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This researcher demonstrates how applied qualitative grounded theory methodology was used in this dissertation to develop a framework to generate future substantive and/or formal theory (objective of the study). He also fulfills his dissertation’s dual purpose: The researcher first describes, analyzes, and explains strategic planning in higher education and its general strategy process so that they are better understood. Second, he establishes a base (i.e., framework) for the development of formal theory from one participant interview and its situational, social, and historical contexts using grounded theory. Collectively, these two purposes and the study’s objective comprise this dissertation’s scope.

It is problematic if faculty members who are stakeholders in strategic planning in higher education understand its general strategy process and are not included in it. Why? Faculty members collectively constitute higher
education’s key participants in the teaching, research, and service variables essential to its success. Yet no research studies currently exist that explain the relationship between strategic planning in higher education and faculty members who are stakeholders in it. For the researcher, this revealed the complex challenge inherent in his dissertation for developing a framework that would generate a future substantive and/or formal theory. His difficulty is compounded by the research problem: What is the relationship between faculty members who are stakeholders in strategic planning in higher education and other aspects of university policies?

Results from the one interviewed faculty stakeholder generated one theme with three sub themes, two metaphors, three propositions, and two social issues about the process of strategic planning in higher education. Further analysis of this one participant enabled this researcher to develop a ten stage process model for conducting grounded theory analysis. Results fulfill this dissertation’s purposes and potentials for significance: (a) to serve as a foundation to generate future formal theory, (b) to help close the gap between higher education research and practice, (c) to aid possible development of new higher education policy, and (d) to contribute new knowledge to the literature.
This dissertation is dedicated, first and foremost, to all students who commit themselves to their education and persist so they finish their degree(s). Although each one traverses a unique educational journey, all experience the imperative responsibility and discipline expected of their conduct and work. Students’ motivation to overcome personal tribulations and their ambition to achieve their academic goals often steadfastly impel many to excel and succeed.

This dissertation is also dedicated to The University of Toledo and its faculty members. The institution promotes student excellence, learning, and diversity: an epitome of opportunity. It bestows accountability upon students to demonstrate their competent ability to organize, synthesize, collaborate, work independently, and clearly communicate. The faculty cultivates critical thinking skills and extends the research privilege to doctoral candidates to develop new, scholarly knowledge. They also champion professional growth and maturity, a benefit that transcends course grades earned and permeates invaluable individual confidence and accomplishment.
Acknowledgements

I would like to thank my dissertation committee: Dr. Hamer, Dr. Edwards, Dr. Poplin Gosetti, and Dr. Meabon. Qualitative research already entails arduous work, detailed organization, incessant focus, and continual investigator commitment to its often long and challenging journey: collectively, you helped cultivate an exemplary dissertation. Dr. Hamer, your feedback, patience, and guidance during my dissertation journey elicited excellence and preserved my sanity as a qualitative researcher. Dr. Edwards, your insightful editorial gems of wisdom and unremitting reminder that politics enveloped my study motivated me to pursue this dissertation to its completion. Dr. Poplin Gosetti, your discernment of my topic's complexity and the need to individually describe and explain each point encouraged my disciplined reading, writing, and research. Each section and chapter evolved and complemented the others; they all contributed to a clear, organized, and well-written dissertation. Dr. Meabon, your insistent suggestion that I conduct an exhaustive literature review to make and defend my argument empowered me to write in a scholarly manner about strategic planning in higher education. Again, I express gratitude to each member of my dissertation committee. Thank you.
# Table of Contents

Abstract  
iii

Acknowledgements  
vi

Table of Contents  
vii

List of Tables  
xiii

List of Figures  
xiv

Preface  
xv

I. Introduction  
1
  A. Introduction  
1
  B. Purpose of the Dissertation and Study  
1
  C. Topic  
1
  D. Theoretical Framework  
3
  E. Justification for Qualitative Research  
4
  F. Problem Statement  
12
  G. Research Questions  
13
  H. Potential Significance  
14
  I. General Research Questions  
30
  J. Researcher’s Assumptions  
30
  K. Delimitations and Limitations  
32
  L. Organization of Dissertation  
34
  M. Definitions  
36
II. Review of Literature

