamics, which in the aggregate in uence the institutional diversity of the entire system.

Aspects of Institutional Diversity

e research literature (Birnbaum, 1983; Huisman, 1998) identi es aspects of institutional diversity allowing the delineation of ve commonly accepted aspects of institutional diversity in U.S. higher education.

Systemic:

Research studies most frequently consider systemic diversity, and these concepts in uence many other institutional diversity aspects identi ed later. e Carnegie Classi cations, the most widely referenced classi cation scheme in higher education, creates a typology using six primary criteria: undergraduate instruction, graduate instruction, enrollment pro le, undergraduate pro le, size, and setting. Since the rst iteration in 1970, the Carnegie Classi cations have undergone subtle and more dramatic changes in an attempt to re ect the changes among higher education institutions. Despite the changes, the in uence of the classi cations remains substantial and results in the importance often being placed on systemic di erences. Furthermore, the aspects of systemic diversity may appear separately but frequently occur together. For example, many small colleges are private institutions, while larger universities tend to be under public control. Research universities o er more graduate programs and typically enroll a larger student body with more full-time students. e relationship among the various characteristics of systemic diversity allows a categorizing of institutions that provides an easy shorthand for describing colleges and universities. As an example, if told to imagine what a private liberal arts college looks like, one might think of a small school, located in a rural or suburban area, with a collegial culture and a focus on teaching and student–faculty interactions. Although this would certainly not describe all private liberal arts colleges in the nation, the typical characteristics enable generalizations useful for daily practice.

Programmatic:

Programmatic diversity includes ve components: degree level, degree area, comprehensiveness, mission, and emphasis. De ning institutions based on their highest degree awarded (associate's, bachelor's, master's, or doctorate) remains one of the most common ways to di erentiate among various higher

degree awarded as a community college with programs such as college transfer courses and vocational education to serve a sizable adult and part-time student population. A doctoral-granting institution would lead one to expect an institution with a research emphasis, a broader array of academic o erings, faculty who emphasize research and tenure, and graduate education programs. Certainly, a great variety exists among institutions that o er an associate's degree or those that o er doctorates as their highest o ering. However, the use of the highest degree level o ered provides a frequently used variable to di erentiate and categorize institutions.

Procedural:

Programmatic diversity refers to the disciplines and academic programs an institution o ers, while procedural describes these programs from a policy perspective. is type of institutional diversity refers to modes of study or student policies and constitutes a smaller impact on institutional activity than other areas noted in this section. Despite complaints regarding the ine - ciency of face-to-face teaching in the modern technological environment, the typical mode of study remains a faculty member in a room with a group of students. While the primacy of the lecture slowly fades (DeAngelo et al., 2009) with the advent of newer pedagogies such as problem-based learning or service learning (Barkley, Cross, & Major, 2005; Bringle & Hatcher, 2000; Savin-Badden & Major, 2004), the fundamental approach of faculty and students together at the same time and place remains. However, the change in procedural diversity related to the growth of online education embodies one of the most signi cant changes in all of higher education during the past 10 years. Students, often working adults or others unable, for a variety of reasons, to participate in traditional face-to-face higher education, take advantage of online classes or entire degree programs. Birnbaum (1983) noted that "these atypical approaches to the delivery of education are at such a low level and of such peripheral importance to the institutions' mission that their presence has almost no impact upon institutional diversity" (p. 43). During the fall 2009 semester, a Sloan Consortium study found that 5.6 million students or nearly 30% of all higher education took at least one course online (I. E. Allen & Seaman, 2010). Surely, the change within this area eclipses any other

con

the classi cations as rankings, prestige generators, and as a recruiting tool for faculty and students. e recent changes to the system, particularly to create independent and parallel classifying frameworks, attempts to minimize these alternative uses. However, this change also limits tity

administrators, broader economic trends, state legislators, alumni, federal policy, and demographic changes represent only a few of the inputs into the higher education system. Diversity within higher education creates stability by allowing the system to more e ectively respond to the institutional and societal expectations. e large and relatively autonomous components within higher education can respond more adequately and sensitively to stakeholder and environmental changes than could a smaller and more centrally controlled system.

e nature of this loosely coupled system as explained by Weick (1976) and others insulates the system from undue external in uence as a result of the variety within the system. Di erent types of institutions vary in their response and dependence on resources and constituencies, making them more or less vulnerable to changes. erefore, institutional diversity not only serves as a value of the system but as a key protector as well.

In the current environment where accountability, increased scrutiny, nancial cutbacks, and escalating costs seem paramount, researchers and practitioners need to critically understand the processes both internal and external to the higher education system that in uence institutional diversity. Higher education advocates and political leaders attack colleges and universities for their growth both in size and cost as well as the lack of programmatic focus (Christensen & Eyring, 2011), yet little information exists to explain the various forces responsible for changes in institutional diversity. The tension between standardization and diversity remains underexplored as well. For example, what contextual issues created a fertile ground for online education and for-pro t higher education while traditional institutional types such as women's colleges and private 2-year colleges waned? Most observers consider a healthy level of diversity one of the valuable attributes of a higher education system that o ers choices for students, multiple entry points and programmatic o erings, and a range of programmatic options (Birnbaum, 1983). For example, a higher education system that possesses research universities and community colleges can provide opportunities for students to engage in academic pursuits as varied as doctoral training to vocational certification. Without a more systemic approach to the research and a broader empirical basis to explain changes in diversity, the policy debate around supporting institutional diversity will continue to struggle with "policies [that] are

ill-informed and run the severe risk of becoming ineffective" (Huisman, Kaiser, & Vossensteyn, 2000, p. 564).

Overview of the Monograph

is monograph reviews the research literature explaining the various ways in which to understand institutional diversity within higher education. e discussion of institutional diversity begins with the premise of the value and importance of institutional diversity in the American context. I believe this work will provide an updated approach to studying the issue and contextualizing institutional diversity within contemporary trends facing colleges and universities today. My main purpose in organizing this work is to (a) review the research literature addressing institutional diversity in a way that improves our understanding of the issue and (b) situate the issue within the larger debate of higher education regarding the role and in uence of market forces, regulation, and educational outcomes. I have designed this monograph for researchers and practitioners to help both groups better prepare to confront challenges to preserving institutional diversity through an improved comprehension of the complex issue and the myriad ways changes in diversity impact higher education. is volume should resonate with faculty and administrators, particularly within public higher education struggling with questions of nancing, mission, and leading their institutions with an improved understanding of the concept of institutional diversity by understanding the various forms, historical roots, theoretical explanations, and positive and negative implications of institutional diversity. I believe that improved understanding of these issues can help higher education leaders navigate the constantly shifting priorities and competing demands that they face almost daily.

To achieve this end, the monograph is organized to provide context into how researchers have increased our understanding of institutional diversity in higher education. The next chapter, "Historical Context of Institutional Diversity," traces the development of American higher education and the constant presence of institutional diversity since the earliest founding of the colonial colleges. Following this chapter is "Theoretical Contexts," which examines the three primary sociological theories used to examine institutional

diversity: population ecology, resource dependency theory, and institutional theory. Particularly important in the theoretical discussion of institutional diversity is how the relationship between higher education institutions and the environment led to changes in diversity.

e following two chapters move away from contextual considerations to an understanding of institutional diversity within current higher education trends, challenges, and opportunities. “Bene ts of Institutional Diversity” considers the implications of institutional diversity on the goals of students, institutions, and society. Much of the research literature emphasizes institutional factors, but the chapter considers the interconnected nature of stakeholder desires and goals. e chapter explores both the positive and negative attributes of diversity for each stakeholder group as well. “Causes of Homogenization” studies the sources for the decline of institutional diversity over the past 40 years. A range of institutional and system factors push institutions toward developing similar functions and structures. Academic drift, the most often cited cause for the decline, is examined as well as other signi - cant in uences such as the pursuit of prestige and statewide coordination. My

Historical Context of Institutional Diversity

IN MANY WAYS, THE STORY OF INSTITUTIONAL growth and diversity represents a key theme throughout the history of American higher education. While other international contexts, most notably those in Europe, sought limited systems with a few world-class institutions, the American experiment consisted of a large number of colleges spread throughout the countryside. Institutional diversity results from and is enabled by the incredible growth of the U.S. higher education system. In part, institutional diversity arises from the same forces that push the system toward university creation and even failure (Trow, 1979). ese currents proved particularly powerful with upwards of 700 institutions opening and closing during the Revolutionary and Civil wars (Rudolph, 1990). ose colleges that survived

fundamentally di erent from proponents of the importance of religion in higher education would design. Franklin's plan for the academy that would become the University of Pennsylvania is particularly noteworthy for its support of a variety of academic pursuits that he contends are "most useful and most ornamental, regard being had to the several professions for which they are intended" (Franklin, 1958, p. 41). e religious focus and favoritism towards the status quo among established Protestant denominations helped create an opening for institutions more broadly conceived. omas Je erson famously attempted to reform his alma mater, the College of William and Mary, to expand the college's curricular o erings and transform the college generally. e reform attempts were "a struggle to shape an inherited institution into a form able to serve peculiarly American interests without destroying the institution's capacity to transmit values important to the survival of the western heritage" (omson, 1971, p. 188). As with many reform e orts, Je erson's failed and he would not realize his ideals of a college embracing new elds of study until establishing the University of Virginia years later.

While falling short of modern ideals of religious tolerance, the colonial colleges nevertheless established a foundation of diversity and a concern for public service. e signi cant contribution of colonial college graduates in shaping the American Revolution suggests the importance of the colleges in creating gentlemen-scholars. e achievement of these institutions placed higher education in a prominent position in colonial society while institutional de ciencies created an opening for the expansion that occurs following the British surrender at Yorktown. Higher education played a signi cant role in supporting larger societal goals since the earliest days of the rst colleges. As American identity expanded, leaders looked to colleges and universities to increasingly provide social and educational training for future generations.

Establishing American Higher Education

At the dawn of the 19th century, 25 colleges dotted the landscape of the new country. Twenty years later, that number increased to 52. is rapid expansion accelerated, and by 1860, 241 higher education institutions existed in

the United States. As elin (2004) notes, “the period saw the creation of other diverse kinds of institutions o ering formal programs: universities, academies, seminaries, scienti c schools, normal schools, institutes” (p. 42). A variety of social, political, and economic factors created the fertile landscape for this massive expansion of American education. Despite the victory over the British, the new nation existed without the nationalism one might expect.

leading patriot, Rush believed in the notion of American greatness and that "if its destiny was fully to be realized, the youth of the new nation would have to be taught republican duties and principles" (Madsen, 1966, p. 17). In his ideas for education in the new country, Rush's philosophy focused on the twin pillars of usefulness and patriotism. In the pursuit of these two goals, he advocated for education's potential to "convert men into Republican machines" (Rush, 1947, p. 92) and even suggested after a period of time, to get the federal university operational, the requirement that all federal o ce-holders must graduate from the national university.