A. Introduction to Military, Business, and Higher Education Strategy

B. Military Strategy
   a. Process

C. Business Strategy
   a. Process
   b. SWOT
   c. Basic Design School Model
   d. Communication

D. Higher Education Strategy
   a. Linear Strategy Model
   b. Adaptive Strategy Model
   c. Interpretive Strategy Model

E. Higher Education Strategy Process
   a. SWOT
   b. Communication
   c. Purpose
   d. Conclusion for Three Patterns of SWOT

F. Military Planning and Business and Higher Education Strategic Planning

G. Military Planning
H. Business Strategic Planning

I. Strategic Planning in Higher Education

J. Conclusion to Strategic Planning Section

K. Strategic Planning in Higher Education from National to Local Context

   a. Morrill Act (1862)
   b. Morrill Act II (1890)
   c. G. I. Bill (1944)
   d. The Higher Education Act and Reauthorizations
   e. No Child Left Behind
   f. Truman Commission
   g. Spellings Commission
   h. Conclusion to the National Context

L. Local Context

   b. Access, accountability, affordability, and quality

M. Research Gap

N. Strategic planning in higher education Studies

III. Research Design and Methodology

   A. Theoretical Tradition – Grounded Theory

   ix
a. Grounded Theory 138

B. Justification for Qualitative Methodology 140

C. Setting, Population, and Phenomenon 141
   a. Setting 141
   b. Population 142
   c. Phenomenon 143

D. Strategy, Genre, and Rationale 143
   a. Participant Selection 145
   b. Recruitment 145
   c. Data Collection 145
      1. interviews 146
      2. dissertation study interview questions 146

E. Researcher Subjectivity 150

F. Rapport 154

G. Pilot Interview 155

H. Data Management 160

I. Data Analysis 162
   a. Trustworthiness Features 165
   b. Ethical Issues 165
   c. Risks to Subjects and Confidentiality 165

IV. Analysis and Findings 167

A. Ten Stage Process Model of Grounded Theory Analysis 167
a. Stage 1  170
b. Stage 2  173
c. Stage 3  176

1. The Relationship of the Core Category to each Initial Category  179

2. The Relationship of the Core Category to each Macro Level Category  192
d. Stage 4  195
e. Stage 5  203
f. Stage 6  205
g. Stage 7  206
h. Stage 8  208
i. Stage 9  209
j. Stage 10  212

B. Analysis of the Situational, Social, and Historical Contexts  217

a. Situational Context Analysis  217
b. Social Context Analysis  221
c. Historical Context Analysis  223

V. Conclusion, Discussion, and Recommendations  225

A. The Analytical Onus Experienced by this Researcher  229

B. Discussion of Strategy Analysis in Strategic Planning in Higher Education  230
C. Discussion of the Higher Education Fit to this Study 231
D. Further Assumptions for Future Study 232
E. Conclusion to Dissertation 233
F. This Researcher’s Recommendations for Further Study 240

References 241

Appendices
A. Definitions of Terminology 264
B. Letter of Permission 281
C. Letter of Faculty Interest 282
D. Consent Letter 283
List of Tables

Table 1. Five Strategy Types in Business vs. Higher Education 61
Table 2. Federal Influence on Strategic Planning Higher Education 109
Table 3. Ohio Ten Year Strategic Plan Accountability Measures 118
Table 4. General Conditional Matrix of Phenomenon 144
Table 5. Data from Stages 1 through 3 171
Table 6. Initial Categories from Data in Stages 1 through 3 178
Table 7. Intermediate Categories at the Macro Level Separated Further into Concepts from the Micro and Macro Levels 192
Table 8. Data of Professor Y for the Ten Stage Process Model 214
Table 9. The Relationship between this Dissertation’s Interview Questions and Research Questions – the Specific Conditional Matrix of Phenomenon 215
Table 10. Analysis that Occurred at Each Stage 216
List of Figures

Figure 1. Literature Review Map 43

Figure 2. Military Strategy Six Step Strategic Planning Process 50

Figure 3. The Strategic Planning Basic Design School Model 64

Figure 4. The Strategic Planning Engine 77

Figure 5. Ten Stage Process Model for Conducting Grounded Theory Analysis 169

Figure 6. A Portrayal of the Storyline for a Grounded Theory of Faculty Stakeholder Understanding of the Strategy Process In Strategic Planning in Higher Education: Professor Y 212
Preface

A new “specter” (Keller, 1983) looms over the towering spire of higher education: greater federally mandated accountability for public universities that transcends traditional budget/performance reporting. This accountability exhibits a paradoxical governmental scrutiny of these institutions’ duty to manifest, execute, and fulfill their overall mission, reflected in their strategic plan. Emotionally, it exudes an aura of dread eschewed by many in academe; its political effect provoked anxiety which permeated the core fibers of faculty members and administrators alike. Notably, the Spellings Commission’s report, A Test of Leadership (U.S. Department of Education [USDOE], 2006), sharply modified how public universities demonstrate fiscal and social responsibility. It resulted from coalesced federal social and political goals for higher education.

Traditional assessment and accreditation methods in higher education neither solely satisfied this need nor must they be the only accepted measures for public universities to evince (i.e., clearly show and demonstrate) their accountability. Strategic planning in higher education recommenced from its perceived inefficiency, prejudiced inception, and presumed remoteness with strategy and, in 2010, presented a beacon for it. This dissertation demonstrates how applied qualitative grounded theory methodology reveals this and other significant, profound social issues in higher education to help close the gap between its research and practice.
Chapter 1
Introduction

This researcher presents an applied qualitative grounded theory methodology used in this dissertation to develop a framework to generate future substantive and/or formal theory. He implements it using interview data with one faculty member who was a strategic planning stakeholder at his university. Specifically, the researcher analyzes the participant interview; the general analysis process for strategic planning in higher education; and its situational, social, and historical contexts. As a result, he presents a framework to generate future substantive and/or formal theory (objective of the study).

The researcher also reveals the complexity and depth imperative to understand the strategy process used in strategic planning in higher education. This fulfills the purpose of this dissertation to explicate strategic planning in higher education and its general strategy process so that they are better understood. He then develops a model for conducting future qualitative grounded theory analysis. Here, the introduction identifies strategic planning in higher education as this dissertation’s topic and subsequently designates grounded theory as the method used to analyze data.
Contentious debate, doubt, and discord over strategic planning in higher education’s perceived inefficiency prejudiced its inception: “either universities have it all wrong” or “strategy theoreticians do” (Hardy, Langly, Mintzberg, & Rose, 1983, p. 407). However, policy change in 2006 modified how these social institutions demonstrate fiscal and social responsibility (see chapter 5 discussions). It resulted from federal social and political goals for higher education that ultimately affected public universities’ strategic planning. As stated in the preface, more common assessment and accreditation neither solely satisfy this need nor are they the only accepted measures for public universities to demonstrate their responsibility. Again, strategic planning in higher education recommenced from its perceived inefficiency, prejudiced inception, and presumed remoteness with strategy and, in 2010, presented a beacon for university accountability. How?

Strategic planning in higher education, over time, develops enormous potential to coalesce universities, departments, and their other units to work towards implementing a “shared mission” that “actualize[s] the vision” (Dooris, Kelley, & Trainer, 2002, p. 10). Such capability and capacity derive from the concerted approach to fulfill the institution–wide mission and adapt to strategic planning environments. For example, individual college/department/unit mission statements collectively help define six elements for the institution’s overall strategic plan: (a) market for success, (b) profitable selling points, (c) tangible products, (d) intangible product,
(e) tangible services, and (f) intangible services. They assist their institution in more clearly understanding specific attributes about niche, differentiation, degrees granted, competence acquired, student privileges, and university operations in its internal and external environments.

Often, these elements become further categorized into quantitative variables measured to determine significance and frequently demonstrate numerical accountability (i.e., FTE, total number of students graduated, revenue generated, total expenses). For this dissertation, however, these six elements substantiate that the researcher apply a qualitative method that enables him to write about the complexities of strategic planning in higher education. If quantitative analyses traditionally convey public accountability and the federal and state government demanded more of it in 2010, then qualitative research must investigate other viable alternatives. The researcher next describes this dissertation’s theoretical framework.