Rush served as a prominent early proponent of the national university idea; however, he was by no means alone among the founding fathers. At the Constitutional Convention, James Madison listed the creation of a national university as one of the nine speci c powers to be granted to Congress. As the Convention came to a close, the establishment of a university was still not included in the Constitution draft. Madison, along with Charles Pinckney of South Carolina, again sought to provide Congress with the authority to "establish a university which no preferences or distinction should be allowed on account of religion" (Hunt, 1903, p. 454). e vote failed with four states favoring the motion; six opposed; and one with its two delegates split. e majority not only voted against creating the institution, but many believed in the argument that speci cally enumerating that Congress had the power to create a university was unnecessary and super uous. Many of the delegates were reluctant to put forward a document for rati cation with an extensive list of enumerated congressional powers. e delegates sought to avoid creating this list, preferring instead the general welfare clause that gave Congress unspeci ed powers of legislation, which presumably included the creation of a univer-

Despite the failure of the national university idea during the debates of the Constitutional Convention, the rst four presidents of the United States all advocated for its creation. George Washington, John Adams, Thomas Je erson, and James Madison all believed in the necessity of a federal institution to provide research instruction to bene t the federal government. A general uneasiness along with the practical consideration of continuing to send a signi cant number of the nation's youth abroad to Europe to attend higher education existed during this time. Perhaps most signi cantly, proponents viewed a federal university as a vehicle for deterring sectionalism and promoting national unity. In his last message to Congress, President Washington made his strongest appeal for the creation of a national university to diminish the increased sectionalism that would ultimately drive the country toward civil war:

> *Our Country, much to its honor, contains many Seminaries of learning highly respectable and useful; but the funds upon which they rest, are too narrow, to command the ablest Professors, in the di erent departments of liberal knowledge, for the Institution contemplated, though they would be excellent auxiliaries. Amongst the motives to such an Institution, the assimilation of the principles, opinions, and manners of our Country men, but the common education of a portion of our Youth from every quarter, well deserves attention. e more homogenous our Citizens can be made in these particulars, the greater will be our prospect of permanent Union; and a primary object of such a National Institution should be the education of our Youth in the science of Government. (Washington, 1796)*

In the end, Washington and the other proponents of the national university were unable to nd su cient backing for the idea. A vote in the U.S. House of Representatives proved the closest the federal university idea would come to fruition (elin, 2004). Each of the various proposals to create this institution faced three primary obstacles even among the ardent advocates. ese issues centered on the primary mission of the institution, the source of nancial support, and the governance and control of the institution (Madsen,

1966). The lack of consensus around these issues was sufficient to result in the failure of the idea in both Congress and the national consciousness.

One may question the significance of discussing an idea that, despite prominent supporters, never came particularly close to implementation. However, a comparison to other countries demonstrates the significance of the American system not possessing a strong federal university. The absence of a federal university encouraged institution building and developed a higher level of institutional diversity within American higher education. Additionally, the limited role and involvement of the federal government enabled institutions to follow more heterogeneous paths. As noted later in this chapter, the federal government does become more involved in higher education, but not until after the foundational elements of the system are largely entrenched.

Institution Building

With higher education left to the domain of the states, institution building demonstrated the growing appeal of higher education throughout the country. Particularly notable in the South, the creation of public universities typified the newest trend in the evolution of institutional types within the country. The founding of the University of North Carolina as the first public university began the trend of state universities serving the postsecondary needs of their respective states. These institutions served a similar purpose as the early colonial colleges did as a source of local pride and in providing local educational alternatives. More substantial was the need for Republican education and the development of virtuous citizens necessary for leading the new nation. With the embrace of Enlightenment thinking, the American colleges sought to support scientific thought and reason.

Concurrently, colleges in New England developed, which provided geo-

interests joined the traditional higher education building denominations, Congregationalists, Anglicans, and Presbyterians (elin, 2004). As a result, small colleges grew in many small towns. With limited enrollments and nancing, these institutions served moderate-income students throughout their local areas. is expansion signi cantly increased the number of colleges in the nation and formed the foundation of the strong private higher education system found in the United States.

e Changing Curriculum

e early colonial curriculum largely focused on the ancient Latin and Greek languages. As the Revolutionary War approached, the curriculum remained focused on ancient languages, yet introduced Enlightenment thinkers such as John Locke. Religion remained an overriding in uence even as institutions struggled to incorporate Enlightenment philosophies. is tension remained through the early years of the new country, with Enlightenment ideals playing an increasingly greater role. Due to a lack of established faculty to teach the subjects, student unrest, and broader societal concerns, institutions slowly sought to reestablish the classical curriculum, moving away from the trend to increase professional education that started to occur in the early 1800s.

Reform e orts by George Ticknor at Harvard and omas Je erson's plan for the University of Virginia pushed defenders of the classical curriculum to reassert the supremacy of their views culminating in the greatest defense of the classical college— the Yale Report of 1828. In the report, Yale's faculty clearly de ned the purpose of collegiate education as "to lay the foundation of the superior education" (Yale Report, 1961, p. 278). e development of the discipline and furniture of the mind were best achieved through the classical curriculum. e Yale faculty argued that other forms of education such as professional training should be left to the work of other types of institutions. e Yale Report's defense of the classical curriculum dominates curriculum discussions until the post–Civil War period. e emphasis on liberal education focused higher education on serving the limited, largely wealthy student population best suited to take advantage of this educational o ering.

e continuing emphasis on the value of liberal education remains a lasting

impact of the Yale Report. Undergraduate education, particularly in elite higher education settings, focuses on liberal education eschewing vocational training. e emphasis on classical education serves as a signi cant counterweight to critics arguing for concentration solely on career and vocational training. As each college and university nds the balance between these competing goals in line with their mission and student populations, a diverse array of curricular programs develop, which increases the level of institutional diversity present.

e Yale Report's supremacy lasted until the Civil War and the enactment of the First Morrill Act creating land-grant colleges. While not calling for the exclusion of classical studies, the land-grant focus on agricultural and mechanical arts transitioned the debate toward the utility of practical education. Signi cant for long-term institutional diversity trends, the inclusion of traditional liberal education with practical elds of study within a single institution proves important in the development of American universities. In comparison, European institutions traditionally focus on either a classical liberal education or polytechnic studies (Trow, 1987). While the ascendancy of the American university would not occur until close to the turn of the century, the legacy of the Morrill Act sets the foundation for the complex "relationship between advanced learning or graduate education, and the American college" (Geiger, 2011, p. 51). Fundamentally, the second half of the 19th century saw American higher education institutions responding to the challenges presented by evolving social and economic contexts. e addition of new students and academic o erings augmented the traditional approach of higher education while laying the groundwork for the university building and emphasis on research that was about to begin.

Rise of the Research University

The time frame from 1865 to 1910 saw substantial formation of the American university recognizable today. According to

> *and cooperation. "Piety and discipline," "liberal culture," "utility," and "research" were some of the traditions invoked by academic missionaries and entrepreneurs. Within each emergent University, these disparate, often con icting, notions took on varying con gurations. (p. 116)*

Critical to understanding how the university influenced institutional diversity are the common administrative and structural arrangements that developed during this time. ese core elements of what Edwin Slosson, an influential journalist in the early 1900s, called the Standard American University occurred in response to larger challenges and trends as opposed to elaborate institutional planning. As Daniel Coit Gilman recalled about the founding of Johns Hopkins, " e founder made no e ort to unfold the plan. He simply used one word,—UNIVERSITY,—and he left it to his successors to declare its meaning in the light of the past, in the hope of the future" (Gilman, 1961, p. 643).

One aspect of higher education that has changed little since 1900 are the country's most premier and prestigious institutions. Of the 14 founding mid pe.0076 te fA. O

organizations, national academic journals, rank and promotion, tenure, and academic freedom, the university professor developed standards, protocols, and an ethos. Along with the transition of faculty, pedagogy changed from the traditional recitation to the lecture, be tting the faculty's newly established expertise, and the seminar to discuss research and serve advanced students. e establishment of graduate education to develop the next generation of faculty experts further encouraged institutions to focus on growing libraries and laboratories.

Commensurate with the emphasis on graduate education, the faculty exerted great in uence on the undergraduate curriculum. e elective system as advocated by Harvard's Charles Eliot continued to move away from Yale's fixed classical curriculum toward one of specialization and majors. Eliot proved particularly in uential with a clear belief in the future direction of higher education and the curriculum. "Many subjects taught at a university involve other subjects, which must therefore be studied rst," Eliot argued. " ere is a prevailing tendency on the part of every competent student to carry far any congenial subject once entered upon. To repress this most fortunate tendency is to make real scholarship impossible" (Eliot, 1961, pp. 707–708). e ability for students to study general and specialized areas of inquiry directly in uences programmatic diversity and the overall future development of programs across various types of colleges and universities.

Public research universities also adapted to the changes occurring throughout higher education. President Edward Kidder Graham of the University of North Carolina argued that the boundaries of the university should be coterminous with the boundaries of the state (Snider, 1992). e University of Wisconsin serves as a prime example of the evolution of state colleges to state universities during this period. e "Wisconsin idea" distinguished the university as producing high-quality innovative research while also serving the needs of the state. e University of Wisconsin, thanks in large measure to the proximity of the state capital in Madison, created educated civil servants across a range of elds to serve throughout state government. The ability of public flagships to engage in high-quality academic pursuits within the framework of a state university proves a lasting legacy of the Wisconsin ideal (Thelin, 2004). The evolution of the university and

several decades of a push toward standardization provided greater de nition to higher education, even while the system largely appeared fairly decentralized and possessed signi cant levels of institutional diversity. By the First World War, standards existed regarding admissions, academic o erings, and structures. For example, the student credit hour expanded as a standard unit to measure instruction and in uenced a variety of academic and administrative decisions throughout higher education (He ernan, 1973; Shedd, 2003). e major di erences were largely a result of the number of resources available that would only expand the hierarchy of higher education following the two world wars.

Transition From Elite to Mass Higher Education

With the massive enrollment growth during the 1920s, higher education began the transition from elite to mass higher education (Trow, 1974). e traditional elite student identi ed as full-time, residential student focused on liberal education with the goal of achieving success in high-status professions started to change. e di erentiation between the historically prestigious and well-funded institutions and those serving a mass education role expanded the perceptional hierarchy among colleges and universities. Mass higher education o ered opportunities for part-time, older students and those seeking technical and vocational education. In particular, the growth of junior colleges and the evolution of normal schools into teachers' colleges provided a major expansion of the mass higher education sector.

e growth of junior colleges during the early 20th century represents one of the most remarkable growths of any institutional type throughout the history of American higher education. e rst junior colleges, as 2-year institutions were known during that time, multiplied during 1920s. By 1940, nearly 11% of all college students enrolled in junior colleges. Although many of the institutions were tied to local high schools, the junior college movement affected both the purposes and structure of American higher education (Geiger, 2011). e value of the community college movement rests largely in the sector's emphasis on providing postsecondary opportunities to local communities and businesses. A uniquely American invention, 2-year

institutions provided general education or vocational classes enabling students to later transfer to a 4-year campus or enter the workforce.

The original transfer function of the community college was frequently superseded by the technical and vocational curriculum. The University of California encouraged the state's community colleges to focus more on vocational education, joined by the California state education establishment, who also strongly advocated for vocational training programs. These government and policy leaders supported the vocational emphasis through their ideology of supporting the "social value of aiding business" (Dougherty, 1994, p. 242).

The local influence of junior colleges challenged the presence of the state universities. With new institutions outside of the control of the established higher education system in any given state, public university leaders often pushed junior colleges away from providing the first 2 years of college instruction and toward terminal technical and vocational programming. A goal of the state university leaders was to integrate junior colleges into the system, thereby also preserving the hierarchy and influence of the state flagship institutions.

As impressive as the growth of junior colleges was during their first few decades of existence, this pales in comparison to the growth that occurred in the 1960s and 1970s, with many college enrollments increasing more than fivefold to over 2 million students. Estimates of community college growth suggest a new community college campus opened each week during the 1960s. Junior colleges served two primary student populations: (a) students interested in transferring to a 4-year institution and (b) students seeking terminal vocational degrees. Junior colleges continued to expand these missions and evolved into "community colleges." With courses from traditional general education to short-term training programs and certificate offerings to community education classes such as photography or computer training, community colleges expanded to a nearly impossible mission, with detractors often criticizing the attempt to be all things to all people. The complex and even competing origins and functions present challenges for the sector, particularly in light of the declining numbers of students transferring from community colleges (Dougherty, 1994; Grubb, 1991). Despite the criticisms of the institutions because of mission expansion and from those who call for a

reemphasis on transfer or vocational programs, the community college movement profoundly expanded the massi cation of higher education, particularly within the public sector. Despite uneven resources and pushback from other public institutions, higher education would be profoundly less diverse without the institutional type of the community college. With over 1,100 institutions nationally, community colleges represent one of the most diverse areas within all of higher education, serving students and o ering programs often inaccessible at other institutions for academic, financial, or geographic reasons.

In addition to community colleges, the rise of normal schools, founded to standardize teacher training, and their transition into teachers' colleges signi - cantly grew postsecondary opportunity. Many of these institutions later became comprehensive colleges, greatly expanding the public higher education sector and accelerating the nation's move toward mass higher education:

> *Normal schools, rather than the land grant universities, were the pioneers of higher education for the people. Almost everywhere the state universities and agricultural and mechanical colleges were developed at a central location or state capital, whereas the normal schools were scattered to the small country towns across the prairies. (Herbst, 1980, p. 227)*

Unlike the traditionally prestigious private institutions and public agships, normal schools exhibited much greater diversity, particularly related to gender. ese institutions not only enrolled what today we would call "nontraditional" students but also served their nancial and student services needs (Ogren, 2005). e dramatic growth of teacher education was the most substantial in a professional eld in terms of both enrollment and educational outcomes.

As with many higher education institutions, normal schools faced pressures to attract students by adjusu36 Tdrtionpion i,]TJ 0.009y tp.003u5

among female and minority students continued to increase, as well as the need to include gender and ethnic studies as part of an expanding curriculum.

e continued evolution toward mass higher education represents one of the strengths of U.S. colleges and universities.

e changing role of the federal government since the 1970s serves as the nal signi cant historical trend important in understanding institutional

One of the most understudied, yet profound changes within higher education over the last century is the growth of the administrative bureaucracy. With the expansion and increased complexity of the higher education enterprise, the administrative lattice lls the need to operate the institution professionally, which satis es demands of both internal and external constituencies (Zemsky, 1990). e degree to which administrative decisions gain short-term competitive advantage, reducing the level of institutional diversity, remains a concern for higher education and those concerned with preserving the institutional diversity inherently necessary and valuable to the U.S. system.

Academic and administrative functions on campus increasingly struggled for additional resources “while professional sta proudly boast of their own ability to perform tasks with managerial e ciency typically found in busi-

eoretical Contexts

H

seeking organizations that ll a need (Hannan & Freeman, 1989). Colleges and universities operate in an environment of limited resources and compete with one another for the nite resources available. Each organizational niche varies in the carrying capacity or the number of institutions that can be sufciently supported (Bess & Dee, 2008). e niche serves as "the focal point at which concerns with environments and concerns with organizational events meet" (Hannan & Freeman, 1989, p. 334). us, Darwin's notion of the survival of the ttest applies as those institutions best able to respond to environmental needs and challenges are selected by the environment to succeed and continue.

Population ecology theory encourages attention on the competition within the environment while also considering the complex relationships that directly and indirectly a ect higher education institutions. is perspective focuses organizational studies on the larger population issues and organizational change over time largely missing from the research literature prior to this type of analysis (Hannan & Freeman, 1989). Researchers di er on the degree to which they believe institutions possess the ability to control the process of natural selection. Put simply, can an institution take proactive

ecology theory and the natural selection concept clearly suggest that Rosemont faced few other alternatives. Additionally, this type of change encourages or even forces institutions to move to another environment or market niche reducing the amount of institutional diversity within the U.S. higher education system.

Birnbaum (1983) posits that despite the growth of higher education occurring during the 1960s and 1970s, the broader environment discouraged a growth in institutional diversity. His study found that the number of institutions grew without a concurrent growth in diversity, and the period may even exhibit less diversity. He argued that population ecology would predict the outcome of declining institutional diversity and suggested that environmental factors such as competition for resources or government relations could drive institutions toward isomorphic tendencies and thus reduce institutional diversity. Population ecology suggests "the expansion of the resources available for organizing will often lead both to growth of individual organizations and to growth in the populations of organizations using those resources" (Hannan & Freeman, 1989, p. 338).

Proponents of population ecology hold several underlying assumptions worth noting. First, population ecology explains macro or population issues and trends, not micro or individual ones limiting the theory's ability to explain individual decisions and responses. Additionally, the theory assumes that the environment "selects" institutions that survive with total determination. Notably, this argument suggests a substantive limit on the role of institutional leaders despite the research on managerialism in higher education currently established in the literature (Birnbaum, 1988; Deem & Brehony, 2005). Additionally, the theory assumes that selection by the environment and survival determines an organization's e ectiveness. Finally, population ecology identifies the foundational principle that a niche possesses only enough resources to provide for a nite number of organizations, also known as the carrying capacity of the niche. Homogenization occurs when the environment selects the various institutional traits deemed most worthy, thus leading to the survival or failure of institutional types.

As noted in Figure 1, a number of variations within a population of organizations will exist either through intentional action or historical

FIGURE 1
Population Ecology Explanation of Organizational Change

accident. Population ecology theory explains that some of these variations better suit the environment than others. e environment selects organizations with the right variations, while other institutions either change to meet the environment's expectations or fail. is process results in a new population of organizations, selected by the environment, that share "common size requirements for efficiency, technologies, and control systems" (Robbins, 1990, p. 227). Within higher education, strategies adapting to the environment lead to colleges and universities that largely possess similar structures and practices.

While population ecology can prove useful for understanding broad trends and historical developments that lead to the present challenges confronting institutions, population ecology faces several signi cant critiques, particularly regarding the concept of environmental selection (Bess & Dee, 2008; Robbins, 1990). e evolutionary notion of survival of the ttest suggests that broad objective environmental forces determine an organization's ultimate success (Reed & Hughes, 1992). Within higher education, however, speci c social or political factors may in uence an institution's ability to survive in spite of the organizational environment selection. For example, a prominent public institution with political ties to powerful state policymakers may ensure continued support regardless of the environmental need for that institution. Colleges can exert control on their environment as the primary supplier of postsecondary education, meaning environment constituencies—such as students, businesses, and governments—rely on higher education institutions to create a degree of insulation. Moreover, the population ecology argument assumes that the environment demonstrates "a kind of reason that may or may not be present within higher education" (Morphew, 2009, p. 245), with the environment selecting organizations and their adaptive strategies. ese critiques substantially limit the e cacy of population ecology and have curtailed the theory's use in recent years.

Resource Dependency eory

Resource dependency theory considers an institution's external environment and how organizations depend on the environment for resources. Organizations rely on external forces due to their inability to create all the necessary resources needed internally. As a result, organizations face pressure to conform to environmental desires and develop structures readily identi able as legitimate with value to the environment in order to increase the likelihood of obtaining resources. Resource dependency theory assumes that institutions can e ectively pursue strategic action to secure resources from the environment. In return, the environment in uences whether organizations receive the necessary resources and how institutions may use them. For example, funding from the federal government or private gifts often include limitations on the spending of funds. In this case, the government or donor not only determines if the college receives the funding but how the college uses the monies. Under the resource dependency framework, organizations face a di erentiated environment where various types of institutions confront di erent expectations (Tolbert, 1985). Public institutions, as an example, face the expectation of responding to policymakers and the public at large, whereas private universities may focus on a narrower constituency (Duderstadt & Womack, 2003).

e degree to which the college depends on external entities varies based on the availability of other potential sources of a resource and how critical the resource is to the operations of the institution. To successfully compete, resource dependency theory contends that institutions adapt internally and develop strategic relationships with the natural environment. Institutions proactively engage to secure resources, which helps define the relationship between the organization and environment. Institutions typically approach the environment using one of three strategies: dependency reduction, external linkages, and creating a new environment (Bess & Dee, 2008; Pfeffer & Salancik, 1978). e three strategies are detailed in Table 2.

In an e ort to limit institutional reliance on any single resource, leaders move to minimize susceptibility to a decline of a resource. In recent years, public institutions illustrate this approach by seeking alternative sources of revenue in light of the dramatic decline in state appropriations. Public universities look to strategically manage enrollment to augment the bottom line

TABLE 2
Managing Resource Dependency

R	D
	D
D	C
	C
E	M
	L
	F
	M
	C

Adapted from Bess and Dee (2008).

through increased tuition revenue (Barnes & Harris, 2010). Resource dependency theory and dependency reduction also provides an explanation of the changes Rosemont College undertook. As a tuition-dependent private institution, Rosemont, as discussed earlier in this chapter, saw a decline in the tuition revenue from students interested in the all-female, Catholic experience. In order to reduce their reliance on this resource, Rosemont diversi ed their potential student population, allowing men to enroll in the undergraduate program. In his examination of the research literature, Hearn (2003) describes several strategies that colleges and universities pursue to gain new revenue streams such as new instructional programs, research activities, development and fundraising, auxiliary enterprises and real estate, pricing strategies, and financial decision making and management. As a result of this diversi cation, substantial changes and the decline of one aspect of the market within higher education no longer threatens the viability of the college.

Managing a relationship with the external environment to increase the dependence of other organizations on the college provides a second avenue for institutions. A steady stream of contacts and resources will follow as an institution's importance grows. e increase in workforce development programs and contract training o ered by community colleges provides a great example of this strategy. Local governments and businesses begin to rely substantially on the training of future employees by community colleges. is means that the broader success of the economy relies on the success of the

community college. As a result, local governments and businesses advocate and provide additional resources and funding for the 2-year sector. The approach presents risks, however, as many institutions become increasingly focused on expanding their linkages with the environment. e result can lead to mission drift and an institution's jumping at any potential opportunity (Balderston, 1995). Additionally, colleges must take care to ensure that external linkages do not leave the institution solely reliant on their success, leaving the institution even more dependent.

A third technique for managing the environment involves creating a new environment more hospitable to providing resources to the organization. is strategy assumes a dynamic environment that institutional leaders can in uence to improve the ow of resources. rough marketing activities or lobbying e orts, colleges can improve their position and how the environment views the organization. With the increasingly prominent role of the federal government in both funding and regulating higher education as noted in the second chapter, colleges and universities increased their lobbying efforts in Washington, D.C. (Brainard, 2004). Colleges also attempt to build coalitions and relationships with in uential members of the environment and community (Jongbloed, Enders, & Salerno, 2008). Private institutions frequently appoint these individuals to their board of trustees or other institutional boards to build support and secure resources.

e environment presents only limited constraints on institutions as evidenced by the strategies utilized to change the number of resources gained. In contrast, population ecology contends that choices by the environment control the institution. While resource dependency theory explains some actions that institutions take that ultimately reduce the amount of institutional diversity evident in the higher education system, the theory insu ciently addresses how these constraints directly impact institutions.

Institutional eory

Population ecology and resource dependency theory propose ways in which organizations can respond distinctively to environmental cues. Institutional theorists contend that an organization's legitimacy explains survival. "A school

universities operate within an organizational field where a variety of external constituencies suggest how institutions should operate, defining them as institutional organizations. For example, government agencies, accreditation bodies, and disciplinary associations all attempt to manage the activities of colleges and universities. When institutions operate within the guidelines and accepted notions, external constituents view the college as a legitimate actor within the higher education field. The environment then rewards legitimacy with additional support in terms of funding, quality faculty, and interested students. As a result, the broader environment with normative expectations provides both positive and negative reinforcement that shapes institutional behavior. DiMaggio and Powell (1983) describe these expectations and pressures on the organization as the "iron cage," which pushes colleges toward isomorphism or the implementation of actions and strategies that resemble others within higher education. Colleges engage in isomorphic tendencies when following the characteristics of other institutions considered successful within their particular niche or higher education more generally.

In explaining the processes related to isomorphism, DiMaggio and Powell (1983) suggest three types of isomorphic processes: coercive, mimetic, and normative. Each of these types leads to an increased homogenization within a given organizational field. Coercive isomorphism occurs when other organizations on which the institution depends apply pressure such as government regulations or new accreditation standards. Accreditation agencies require standards of academic and financial quality and force institutions to adapt to maintain their accreditation. In contrast, mimetic isomorphism arises from unclear technologies for goals that lead less prestigious or less resourced institutions to model and emulate those considered as leaders within the organizational field. A nearby college may upgrade its campus recreation facilities, leading other surrounding institutions to update their own campus recreation offerings in order to remain competitive. Finally, normative isomorphism occurs as a result of increased professionalization as networks grow and increased communication takes place, with "best practices" encouraging a homogenization of institutional activity. External expectations and higher education norms influence university activity such as the expectation that doctoral degrees require dissertations or courses are offered on a semester basis.