**Theoretical Framework**

This researcher applies grounded theory to analyze a participant’s interview; the general analysis process for strategic planning in higher education; social issues incurred in it; and its situational, social, and historical contexts (see chapter 4). Qualitative grounded theory embodies this dissertation’s theoretical framework whose developed logic the researcher more explicitly discusses in chapters 2 and 3. The following paragraph and next section complete his introduction to it.
The literature revealed strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats (SWOT) analysis to constitute the general strategic planning process common to many models (Collins, 2002; Mintzberg, 1994; Mintzberg & Quinn, 1991; Mintzberg, Quinn, & James, 1991). SWOT analysis also prevails in strategic planning models in higher education (Alfred, 2006; Dolence & Norris, 1994; Rowley, Lujan, & Dolence, 1997, 1998; Sevier, 2000; Trainer, 2004): There, it executes a process that analyzes “internal and external factors” (Rowley et al., p. 131) in universities’ environments. These factors constitute quantitative variables measured and deemed significant to determine and distinguish programs or departments needed to be cut from those requiring further investment to survive or flourish. Why is this significant? The researcher found the primary means of analysis in all strategic planning to be quantitative and his dissertation implements a qualitative grounded theory methodological approach. He justifies his qualitative approach next.

**Justification for Qualitative Research**

This researcher compares the importance for quantitative investigations and contexts to qualitative ones to justify applying grounded theory in his dissertation and its study. Quantitative studies frequently are conducted with a pretest, treatment, and post test (Monette, Sullivan, & DeJong, 2008) to ensure replicable research and establish generalizability and reliability. They adhere to the positivist paradigm where “the objectives
of theory are *explanation* and *prediction*” (Charmaz, 2006, p. 126) predicated on analyses of null and alternate hypotheses to determine power.

To illustrate, the quantitative paradigm determines significance (i.e., power) by examining and evaluating relations between dependent variables and the independent one(s). Such relations are frequently computed by different procedures in a multiple regression (Hinkle, Wiersma, & Jurs, 2003): Low correlation of the dependent variable (DV) with the independent variable (IV) confines quantitative power, diminishes applicability, and restricts dependent variables’ relational strength to the IV. Correlation purposefully limits DVs that do not vary together with the IV to eliminate them from additional analysis. They are not significant predictors and do not help “establish that a relationship exists between variables” (p. 176).

Further, overreliance on quantitative analyses remains a major difficulty with strategic planning in higher education. Mathematics alone embody a complex subject meticulously detailed with multiple meanings whose scientifically respected and rigorous empirical evaluations are preferred, maybe even esteemed, beyond its collective shared understanding. Moreover, quantitative studies’ capacity to determine power/significance is limited when researchers examine and evaluate social phenomena. Phenomena are “complex and multidimensional” (Beltyukova, 2002, p. 26): they are facts, events, and/or instances difficult to understand. Quantitative research methods will not appropriately measure their importance.
Quantitative contexts categorize data into nominal, ordinal, interval, and ratio groups of measurement in studies where the first two are qualitative in nature and the latter two are imperative for numeric statistical analyses (see chapters 2 and 4). They are external facts and/or circumstances that help determine, define, and provide specific secondary independent variables to be examined and evaluated. Nominal and ordinal groups of measurement are less precise in calculation and classify or characterize: “measurement consists of unordered or ordered (ranked) discrete categories, such as religious background or grades” (Hinkle et al., 2003, p. 11). Interval and ratio groups of measurement get quantitatively analyzed and are assumed to “have underlying continuity; that is, they can take on any value on the measurement scale” (p. 11). Only variables for interval and ratio data provide exact parameters that exemplify “measure[s] of a characteristic of a population” (p. 12). Problematic, quantitative contexts limit and thwart investigators who seek to acquire selected participants’ perceptions about a specific topic and qualitatively evaluate them.

For this dissertation, however, qualitative grounded theory facilitates readers’ increased understanding of strategic planning in higher education through analysis and explanation; it does not preclude it. How? This researcher applies quantitative rigor to his qualitative grounded theory analysis; an almost oxymoronic logic for research novices. If higher
education, as a community, solely depends on the scientific method to demonstrate accountability, then where are we open to discovery of new knowledge to determine other viable measures?