Postsecondary innovation often occurs from institutions that can a ord to take risks due to their environmental position or by those institutions with limited market position to risk (Bess & Dee, 2008). Institutional theory helps explains the issue of deviance by suggesting that those institutions with sufcient resources can a ord to risk some of those resources in the pursuit of change and innovation. us, stronger institutions may move outside of environmental expectations in an attempt to successfully ignore normative pressures. Leaders within the organizational eld may take these chances and thus in the end become even more well known and well resourced. For institutions in the middle, however, moving beyond the normal expectations would take them outside the accepted bounds and lead to external constituencies' considering them too outside the mainstream. While Stanford, Caltech, or MIT might be able to create new and innovative approaches to teaching in the STEM elds and have these innovations adapted throughout higher education, a small regional public institution would less likely succeed in innovating in this way or have its innovations accepted by others due to its reputational endowment within the environment.

Neo-institutional theory examines how institutions and their environments can have multidirectional e ects on one another (Ruef & Scott, 1998). Not only does the environment determine the normative expectations for higher education, as noted earlier, but colleges and universities also help shape the perceptions and expectations of the environment. As in the preceding example, Stanford's instituting new curricular or pedagogical approaches can change what the environment expects when teaching in the STEM elds. State college leaders may work with members of the legislature to alter rules and regge47tmrs of the legisno

Benefits of Institutional Diversity

THE BENEFITS OF INSTITUTIONAL DIVERSITY enable the American higher education system to achieve a variety of student, institutional, and societal goals. No single institution or institutional type could possibly possess the attributes to meet all of the expectations placed on higher education. Changing student demographics require institutions that o er a range of academic o erings that also consider cultural di erences. e variation within the system supports increased e ectiveness and provides alternative models for institutions considering potential reforms. Within a democracy, the creation and dissemination of knowledge free from inappropriate in uence supports a free society. A diverse system of higher education limits the ability of external in uences to exercise control and protects academic freedom. Additionally, the economic context of the country demands that higher education provide an opportunity for social mobility and the ability to improve one's economic and social status. Specialized minority-serving institutions play a pivotal role in achieving this goal by ensuring the access and public-good missions of colleges and universities. In this chapter, I will explore the bene ts o ered by institutional diversity, considering the implications for students, institutions, and society.

Meeting the Needs of All Types of Students

e ability to meet the diverse range of postsecondary needs of American students is one of the most frequently mentioned, principal benefits of

institutional diversity. e higher education system delivers a broad range of programs, from career training to advanced research degrees. Colleges and universities vary not only in their academic focus but also in their selectivity, size, and target student population, to name a few of the variables. e system provides multiple entry points, catering to a compendium of student achievement in an attempt to provide broad opportunities to postsecondary education. As a result of the diversity of students' needs, higher education institutions respond by providing a variety of models and academic o erings. While some students may be attracted to a religious institution or one with a great athletic program, many others desire quite the opposite. For the number of institutions that seek to enroll the valedictorian of a high school graduating class, many more o er retraining opportunities for a laid-o manufacturing worker. In many ways, the diversity of colleges and universities present in the American system allows students to select the program, degree, and setting that matches their educational goals and abilities.

e sheer range of educational aims that higher education attempts to address is vast. While some common indicators of student success are quite well known (Braxton, 2000; Kuh, Kinzie, Schuh, Whitt, & Associates, 2010; Tinto, 1994), the reality that students thrive in many di erent settings places great strain on our system to attempt to provide for all of the desires and goals and achieve the "best t" for students in American higher education. e example of community colleges highlights the challenge and inability of any single institutional type to meet the goals for all students. Community colleges o er programs for transferring to 4-year institutions as well as career and technical programs. Without even mentioning the other functions of the community college, most institutions struggle to even meet these two academic goals and in practice tend to focus on one or the other (Bahr, 2012).

e success of historically Black colleges and universities highlights how an institutional type can serve one speci c population well. Historically Black colleges and universities (HBCUs) provide open and welcoming enM19snivc6(c6(Tj 0.0055 oad rang

(Riordan, 1994). ese examples are just two of institutional types that demonstrate achievement with their target population. Quite obviously, however, these institutions are not a

institutions instituted a range of new administrative practices largely modeled on successful private universities and other prestige-seeking public universities. Particularly notable was a change in recruiting practices with the growth of regional admissions officers, recruiters located far from campus in an attempt to attract students and long a mainstay of elite private universities,

Colleges Are Wasting Our Money and Failing Our Kids—And What We Can Do About It (Hacker & Dreifus, 2011) and *Academically Adrift: Limited Learning on College Campuses* (Arum & Roksa, 2011) following the tradition of *e Closing of the American Mind: How Higher Education Has Failed Democracy and Impoverished the Souls of Today's Students* (Bloom, 1987), the national conversation around these issues include academics in addition to nancial matters. e push for student learning outcomes, rubrics, and other supposedly objective measures of student learning and achievement extend from the testing-driven culture of K–12 education and received encouragement from the regional accreditation agencies (Wellman, 2000). Perhaps no two institutions have faced more pressure in terms of accountability and productivity than the University of Texas at Austin and Texas A&M. Conservative Governor Rick Perry and his political allies frequently use the two universities as whipping posts and examples of bloated higher education institutions failing in their duty to the state to keep costs low and graduate more students.

is rhetoric persists despite evidence that both universities compare quite favorably to peers outside of Texas, as noted in a recent policy report (McLendon, 2012). In many cases, Governor Perry and his supporters blamed faculty as a leading cause of waste (and thus rising tuition costs) due to their time spent conducting frivolous research and avoiding the classroom.

is debate culminated in the publishing of an extensive database of all faculty at the universities. For each faculty member, productivity measures were included, such as grant funding awarded and student credit hours produced (Barrett, 2011). Many campus leaders decried the measures as fundamentally awed (Powers, 2011) and responded with what the university considered better data as well as analysis (Jaschik, 2011). Research on faculty productivity also shows the limited value and myth of such measures and a monetary evaluation of faculty work (Fairweather, 2002; Middaugh, 2001).

One of the successes of the for-pro t sector cited by researchers is how the institutions are not bogged down by traditional ways of o ering higher education (Tierney & Hentschke, 2007). As a result, for-pro ts and particularly online universities attempt to achieve e ciencies that brick-and-mortar institutions prove unable to realize. For-pro ts have proved particularly adept at enrolling higher numbers of adult learners, women, and minorities. As online

education providers grew, colleges and universities felt compelled to engage in distance education and other programs to attempt to maintain student enrollments. Innovations in online education provided models that many other institutions sought to implement to increase e ciency, although the results of these e orts frequently appear mixed as a result of abuses and unful lled promises in both the for-pro t and nonpro t sectors (Wilson, 2010).

The success of the American higher education system in achieving the broad range of postsecondary outcomes can largely be attributed to the diversity present in the system. e ability to provide access for both traditional and nontraditional students and all levels of academic achievement represents an American success unseen in virtually any other nation. At the same time, U.S. higher education serves as a key national resource as well as holding a place of international preeminence in terms of scienti c research and development (Cole, 2009). e variety in di erentiation of goals, constituencies, missions, structures, funding, and technologies enabled the system to achieve these successes. If every college or university exhibited the same characteristics, it seems highly unlikely, if not impossible, to imagine successes across a range of the aspects as currently supported within American higher education.

Provide Models

As noted in organizational theory, higher education exhibits ambiguous goals and technologies as an institutional organization. As a result, colleges and universities look to other organizations within the organizational eld in an e ort to evaluate the potential success of new or changing processes. e diversity within the higher education system provides examples for institutions to benchmark and consider when making their own decisions about creating new academic programs or changing administrative structures. e ability to conduct this environmental scanning increases the likelihood of successful decision making and changes. Within the various organizational niches that make up higher education, colleges can look to a variety of institutional examples for ideas on how to respond to di erent circumstances. For example, colleges facing nancial pressure can explore the strategies used by institutions confronted by the same issues to help ascertain the best course of action. Additionally,

other institutions face a variety of internal and external pressures in uencing their potential success. Campus leaders can evaluate the circumstances, goals, mission, and success of colleges when considering their own initiatives.

As colleges and universities consider the changes under way at peer institutions, Birnbaum (1983) argues, "diverse institutions' ability to establish individually new programs or policies signi cantly lowers the risk of change for the entire system" (p. 7). However, within higher education, the trend of academic drift presents real challenges and likely increases the overall risk to the system. As noted later in the fth chapter, colleges and universities frequently seek to emulate the most prestigious and successful models nationally. is tendency has privileged the research university model and other elite university practices despite the differential missions, student populations, and finances of the majority of colleges in the United States. While institutional diversity has the potential to lower the risk of changes and innovation by demonstrating many alternatives, many colleges and universities continue to follow a narrowly de ned model of higher education. As a result, a single model of academic and administrative work dominates despite the diversity of institutions in the system. Although highly touted and respected as a result of the prestige held by leading research universities, the singular focus fails to account for diversity and increases the risk of poor decision making given the local context. As an illustration, a campus that traditionally provided low-cost, accessible higher education would lose that focus by engaging in strategies used by well-resourced institutions that pursue prestige and rankings. An institution might emulate a strategy to recruit a high-caliber research scientist to increase sponsored grant activity but with insu cient laboratory space or graduate students would fail to attract extramural funds. In this way, as institutions become more diverse and di erent from the research university ideal, the search for alternative models and environmental scanning becomes more important to nd innovative approaches that take into account local circumstances.

Support Reform rough Competition

roughout the history of American higher education, colleges and universities frequently have been forced to compete over limited resources. e result

of this competition is that institutional success and indeed survival often rested on the ability to meet the demands of society and various stakeholders. With the competition and changes in higher education,

> *Colleges were forced to make crucial decisions about how to use their generally meager resources to achieve a mix of o erings that would meet the needs of sponsors, traditional constituencies, potential new students, and their own treasuries. (Geiger, 2000, p. 128)*

In many ways, the diversity present within American higher education is re ected by the varied institutional responses to competitive pressures. e di erences in institutional diversity around areas such as student population served, prestige, mission, and nances ow from competitive responses. As noted in the second chapter, the history of higher education reveals numerous examples of how institutions responded to broaden curricular o erings or student populations in order to remain viable and successful. e expansion of the curricula within teachers' colleges and the adaptations during the two world wars demonstrated this type of institutional response.

Higher education has shown remarkable durability and flexibility in changing programs and missions to remain competitive economically, politically, and academically. Colleges and universities increased recruiting e

than an intentional design of the system, this useful growth was largely related to the desire of interest groups for colleges that would meet their own unique goals and values. Early in the history of U.S. higher education, groups as varied as religious denominations and state governments all sought the development of a college that would serve their particular religious, geographical, ethnic, or social group. “Visibility and legitimacy, as well as economic advantage” (Birnbaum, 1983, p. 13) played signi cant roles in the development of colleges. As noted in the second chapter, local boosterism and civic pride also drove the desire and need for colleges. e diversity of the groups looking to found and support colleges encourages the growth of institutional diversity as only a diverse system can achieve the economic, social, and political goals of these interest groups.

From a system standpoint, the diversity of institutions catering to a range of interest groups supports a variety of educational missions and philosophies. e bene t of institutional diversity is that institutions can address a variety of purposes without the need for extensive debate or restriction of o erings. Without the degree of diversity present in the American system, the goals of certain groups would largely remain unaddressed or require extensive change and thus alienate other groups. e value proposition of institutional diversity is that institutions in various ways serve the needs and desires of students and interest groups instead of forcing them into a unitary model that would marginalize the minority. Simply put, institutional diversity supports the long-standing values of our pluralistic society and protection of the minority valued since the founding of the nation.

Protect Academic Freedom and Autonomy

e preservation of academic freedom and safeguards for free inquiry and discourse prove one of the most sacred values in all of American higher education. e university’s role in conducting research and creating knowledge without undue in uence is a cornerstone not only of higher education, but the country generally. To foster this, colleges and universities develop a variety of structures and processes—most notably the awarding of tenure to faculty. American society relies on higher education to pursue teaching and research

for the common good essential for a free society. As the American Association of University Professors (1940) argues in the *1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure*:

> *Institutions of higher education are conducted for the common good and not to further the interest of either the individual teacher or the institution as a whole. e common good depends upon the free search for truth and its free exposition. Academic freedom is essential to these purposes and applies to both teaching and research. Freedom in research is fundamental to the advancement of truth. Academic freedom in its teaching aspect is fundamental for the protection of the rights of the teacher in teaching and of the student to freedom in learning. (p. 1)*

As noted by Birnbaum (1983), the relationship between institutional diversity and academic freedom, "while indirect, is quite strong" (p. 9). Despite the successes of elite public research universities during the 20th century, he continues by arguing that private universities are best able to protect academic freedom. " e fear of o ending a state legislator or governor is in nitely greater," Riesman (1975) also concurred, "than the fear of o ending a particularly wealthy donor in the major private institutions" (p. 471). While public universities face challenges from governors and legislators that their private counterparts do not face, the recent record demonstrates the continued success of public research universities in pursuing free inquiry and knowledge. Indeed, the protections of academic freedom include not only inappropriate in uence by governmental actors, but also the values the institution supports. The concern of undue sway by public as well as private sources raises issues at every postsecondary institution in the nation.

Perhaps the largest external event in recent years challenging the value of academic freedom arose in the aftermath of the September 11 terrorist attacks. e nation's raw emotional state and some ill-advised comments by faculty around the country led many to question what type of institution would support statements from those who blamed the United States and American foreign policy for the attacks. The contrast between President

George W. Bush's rhetoric of "Dead or Alive" and "You're either with us or against us" proved a great contrast to some rhetoric within higher education. These sentiments came to a head in the case of the University of North Carolina, the nation's oldest public university.

As part of the university's annual freshman orientation, UNC regularly assigned a common book experience. In 2002, a selection committee of faculty, administrators, and students identi ed *Approaching the Qur'an: e Early Revelations* by Michael Sells (1999). The book explores Islamic scripture through an academic approach. e committee's goal was to select a book that would examine Islam without focusing on terrorism. e university was hit from both sides of the political and religious spectrum as the American Civil Liberties Union was concerned about a violation of church and state while the Family Policy Network, a Christian group, argued the university was attempting to paint Islam in a positive light. ree incoming students led suit in federal court seeking an injunction to stop the book discussion, but were denied. Conservative state legislators threatened to cut o funding. e leaders of the university seemed to almost relish the challenges appearing frequently on national media outlets. On ABC's *Good Morning America*, Chancellor James Moeser exclaimed, " e controversy in fact validated the purposes of the assignment. And we succeeded beyond our wildest dreams." While the common book experience was optional, UNC's freshmen participated in record numbers.

The University of North Carolina was not alone in fighting for free inquiry as many institutions faced similar concerns and faculty feared the formation of a new McCarthy era. However, research exploring the most controversial events in the post–September 11 landscape showed the preservation of academic freedom (Gerstmann & Streb, 2006). Institutions of all types faced challenges to academic freedom, and while no sector can claim the mantle of protector, the overall system has managed to preserve freedom and discourse in a hyperpoliticized environment. In many ways, academic freedom cases of the 2000s are not substantively di erent from the 1980s or 1990s except for the public scrutiny and 24-hour news cycle.

In a diverse system of higher education, the pressures on institutions vary in such a way that no single trend or influence impacts all or even the

In describing mass and elite higher education, I use the terms as does Martin Trow (1979) to describe the forms and functions of colleges and universities. In this framing, elite higher education focuses not on the exclusivity in social background of students, but rather on "the forms of education and the level of intensity and complexity to which subjects are pursued" (Trow, 1979, p. 277). Colleges and universities in this tradition increase the ambitions of students by developing their personal and intellectual capacities. In contrast, mass higher education focuses on conveying the knowledge and skills necessary for success particularly within the workforce, both blue and white collar. Trow places an emphasis on the degree to which elite higher education encourages student ambition for making a di erence in the world. is leads to postsecondary training that emphasizes socialization as opposed to practical training. e specialization within elite higher education presents challenges of cost, time, and energy that often exclude students who do not t a traditional, residential, 18- to 22-year-old student model.

A strong bene t of institutional diversity in American higher education is the mobility of students and faculty to move between institutions that o er both elite and mass education. is trend is largely possible as a result of most institutions, demonstrating some values of each trend. e variability in the degree to which each individual institution and the American system manages the inherent tension between elite and mass education contributes to the institutional diversity present. Without the tension and the necessary grappling of the competing ideals within institutions, the education system would likely fail to serve the needs of the diverse constituencies that rely on higher education. Elite and mass higher education rely on one another and would prove politically, economically, and socially unsound without the existence of the other and the resulting institutional diversity.

Improve Social Mobility

A frequently espoused mission of the American higher education system is to provide access and improve the social mobility of students. e ability to ful ll the American dream of improving one's social and economic status largely relies on higher education. e ability of successive generations to

change classes prevents a caste system and rigid social barriers. Institutional diversity fosters increased social mobility by o ering a variety of entry points

1960), which may include students transferring from a college transfer program to one more vocationally and career focused. Providing a place for students to consider their future education and career plans serves an important and useful function for the economy and society. Allowing students the ability to move in a direction that better suits their interests and aspirations maximizes the long-term socioeconomic success of students continuing to support their social mobility.

Minority-Serving Institutions

e establishment of minority-serving institutions (MSIs) illustrates one of the strong bene ts of institutional diversity in American higher education. MSIs serve a key role in providing access and supporting the public-good notion of higher education through their commitment to historically underrepresented groups in higher education (Gasman et al., 2008). As MSIs, these colleges and universities as a group enroll a high proportion of African American, American Indian, and Hispanic students. ree types of institutions are formally designated as minority-serving institutions: historically Black colleges and universities (HBCUs), tribal colleges and universities (TCUs), and Hispanic-serving institutions (HSIs).

In light of the changing demographics of the nation, MSIs will continue

addition to these challenges, minority students are more likely to be first-generation college students and must navigate institutional processes and infrastructure while battling fears of failure and cultural separation (Rendon, Jalomo, & Nora, 2000). Minority-serving colleges and universities demonstrate success in achieving engagement with students (Bridges, Kinzie, Nelson Laird, & Kuh, 2008) and improving graduation rates. Institutions that recognize the unique educational challenges of minority students are best prepared to help meet the needs of this population to facilitate postsecondary success.

The following sections describe the three types of MSIs and their contributions to the higher education system.

Historically Black Colleges and Universities

Among MSIs, historically Black colleges and universities have the longest history and are the most studied (Gasman & Tudico, 2008). Since the founding of the Institute for Colored Youth (now Cheyney University) in 1837, HBCUs have faced skepticism and scrutiny from many policymakers and society at large. Questions of purpose and whether an ongoing need for the mission of HBCUs exists today confront supporters of the institutional type (W. R. Allen & Jewell, 2002; Ricard & Brown, 2008). In response to these challenges and to increase our empirical understanding of HBCUs, scholars have explored a variety of aspects including faculty (Foster, 2001; Johnson, 2001), students (Freeman, 2002; Harper, 2004), and governance (Minor, 2005). A complicating factor in this discussion is the assumption that all HBCUs fulfill the same mission despite the inherent variety within the institutional type in regards to variables such as size, control, and the academic preparation of students (M. C. Brown, 2003).

Although HBCUs generally struggle for resources and represent only about 3% of colleges nationwide, the success of the institutional type remains quite impressive. HBCUs enroll over a quarter of all Black students in higher education and grant a sizeable number of degrees awarded to African Americans (over 25% of baccalaureates, 15% of master's and professional degrees, and 10% of PhDs) (W. R. Allen & Jewell, 2002; Nettles & Perna, 1997). Additionally, historically Black colleges play a significant role in producing graduate education in the STEM fields (Solorzano, 1995). The land-grant

mission plays an important role in the curricula of many HBCUs harking back to the days of Booker T. Washington and vocational training. e important historical role of the land-grant mission receives support from faculty at HBCUs that demonstrate a commitment to teaching and establishing strong mentor relationships with students (Taylor & Palmer, 2013). HBCUs provide

Hispanic-Serving Institutions

Hispanic-serving institutions di er from HBCUs and TCUs because their founding was not for the expressed purpose of meeting the postsecondary needs of Hispanic students (O'Brien & Zudak, 1998). Rather, HSIs evolved over the course of the past 40 years as a result of their geographic proximity to large Hispanic populations. e dramatic growth of Hispanic students resulted in the recognition of over 200 HSIs enrolling approximately two thirds of all Hispanics in higher education (Hurtado, 2002). is development "has conferred on [HSIs] ad hoc missions to better address the education needs of this population" (Laden, 2001, p. 75). e commonly accepted de nition for a Hispanic-serving institution is a college or university with 25% or more Hispanic undergraduate full-time equivalent (FTE) enrollment (Benitez, 1998). Hispanic students commonly face barriers to higher education as a result of the high percentage that are rst-generation students. As the Hispanic population continues to grow, HSIs provide culturally sensitive postsecondary education and work with students at a greater risk for not completing college (Nunez, Sparks, & Hernandez, 2011). e role of community colleges proves vital to serving this population with 54.7% of HSIs that are 2-year institutions (Laden, 2001). Despite the tremendous growth in the U.S. Hispanic population, educational progress continues to lag relative to other groups. To further complicate a discussion of Hispanic students, educational attainment rates vary drastically among ethnic groups. For example, Cuban Americans are 4 times more likely than Mexican Americans to attend college. e gap among recent immigrants and rst-generation students is more prevalent than students from families who have lived in the United States longer (Hurtado, 2002). e need for improved economic bene ts for Hispanics and greater social integration suggests that the role of HSIs will continue to grow in the coming years.

Conclusion

Institutional diversity serves a variety of student, institutional, and societal goals. The majority of the research literature focuses on the institutional aspects despite the interconnected nature of the three. Diversity is required to

satisfy the number of niche markets within U.S. higher education. Diverse needs demand a variety of institutional responses as no single institution or institutional type possesses the ability to do everything well (Birnbaum, 1983). In addition to the well-acknowledged strengths that institutional diversity brings to the higher education system, as discussed in this chapter, a diverse system also presents challenges. A range of baccalaureate options, for example, may provide opportunity and access, but also presents di culties for students seeking to transfer between institutions and reduces students' ability to migrate within the system. Additionally, a diverse array of institutional types causes di culties in measuring quality and establishing standards throughout the system despite calls to improve assessment and accountability.

Causes of Homogenization

ALTHOUGH OBSERVERS OF AMERICAN higher education agree that institutional diversity has decreased over the past 40 years (Morphew, 2009), the causes of the decline appear less clear. “Powerful forces tending toward . . . centralization and homogenization” persistently influence colleges and universities (Trow, 1979, p. 271). Understanding the push toward homogenization helps provide a view of the dynamics at play in leading to the reduction of institutional diversity. A variety of institutional and system factors encourage institutions to engage in activities and to develop structures similar to other colleges and universities.

is chapter explores the dynamics of homogenization, highlighting the key causes as identi ed in the research literature. I start by discussing academic drift, the most frequently cited cause of the decline of institutional diversity. Then, I consider related topics influencing colleges such as the desire to increase institutional prestige and rankings. e chapter concludes with a discussion of statewide coordination, which provides context to the question of homogenization with researchers divided on whether coordination increases or decreases diversity. e relationship between governmental policy, market forces, and institutional decision making proves particularly important in understanding the role of homogenization and how these trends in uence institutional diversity. Each of the major topics addressed in this chapter demonstrates varying degrees in which these three forces encourage homogenization and cause changes in institutional diversity.