Qualitative investigations, alternatively, are consistent with the interpretivist paradigm which “emphasizes understanding rather than explanation” (Charmaz, 2006, p. 126). Here, “knowledge–and theories– are situated and located in particular positions, perspectives, and experiences” (p. 127). Such studies cannot ascribe generalizability and often remain confined to individual case studies (i.e., Dooris & Lozier, 1990; Pennsylvania State University, 1984) unless referring to Kennedy’s (1979) concept of the “second decision span.”

Explicitly, qualitative investigations of strategic planning in higher education are not conducive for “controlled studies or even quasi experimental designs” (Dooris et al., 2002, p. 9). Individuals’ perceptions and contemplated “wants, needs, [and] expectations” (Alfred, 2006, p. 68) more appropriately conform to qualitative investigatory methods: Participants’ recorded responses reveal explanatory insight of a researched phenomenon, for example, this study’s selected faculty members who are stakeholders in strategic planning in higher education.

This researcher presents a qualitative approach where contexts support his grounded theory study and help explain strategic planning in higher education. This permits him to form and combine many concepts that
characterize it. He organizes “conceptualization and measurement of individual constructs” (Boyd & Reuning–Elliott, 1998, p. 181) in the first two chapters to better explain contexts (i.e., the set of circumstances that envelop strategic planning in higher education). As a result, he more fully describes them to provide qualitative significance, ground support for his analysis, and help develop a framework to generate future substantive and/or formal theory (objective of the study). Qualitative contexts provide significance when they create a base that enables meticulous evaluation in the analysis chapter and help answer the research questions. Several are presented in the potential significance section later in this chapter.

For this dissertation, contexts provide significance derived from the coding structure applied in a grounded theory constructivist approach: Many codes often collectively embody contexts that delineate “subheadings [which] serve as conceptual categories and ground the analysis” (Charmaz, 2006, p. 162). For example, communication (i.e., the means to successfully accomplish specific strategic planning goals) represents a possible sub code for its axial code of strategy. “Terminology” comprises another probable subheading and/or subcategory for this axial code used in the military, business, and higher education strategy (see chapter 4).

Further, qualitative contexts (see first two chapters) demonstrate how the research questions are relevant, develop the theoretical framework for this dissertation and its study, and support the researcher’s argument.
Shared stakeholder understanding exemplifies one such significant context for practice in universities. Conveyed strategic planning strategies, concepts, and terminology to stakeholders without having first established it might impede successful implementation of the plan. Notably, strategic planning in higher education borrows many of its concepts and terms from business strategic planning which evolved from military strategy and planning. Discipline-specific terminology isolates individual comprehension and neither promotes collective shared understanding nor imparts meaning to experts in different disciplines: “A good deal of confusion stems from contradictory and ill-defined uses” (Mintzberg & Quinn, 1991, p. 19).

Businesses pursue “frontal attack” marketing strategy, universities “speedily surprise” their market to establish differentiation, and computers are “deployed” to specific work stations/labs: Words in quotes are military terms used in each of these three disciplines. Resulting misinterpretations can frequently stifle university universities’ progress to attain goals embodied in their strategic plan and conveyed in mission statements. Frequent use of military terminology demonstrates one possible reason why higher education may inadvertently help perpetuate the societal status quo (see tacit theory, chapter 3).

Any conveyed strategic planning concepts without tailored messages to one’s audience more easily exacerbates its already broad meaning, confusion, and cataloged consequences. Originally, business identified military strategy
and its concepts to be “among the oldest continuous literatures in the world” (Mintzberg & Quinn, 1991, p. 4) and business strategic planning began in the 1960s (Drucker, 1954; Steiner, 1969). Academe and academicians did not more widely recognize a need for strategic planning until the 1980s (Keller, 1983) when it “borrowed” business concepts and strategy for its planning (Chaffee, 1985, p. 135).