Academic Drift

David Riesman's (1956) seminal work on academic drift describes the concept as a pattern of imitation where less prestigious and less resourced colleges follow the lead of more successful and high-status ones. His use of the snake metaphor describes the tendency of universities at the "tail" attempting to model themselves after those at the "head." Academic drift occurs as less prestigious "tail" institutions follow the strategic direction laid down by institutions with the reputational and political capital to engage in innovative activity. As institutions seek to follow the lead of "head" universities, institutional diversity declines as the "snakelike procession causes a convergence upon a single organizational model" (Morphew, 2000, p. 57).

Researchers often cite academic drift as "the greatest threat to institutional diversity" (Morphew, 2009, p. 246), substantially due to the widely held belief that diversity within the higher education system declines as colleges and universities pursue policies in line with drift. Both domestically and internationally, scholars examine the ways that institutional decisions and actions lead institutions toward academic drift and homogeneity within both state and national systems (Birnbaum, 1983; Huisman & Morphew, 1998; Neave, 1979). is results from "institutions mov[ing] away from their original mission toward norms of achievement, competence, and judgment, typical for the academic values of national elite institutions" (Huisman, 1998, p. 89). e act of imitation, referred to as academic drift (Neave, 1979), mission creep (Aldersley, 1995) or vertical extension (Schultz & Stickler, 1965), creates pressures for institutions to behave normatively, increasing uniformity and decreasing institutional diversity. Colleges and universities engage in academic drift in order to move up the "pecking order" described by McConnell (1962) as research universities at the top of the pyramid followed by regional institutions and less selective comprehensive colleges.

e research literature points to a number of causes for academic drift. is lack of consensus likely occurs as a result of the identi ed causes operating together and holding di erent levels of in uence at various points in time (Morphew & Huisman, 2002). Additionally, studies of academic drift approach the topic from di erent theoretical bases such as those described in

the third chapter of this volume. e lack of clear and consistent conceptualizations of the primary aspects of academic drift as well as measurement issues proves problematic as well (Huisman, 1998). A continued e ort on the part of scholars to clarify the concepts involved in the study of academic drift and institutional diversity more generally would aid our understanding of the dynamics involved.

Research on academic drift has occurred for more than 50 years, with the studies frequently focusing on systems of higher education and changes within these systems (Aldersley, 1995; Birnbaum, 1983; Morphew, 2000, 2002; Neave, 1979; Riesman, 1956). Despite evidence of the ongoing prevalence of academic drift, limited research since the 1960s, other than that by Morphew (2000, 2002, 2009), addresses the causes and implications in American higher education. In contrast, international researchers developed a signi cant body of empirical work (Huisman, 1995, 1998; Meek, 1991; Neave, 1979; van Vught, 2009). e research literature would bene t from a consideration of the current dynamics in U.S. higher education and understanding the lessons from postsecondary systems across the globe to preserve and protect institutional diversity.

Given the current dialogue in policy and higher education circles emphasizing increased e ciency and accountability (McLendon, Hearn, & Deaton, 2006), mission creep appears particularly problematic. Academic drift intensifies inefficiency within state and national higher education systems by increasing unnecessary duplication and competition. As state funding declines, or at best maintains existing levels, a focus on mission-central activities proves paramount and the resources wasted through gratuitous overlap and in ghting within a system hinders the ability of colleges and universities to achieve their goals and missions. Higher education struggles too greatly to secure resources to waste them on unnecessary duplication in the face of current economic, political, and social pressures.

While institutions seek to expand to reach new student markets during economic downturns (Holley & Harris, 2010), a tenuous link exists between student demand and academic drift with researchers arguing that programs created as a result of mission creep often serve few students (Birnbaum, 1983; Morphew, 2000). In fact, research suggests that student demand for programs

training of faculty members at research universities contributes to academic drift as faculty seek to recreate their prior experiences and doctoral institution at their current university. By developing organizational structures and degree programs that mirror their own doctoral experience, faculty members transform their institution along research university norms regardless of the institutional mission and values of their current department or university. e increased specialization of faculty and disciplines is the heart of the blame of the faculty role in fostering academic drift. e creation of “cosmopolitan

systems. e goal of growing institutional prestige relates to many of the strategies described within academic drift. While businesses typically gauge success through the generation of pro t, colleges and universities focus on prestige-maximizing structures and activities to improve their standing. As noted in the prior section, faculty behaviors, activities, and institutional reward structures can lead to an attempt to expand prestige-maximizing activity. As Toma (2012) notes:

> *Despite the impressive diversity of institution types, the relative autonomy of individual universities and colleges, and the vast differences in perspective resources available to them, higher education institutions in the United States tend to arrive at a common aspiration. ey are eerily similar in vision, in fact, seemingly obsessed with "moving to the next level." (p. 118)*

From an institutional theory perspective, these institutions seek legitimacy within their organizational field (Meyer & Rowan, 1977; Ruef & Scott, 1998) with the goal of enhanced prestige as the means to this end. e study of rankings and how they shape organizational strategy, decision making, and identity remain understudied in higher education (Bastedo & Bowman, 2010).

Ranking systems such as *U.S. News* prove problematic in their ability to truly evaluate the quality of an institution. e rankings substantially rely on the characteristics of incoming students with SAT/ACT scores as the most in uential variable in determining an institution's ranking (Kuh & Pascarella, 2004). As Ehrlich (2004) poignantly described, "No one would choose a hospital based on the health of patients coming into the hospital, and no one should choose a college based primarily on the grades and test scores of incoming students" (p. 1). Few of the changes in the *U.S. News* rankings relate to actual quality changes in the institution (Dichev, 2001). Despite a limited ability to measure quality, the rankings profoundly in uence student choice and institutional resources (Bastedo & Bowman, 2011; Bowman & Bastedo, 2009).

Students struggle to make an informed decision about institutional t and selecting the best college largely due to the lack of readily available, clear,

and comparable information to base the decision (Zemsky et al., 2005). In 1995, over 40% of students considered college rankings important in their

heavily tuition dependent institutions, reputation-building institutions seek

rewards, and reward structures (O'Meara & Bloomgarden, 2011). Furthermore, faculty play a role in driving the prestige arms race with their own experiences and normative expectations. Additional empirical research should examine the interplay of these changes and faculty agency in the process to better understand the dynamics at work in prestige-seeking universities.

While the strategies used to gain prestige may vary across di erent types of institutions, the competition within the higher education market suggests few institutions will prove immune to these aspirational pressures. While virtually all colleges face pressure, liberal arts colleges as an institutional type seem particularly vulnerable due to their size and curricular focus (Massy & Zemsky, 1994; Morphew, 2002; Schultz & Stickler, 1965). e dichotomy of an institutional mission focused on teaching and student engagement creates tension with disciplinary expectations of research productivity. Comprehensive colleges and their faculty, positioned within the middle of the academic hierarchy (Clark, 1987), struggle "between a rock and a hard place" (Wolf-Wendel & Ward, 2006). ese universities frequently started as teacher colleges or liberal arts institutions and typically o ered undergraduate degrees and some master's degrees. Morphew and Huisman (2002) suggest these types of universities often created new duplicative academic programs particularly at the graduate level. As noted in the second chapter, comprehensive colleges play a pivotal role in furthering the ideals of mass higher education in the United States, and changes in this institutional type dramatically impact the overall accessibility and availability of higher education.

Although typically possessing better resources than other institutions in a

g 6 state009 g0266 l6a6g<510(esear)6 of 6nivey camp fotiolsodent enk in prestpar-s

to take advantage of the rise of conservative legislatures in order to freely compete in the higher education market (Harris, 2009a).

The conflict surrounding the University of Wisconsin at Madison's attempt to break away from the University of Wisconsin system exempli es this trend (Durhams, 2011). Partnering with controversial Republican Governor Scott Walker, Chancellor Biddy Martin backed a plan that would provide regulatory relief and sever the Madison campus from the UW system. e hope was that the plan would create exibility, particularly for revenue generation and scal planning. Critics contended that the plan would lead to an escalation of tuition, dramatically increase nonresident enrollment, and leave other system campuses in a weaker position. Ultimately, the plan failed to gain su cient support among the board of regents or the legislature, and Chancellor Martin subsequently left Madison to assume the presidency of Amherst College. Regardless of the plan's failure, the fact that the institution home to the "Wisconsin Idea" and service to the state could come so close to breaking away to pursue market and prestige success shows the power of the pressures facing higher education institutions.

ese trends combine with others facing public research universities leading to increased privatization. Well documented in the research literature and national policy debate, public funding plays a smaller role in institutional financing both in constant dollars and as a percentage of the university budget (Eckel & Morphew, 2009; Heller, 2006). A focus on privatization also changes the organizational structure of universities increasing the number and significance of research centers and institutes on campuses (Clark, 2004; Slaughter & Leslie, 1997). e creation of new structures in uences internal dynamics shifting power and decision making in favor of those best able to generate revenue and increase prestige. As the environment rewards prestige-maximizing behaviors through resources and perception, colleges and universities may eschew traditional forms, functions, and missions in favor of these new pursuits leading to a decrease in institutional diversity. While statewide coordination holds the potential to limit the ability of institutions to engage in these strategies, the research literature presents uneven evidence of the likelihood or potential success of coordination to preserve and protect institutional diversity in American higher education.

Statewide Coordination

Since the 1950s, much of the research on state governance in higher education focuses on the role and in uence of coordination and autonomy (Hearn & McLendon, 2012). e balance "sought is delicate, and equilibrium may only exist in theory" (Halstead, 1974, p. 11) presenting challenges for institutions and state systems (Millett, 1984). Strong arguments exist in favor of both autonomy and coordination depending on the state's values, system design, and mission for higher education (Richardson, Bracco, Callan, & Finney, 1999). On one hand, institutions require autonomy to successfully compete and remain separate from inappropriate political and financial intrusion (Moos & Rourke, 1959). Others call for greater state coordination and planning to e ectively guide a growing number of institutions and prevent the domination of public agship interests over larger societal or system interests (Glenny, 1959).

With the locus of control of higher education at the state level in the United States, a number of models exist regarding the organization of state higher education systems. e systems also vary on the degree to which the private higher education sector factors into the system, which directly impacts the overall higher education system within a state. In describing a taxonomy of the state structures of higher education, Richardson et al. (1999) identify the three commonly accepted types of designs: consolidated governing boards, coordinating boards, and planning agencies. A consolidated governing board consists of a single board with management and control over all public colleges and universities in a state. Some states include community colleges under the same consolidated board, while others place the sector under a di erent structure. Under a coordinating board, a state agency holds the responsibility for some or all of the major functions for higher education such as planning, academic program review, budgetary processes, or policy analysis. e strength and policy reach of coordinating boards varies with some holding regulatory authority over their higher education systems with others serving only an advisory function. Planning agencies hold the least in uence with no single agency or board with authority beyond voluntary planning responsibilities. To reiterate, these three forms are simply a

Conclusion

e pressures driving institutions toward homogenization demonstrate the complexity of understanding the decline in institutional diversity within American higher education. In order to preserve institutional diversity as a strength of the U.S. system, higher education leaders, policymakers, and researchers need to make e orts on a variety of the issues raised within this chapter. Previous chapters in this monograph examined the historical development and theoretical contexts useful in understanding institutional diversity. This chapter explored the three trends and policy concerns most frequently found to encourage activities and structures similar to other colleges and universities. Understanding the drive toward homogenization assists supporters of institutional diversity by explaining the reduction over the past 40 years. e range of institutional and system factors that push institutions toward activities and structures similar to other colleges and universities remains strong and will likely continue in the coming years without direct intervention to support institutional diversity.

e Future of Institutional Diversity Research and Practice

INSTITUTIONAL DIVERSITY HAS SERVED as a cornerstone and key value of American higher education since the earliest days of the colonial colleges. Although the higher education system in the United States exhibits some of the most diverse tendencies of any in the world, the steady decline of diversity over the past 40 years remains a cause for concern and presents great challenges to the historical missions of higher education. The key to understanding changes in institutional diversity rests with appreciating the external in uences and institutional responses that drive change at the system level. Although decisions and changes within individual campuses may focus on the circumstances of that college, the macro in uence on the system of higher education remains important for scholars and practitioners alike to understand and consider.

My goal for this monograph is to examine the institutional changes taking place in higher education, particularly as a result of the external environment.

is concluding chapter concentrates on the need for institutions to focus on their mission in order to overcome the challenges caused by homogenization and thereby to preserve the long-standing strength of the U.S. system. More speci cally, a clearly de ned mission supports both institutional aspiration and systemic necessities. For higher education to ful ll time-honored societal functions, colleges and universities must serve a variety of learning, research, and service goals. Debates around issues such as e ciency (Cohen & Kisker, 2010), accountability (Burke, 2005; McLendon et al., 2006), and relevance

(Altbach, 2011) only intensify the need for this self-examination within the higher education system. is chapter identi es the implications and future research directions relevant for policymakers, campus leaders and administrators, faculty, and students. Institutional diversity dates to the beginning of American higher education, yet the contemporary context requires an understanding of the concept in light of the changing political, demographic, and economic realities of colleges and universities.

Market Smart *and* Mission Centered

e role and mission of higher education remained focused on the public good and social contract of providing quality academic programs, conducting and disseminating research, and engaging in public service activities until recent years (Kezar, 2004). During this time, higher education underwent change and pressure to adapt to more commercial forms and functions (Bok, 2003). For example, the growth and expansion of marketing strategies and consultants attempted to brand and influence institutional messaging (Hartley & Morphew, 2008). As noted throughout this monograph, the trends and responses to market pressures often encourage institutions to engage in isomorphic tendencies that lead to increased homogenization and a decline in institutional diversity. In this approach, revenues generated from market-based activities were used to supplement declining or unpredictable public monies. While perhaps a successful short-term strategy, the long-term implications for institutions and the American higher education system remain pronounced.

Robert Zemsky and his colleagues (Zemsky, Shaman, & Shapiro, 2001; Zemsky et al., 2005) have argued for colleges and universities to be market smart and mission centered. Simply put, Zemsky contends that institutions must strategically position themselves within the marketplace in order to generate revenue and resources that can then be used to support the core mission and key values of the college. is approach protects the mission and positively utilizes the revenue generated. Unfortunately, too many market-based strategies and programs feed their own purposes rather than larger institutional goals (Zemsky & Massy, 1995).

institutional diversity. Academic drift or mission creep, encouraged by signi - cant deregulation within the public sector and rising institutional aspirations, occurs across all sectors and represents one of the most commonly cited causes of the decline of institutional diversity (Aldersley, 1995; Morphew & Huisman, 2002; Neave, 1979). ese changes entice colleges and universities to pursue market-based strategies that favor revenue generation, prestige generation, and an expansion beyond traditional missions. Examples of this trend include the growth of doctoral degrees from institutions customarily focused

overall success of any policy changes and improvements. Leveraging the potential of community colleges to serve as a source for academic preparation in those elds critical for improved success as an employee and a citizen presents a great opportunity to support the institutional type most foundational to ensuring the success of the overall higher education system in the United States. Policymakers in recent years have focused funding and expectations for community colleges on the singular mission of improving workforce training and development. While an important and necessary function, community colleges can additionally serve to drive the local economy and labor conditions rather than simply responding to the external environment.

Proprietary institutions present a signi cant challenge for policymakers seeking to support expanded access to higher education, increased job training, and preventing abuse of federal nancial aid. For-pro t institutions ll an important niche in the American higher education system o ering educational opportunity to students seeking professional and market-oriented postsecondary education (Ruch, 2001). Furthermore, many for-pro t universities o er a second chance for students who due to social or educational reasons were unable to participate in higher education. Despite the rapid expansion of proprietary schools, the sector has faced substantial scrutiny from Congress and regulators (Fain, 2012) as a result of recruiting scandals, high student debt default rates, and program costs. Policymakers will continue to consider ways to protect students and taxpayers while also encouraging for-pro ts to provide for students underserved by nonpro t higher education.

e damage caused by the Great Recession has driven many of the policy decisions related to higher education in recent years. Even before the economic downturn however, higher education nancing, governance, and policymaking exhibited signs of substantial change. e long-standing social compact between government, institutions, and students (Kezar, 2004) appeared to undergo change and even substantial decline. e conservative resurgence in state houses across the country as well as the general antitax rhetoric exhibited by both political parties decreased the funding available to support higher education. e growth in spending for corrections, K–12 education, and most importantly health care have taken up a greater share of discretionary budgets (Breneman & Finney, 1997; Hovey, 1999). Despite the

rhetoric lamenting the dramatic growth of tuition costs, many political leaders deemphasized spending on higher education knowing the result of such decisions would lead to the rise of tuition. In a very real sense, the antitax positions and philosophy facilitated this trend. Rising tuition, in effect, became an increase in taxes without having to take the political hit, leaving

traditional mission by supporting those initiatives most valuable within their respective institutional type. For example, faculty can reemphasize the teaching mission or public service role often left behind in the pursuit of academic entrepreneurship. Across higher education, faculty will likely continue to engage in entrepreneurial pursuits at the behest of their campus administrators and their own personal aspirations. Faculty hold a unique role as the designers and implementers of academic work to ensure the larger social orientation of teaching, research, and service (Mars & Metcalfe, 2009). Faculty can operationalize these values in a variety of faculty-run structures, most notably the tenure and promotion process.

e ability to promote additional views of academic entrepreneurship and institutional aspiration that value new sources of market success and revenue as well as the traditional social and public contract of higher education will prove important in maintaining the strength of the overall higher education system. Professors individually and collectively can convey support for structures, forms, and rewards that value the traditional purposes of the institu-

Students

Despite the oft-cited bene t of institutional diversity in providing students a variety of options for pursuing higher education, the research literature examining the implications of changes in institutional diversity on students remains limited. In particular, research should explore student expectations and how the diversity present in a system meets the desires and expectations of students. For example, the cause-and-e ect relationship between student expectations and desires for postsecondary education options and the opportunities available in the system remain largely unexplored. Additionally, how does increased consumerism in uence the expectation of students for higher education opportunity to meet their individual goals both personally and professionally? Within the competitive marketplace of higher education, understanding institutional strategy and aspirations and how these in uence institutional diversity in the higher education system remains critical. More research is needed to understand changes in enrollment and recruiting of students and how these may be privileging certain segments of the student population as well as particular institutions. How do institutional recruiting practices in uence student enrollment and the perception of the opportunities available for postsecondary study? How do these images and messages in uence a variety of external constituencies?

Furthermore, exploring how changes in the student population as well as the college search process in uence students' pursuit of higher education would contribute to the research literature. One important aspect, particularly for state governments and state higher education systems, is in understanding how changes in students and college search in uence the migration of students between states. A diverse higher education system is touted for the ability to keep students in state by providing a range of higher education o erings, but empirical testing of this assumption remains underdeveloped.

e debate within higher education regarding the utility and in uence of university rankings continues with some questioning whether the trend will continue to push institutions towards the prestigious research university model leading to a continued decline in institutional diversity (Marginson, 2006). To put it simply, if the trend toward emphasizing the private bene ts

of higher education and student consumerism continues largely unabated, will institutions continue to implement strategies and initiatives to meet student demands in similar isomorphic ways? Understanding how these trends will in uence institutions and ultimately the opportunities available in a system of higher education remains one of the essential questions facing the future of higher education.

Conclusion

Institutional diversity has been a leading value and strength since the earliest founding of colleges and universities in the United States. e diverse system of higher education developed in response to a variety of uniquely American ideals and beliefs shaping our postsecondary opportunities and our society. Despite the challenges facing colleges and universities and a decline of institutional diversity in recent years, the U.S. system of higher education remains one of the most diversi ed systems in the world. e institutions that make up our education system provide opportunity for students from a variety of social and academic backgrounds and in many ways reflect the diversity of our country.

is monograph provides an overview of the research examining institutional diversity and can serve as a foundation for additional research necessary to understanding changes and challenges to institutional diversity in the future. e American higher education system is certainly not perfect and has room to improve, innovate, and invest. However, in these e orts, we should not and we must not lose one of the great historical strengths of the system. Improving postsecondary opportunity, particularly among marginalized groups, as well as supporting the economy and nation in light of globalization and the knowledge economy, remain important goals for higher education to achieve in this century. Increased empirical research on institutional diversity and asking tough questions regarding institutional strategy and aspirations remain essential to preserving and strengthening American higher education. Researchers must be cognizant of both the historical missions of higher education and the real economic and political challenges facing campuses and institutional leadership. A considerable gap in our knowledge regarding best

practices and theoretical implications for resolving this critical tension remains. Additional research, given the neoliberal regime currently in place, should explore these issues and provide greater information and answers to individual institutions, students, states, systems of higher education, the federal government, and society.

e arena of institutional diversity presents a substantial opportunity for scholars to improve higher education research. With the changing economic circumstances and demographics of the country, providing a strong higher education system will in many ways necessitate a greater degree of institutional diversity. Higher education systems that are able to meet students with a variety of skills, talents, and socioeconomic backgrounds will be best positioned to succeed in the 21st century. Research examining institutional diversity in the coming decades will prove signi cant in the future and ongoing success of colleges and universities. e historical advantage that higher education has o ered to the United States relied greatly upon the bene ts of institutional diversity. Understanding how to strengthen and preserve this key strength presents one of the greatest challenges and opportunities facing American higher education.

References

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

Allen, I. E., & Seaman, J. (2007). *Online nation: Five years of growth in online learning.* Needham, MA: Sloan Consortium.

Allen, I. E., & Seaman, J. (2010). *Class di erences: Online education in the United States, 2010.* Newburyport, MA: Sloan Consortium.

Allen, W. R. (1992). e color of success: African American college student outcomes at predominantly White and historically Black public colleges and universities. *Harvard Educational Review, 62*(1), 26–44.

Allen, W. R., & Jewell, J. O. (2002). A backward glance forward: Past, present, and future perspectives on historically Black colleges and universities. *Review of Higher Education, 25*(3), 241–261.

Altbach, P. G. (2011). Harsh realities: e professoriate in the twenty- rst century. In P. G. Altbach, P. J. Gumport, & R. O. Berdahl (Eds.), *American higher education in the twenty-rst century: Social, political, and economic challenges* (3rd ed., pp. 227–253). Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

American Association of University Professors (AAUP). (1940). *1940 Statement of principles on academic freedom and tenure.* Washington, DC: Author.

American Council on Education (ACE) Board of Directors. (2012). *On the importance of diversity in higher education.* Washington, DC: Author.

American Indian College Fund. (2003). *Cultivating success: The critical value of American Indian scholarships and the positive impact of tribal college capital construction.* Denver, CO: Author.

Anctil, E. J. (2008). Selling higher education: Marketing and advertising America's colleges and universities. *ASHE Higher Education Report, 34*(2). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Arum, R., & Roksa, J. (2011). *Academically adrift: Limited learning on college campuses.* Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Asimov, N. (2013, February 22). UC online courses fail to lure outsiders. *San Francisco Chronicle*. Retrieved from http://www.sfgate.com/education/article/UC-online-courses-fail-to-lure-outsiders-4173639.php

Avery, C., Fairbanks, A., & Zeckhauser, R. J. (2003). *e early admissions game: Joining the elite.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Axtell, J. (1974). *e school upon a hill: Education and society in colonial New England.* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Bahr, P. R. (2012). Classifying community colleges based on students' patterns of use. Washington, DC: HCM Strategists.

Balderston, F. F. (1995). *Managing today's university: Strategies for viability, change, and excellence* (2nd ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Barkley, E. F., Cross, K. P., & Major, C. H. (2005). *Collaborative learning techniques: A handbook for college faculty*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Barnes, B., & Harris, M. S. (2010). Privatization in uences and strategic enrollment management decisions in public research universities. *College & University, 85*(4), 2–9.

Barrett, D. (2011, July 20). Calling out "coasters" or name-calling? *Inside Higher Ed*. Retrieved from http://www.insidehighered.com/news/2011/07/20/controversial_former_texas_o cial_criticizes_productivity_of_university_faculty

Bastedo, M. N., & Bowman, N. A. (2010). e *U.S. News & World Report* college rankings: Modeling institutional e ects on organizational reputation. *American Journal of Education, 116*(2), 163–183.

Bastedo, M. N., & Bowman, N. A. (2011). College rankings as an interorganizational dependency: Establishing the foundation for strategic and institutional accounts. *Research in Higher Education, 52*(1), 3–23.

Becher, T., & Trowler, P. R. (2001). *Academic tribes and territories: Intellectual enquiry and the culture of disciplines.* Buckingham, United Kingdom: Society for Research in Higher Education and Open University Press.

Benitez, M. (1998). Hispanic-serving institutions: Challenges and opportunities. *New Directions for Higher Education, 102*, 57–68.

Berdahl, R. (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.

Bergquist, W. (1993). *e postmodern organization: Mastering the art of irreversible change.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Bess, J. L., & Dee, J. R. (2008). *Understanding college and university organization: eories for e ective policy and practice* (Vol. I). Sterling, VA: Stylus.

Birnbaum, R. (1983). *Maintaining diversity in higher education*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Birnbaum, R. (1988). *How colleges work: e cybernetics of academic organization and leadership.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Blau, P. M. (1994). *e organization of academic work* (2nd ed.). London, United Kingdom: Transaction.

Bloom, A. D. (1987). *e closing of the American mind: How higher education has failed democracy and impoverished the souls of today's students.*

Brainard, J. (2004, October 22). Lobbying to bring home the bacon. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, p. A26.

Braxton, J. M. (Ed.). (2000). *Reworking the student departure puzzle*. Nashville, TN: Vanderbilt University Press.

Breneman, D. W., & Finney, J. E. (1997). e changing landscape: Higher education nance in the 1990s. In P. M. Callan & J. E. Finney (Eds.), *Public and private nancing of higher education* (pp. 30–59). Phoenix, AZ: Oryx Press.

. 2000)2

Eliot, C. W. (1961). Charles William Eliot expounds the elective system as "Liberty in Education." In R. Hofstadter & W. Smith (Eds.), *American higher education: A documentary history* (Vol. 2, pp. 701–714). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Fain, P. (2012, July 30). Results are in. *Inside Higher Ed*. Retrieved from http://www.insidehighered.com/news/2012/07/30/harkin-releases-critical-report-pro ts

Fairweather, J. S. (2000). Diversi cation or homogenization: How markets and governments combine to shape American higher education. *Higher Education Policy, 13*(1), 79–98.

Fairweather, J. S. (2002). e mythologies of faculty productivity: Implications for institutional policy and decision making. *Journal of Higher Education, 73*(1), 26–48.

Feller, I. (1990). Universities as engines of R&D-based economic growth: ey think they can. *Research Policy, 19*(4), 335–348.

Foster, L. (2001). e not-so-invisible professor: White faculty at the Black colleges. *Urban Education, 36*(5), 611–629.

Frankenberg, E., & Or eld, G. (2012). *e resegregation of suburban schools: A hidden crisis in American education*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Press.

Franklin, B. (1958). A plan for the education of youth in Pennsylvania. In A. C. Spectorsky (Ed.), *e college years* (pp. 39–45). Philadelphia, PA: Hawthorn Books.

Freeman, K. (2002). Black colleges and college choice: Characteristics of students who chose HBCUs. *Review of Higher Education, 25*(3), 349–358.

Gasman, M., Baez, B., & Turner, C. S. V. (Eds.). (2008). *Understanding minority-serving institutions*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Gasman, M., Lundy-Wagner, V., Ransom, T., & Bowman, N. (2010). *Unearthing promise and potential: Our nation's historically Black colleges and universities. ASHE Higher Education Report, 35*(5). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Gasman, M., & Tudico, C. L. (Eds.). (2008). *Historically Black colleges and universities: Triumphs, troubles, and taboos*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.

Geiger, R. L. (2000). e era of multipurpose colleges in American higher education, 1850–1890. In R. L. Geiger (Ed.), *e American college in the nineteenth century*. Nashville, TN: Vanderbilt University Press.

Geiger, R. L. (2004). *Knowledge and money: Research universities and the paradox of the marketplace.* Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Grubb, N., & Lazerson, M. (2005). *e education gospel*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
Gueverra, J. (2001). Women's colleges in Massachusetts: Responses to enrollment declines. *Review of Higher Education, 24*(4), 351–368.

Holley, K. A., & Harris, M. S. (2010). Selecting students, selecting priorities: How universities manage enrollment during times of economic crisis. *Journal of College Admission, 207*, 16–21.

Hoover, E. (2010, October 24). More colleges put reps in distant ZIP codes. *Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved from http://www.chronicle.com/article/More-Colleges-Add-Admissions/125058

Horta, H., Huisman, J., & Heitor, M. (2008). Does competitive research funding encourage diversity in higher education? *Science and Public Policy, 35*(3), 146–158.

Hovey, H. A. (1999). *State spending for higher education in the next decade: The battle to sustain current support*. San Jose, CA: National Center for Public Policy and Higher Education.

Huisman, J. (1995). *Differentiation, diversity and dependency in higher education*. Utrecht, Netherlands: Lemma.

Huisman, J. (1998). Differentiation and diversity in higher education systems. In J. C. Smart (Ed.), *Higher education: Handbook of theory and research, 13*, 75–100. Edison, NJ: Agathon Press.

Huisman, J., Kaiser, F., & Vossensteyn, H. (2000). Floating foundations of higher education policy. *Higher Education Quarterly, 54*(3), 217–238.

Huisman, J., Meek, V. L., & Wood, F. (2007). Institutional diversity in higher education: A cross-national and longitudinal analysis. *Higher Education Quarterly, 61*(7), 563–577.

Huisman, J., & Morphew, C. C. (1998). Centralization and diversity: Evaluating the effects of government policies in the U.S. and Dutch higher education. *Higher Education Policy, 11*(1), 3–13.

Hunt, G. (Ed.). (1903). *The writings of James Madison* (Vol. 4). New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons.

Hurtado, S. (2002). Creating a climate of inclusion: Understanding Latina/o college students. In W. A. Smith, P. G. Altbach, & K. Lomotey (Eds.), *The racial crisis in American higher education: Continuing challenges for the twenty-first century*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Jaffe, M. (1992, November 23). Men of Troy. *Sports Illustrated*, 88–89.

Jaschik, S. (2011, November 14). Nuance on faculty productivity.

McGuinness, A. C. (1994). e changing structure of state higher education leadership. In A. C. McGuinness, R. M. Epper, & S. Arrendondo (Eds.), *State postsecondary education structures handbook* (pp. 19–21). Denver, CO: Education Commission of the States.

McGuinness, A. C. (2011). e states and higher education. In P. G. Altbach, P. J. Gumport, & R. Berdahl (Eds.), *American higher education in the twenty- rst century: Social, political, and economic challenges* (pp. 139–169). Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

McLendon, M. K. (2012).

Morphew, C. C. (2009). Conceptualizing change in the institutional diversity of U.S. colleges and universities. *Journal of Higher Education, 80*(3), 243–269.
Morphew, C. C., & Eckel, P. D. (2009). *Privatizing the public university: Perspectives from across the academy*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
Morphew, C. C., & Huisman, J. (2002). Using institutional theory to reframe research on academic drift. *Higher Education in Europe, 27*(4), 492–506.
National Center for Education Statistics. (2002). *e condition of education.* Hviui( )]TJ 0 TEersi 1 Tf (0 Tw 18.9531 0 Td23.3

Sells, M. A. (1999). *Approaching the Qur'an*. Ashland, OR: White Cloud Press.
Shedd, J. M. (2003). e history of the student credit hour. *New Directions for Higher Education, 122*, 5–12.
Shils, E. (1962). Observations on the American University. *Universities Quarterly, 17*, 182–193.
Slaughter, S., & Leslie, L. L. (1997). *Academic capitalism: Politics, policies, and the entrepreneurial university*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
Slaughter, S., & Rhoades, G. (2004). *Academic capitalism and the new economy: Markets, state, and higher education*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
Smith, D. G. (2011). The diversity imperative: Moving to the next generation. In P. G. Altbach, P. J. Gumport, & R. O. Berdahl (Eds.), *American higher education in the twenty-rst century: Social, political, and economic challenges*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
Snider, W. D. (1992). *Light on the hill: A history of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.* Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
Snyder, S. (2008, May 18). Rosemont struggles with call to admit men. *Philadelphia Inquirer*. Retrieved from http://articles.philly.com/2008-05-18/news/25262143_1_catholic-colleges-immaculata-rosemont-college
Solorzano, D. G. (1995). The doctorate production and baccalaureate origins of African Americans in the sciences and engineering. *Journal of Negro Education, 64*(1), 15–32.
Stadtman, V. A. (1980). *Academic adaptations*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
Stein, W. J. (1992). *Tribally controlled colleges*. New York, NY: Peter Lang.
Taylor, K., & Palmer, R. T. (2013). Cultivating engineering student success at an HBCU: An empirical study on development. In R. T. Palmer, D. C. Maramba, & M. Gasman (Eds.), *Fostering success of ethnic and racial minorities in STEM: e role of minority serving institutions.* New York, NY: Routledge.
elin, J. R. (2004). *A history of American higher education*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
omson, R. P. (1971). e reform of the College of William and Mary, 1763–1780. *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society, 115*(3), 187–213.
ursby, J. G., & Kemp, S. (2002). Growth and productive e ciency of university intellectual property licensing. *Research Policy, 31*(1), 109–124.
Tierney, W. G. (1988). Organizational culture in higher education: De ning the essentials. *Journal of Higher Education, 59*(1), 2–21.
Tierney, W. G., & Hentschke, G. C. (2007). *New players, di erent game: Understanding the rise of for-pro t colleges and universities*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
Tinto, V. (1994). *Leaving college: Rethinking the causes and cures of student attrition.* Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
Tolbert, P. S. (1985). Institutional environments and resource dependence: Sources of administrative structure in institutions of higher education. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 30*(1), 1–13.
Toma, J. D. (2012). Institutional strategy: Positioning for presti0.26SaNcyasman (Eds -0ole of 012 -1 G ierneyative structu:f

Toma, J. D., Dubrow, G., & Hartley, M. (2005). e uses of institutional culture: Strengthening identi cation and building brand equity in higher education. *ASHE Higher Education Report, 31*(2). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Townsend, B. K. (2001). Rede ning the community college transfer mission. *Community College Review, 29*(2), 29–42.

Trow, M. (1974). *Problems in the transition from elite to mass higher education*. Paris, France: Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development.

Trow, M. (1979). Aspects of diversity in American higher education. In H. J. Gans, N. Glazer, J. R. Gus eld, & C. Jencks (Eds.), *On the making of Americans: Essays in honor of David Riesman*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Trow, M. (1987). Academic standards and mass higher education. *Higher Education Quarterly, 41*(3), 268–292.

Trow, M. (2005). *On mass higher education and institutional diversity.* Haifa, Israel: Samuel Neaman Institute for Advanced Studies in Science and Technology, Technion–Israel Insti-

Yale Report. (1961). e Yale report of 1828. In R. Hofstadter & W. Smith (Eds.), *American higher education: A documentary history* (Vol. 1, pp. 275–291). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
Zemsky, R. (1990). e lattice and the ratchet. *Policy Perspectives, 2*(4), 1–8.

Name Index

Subject Index

About the Author

[redacted] is associate professor of higher education at Southern Methodist University in Dallas, Texas. His scholarly interests include organizational theory and public policy in higher education. Speci cally, he is interested in how external forces in uence institutional activity of colleges and universities, with a particular focus on public higher education. He holds a BA from the University of North Carolina and MEd and EdD from the University of Pennsylvania in higher education administration. Harris formerly served on the higher education faculty at the University of Alabama.