How might this relation be observed and/or witnessed to demonstrate importance for this context regarding how strategic planning in higher education is understood? Strategic planning further elicits divergent interpretations by faculty, administrators, and staff even if they all work at the same university. It has been metaphorically referred to as “steering a ship” (Rowley et al., 1997, p. 39); “new management wine in old bottles” (Keller, 1983, p. 40); “old wine in new bottles” (Checkoway, 1986, p. 66); “an eagle and an ant” (Beerel, 1998, p. 176); and “three blind men who describe an elephant” (Martinez, 2002, p. 349). For purposes of simplicity, Saxe’s (1873) “The Blind Men and An Elephant” provides an excellent analogy because it portrays how people interpret the message of the exact same subject differently. Each visually impaired man individually touches and feels part of an elephant and concludes that his interpretation is correct: it is a wall (body), snake (trunk), fan (ear), spear (tusk), tree (leg), and rope (tail) respectively.
Similarly, many university faculty members tend to perceive strategic planning in higher education one way, administrators a second, and other stakeholders a third. Some might believe that it derives from military strategist forecasts of an enemy’s moves to better prepare soldiers for winning in battle (Keller, 1983). Others may understand it to emphasize process that helps determine/measure attributes (i.e., strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats) or the process as “a bridge” (Rowley et al., 1997, p. 265). Still others might convey strategic planning in higher education through its specific quantitative use of cost–benefit analysis, benchmarking, or other strategy type (i.e., “process,” “competency,” and “context–based”) (Alfred, 2006). If communicated shared misunderstanding elicits one of strategic planning in higher education’s dilemmas, then grounded theory can emancipate the general process from its distorted certainty that maintains stagnancy.

The introduction, thus far, identified strategic planning in higher education as this dissertation’s topic and discussed it and grounded theory as the framework. Again, developed logic for both the theoretical framework and argument is expounded on in chapters 2 and 3: Here, it suffices to mention that the former “locates the specific argument that you make” (Charmaz, 2006, p. 169) and the latter is supported by contexts presented in the potential significance section. How is this important for this dissertation? The researcher uses grounded theory to describe and explain the
phenomenon of strategic planning in higher education so that it is better understood. He applies its analysis to a faculty stakeholder’s perceptions; the literature review’s situational, social, and historical contexts; and social issues incurred in it to ground the framework for development of future generated substantive and/or formal theory.

This researcher then justified using a qualitative research approach and metaphorically defined strategic planning in higher education as an elephant described differently by three blind men. This analogously portrayed how frequently used terminology in strategic planning overall may not mean much to stakeholders. Lastly, the introduction, up to this point, revealed that possible communicated shared misunderstanding elicits one of its dilemmas. This leads to this dissertation’s explicit forthcoming and subsequent problem statement.

**Problem Statement**

It is a problem if faculty members who are stakeholders in strategic planning in higher education understand its general strategy process and are not included in it. Why is this important? It is this researcher’s impression that administrators, politicians, and others need to comprehend faculty members’ value and worth to higher education beyond the “publish or perish” paradoxical lexicon. Faculty members have the most frequent contact with higher education customers, the students, and fulfill the primary business
Faculty members collectively constitute higher education’s “means of production” (Birnbaum, 1991) – the teaching, research, and service variables essential to its success. Yet no research studies currently exist that explain strategic planning in higher education and any relation it has to the above identified three categories for specific variables. This revealed the explicit research problem for this dissertation: What is the relationship between faculty members who are stakeholders in strategic planning in higher education and other aspects of university policies? This problem helped the investigator generate his research questions, develop interview questions, and obtain primary data to analyze. His research questions follow.

**Research Questions**

1. How do faculty members who are involved in strategic planning at selected Ohio four–year public state universities understand the general strategic planning process at the university level?

2. How do faculty members who are involved in strategic planning at selected Ohio four–year public state universities describe a relationship between the general process of strategic planning in higher education and other aspects of university policies?

These two research questions address the identified research problem. However, this study develops a framework from one participant interview.
that can be applied by other researchers to generate a future substantive and/or formal theory. Moreover, it presents the researcher’s portrayal of preliminary grounded theory of faculty involvement in strategic planning in higher education and a model for analysis of the qualitative method.

**Potential Significance**

Potential significance for this dissertation and its study derive from qualitative research on strategic planning in higher education that: (a) serves as a foundation to generate formal theory, (b) helps close the gap between higher education research and practice, (c) aids possible development of new higher education policy, and (d) contributes new knowledge to the literature. Each section for potential significance helps build this researcher’s argument and demonstrates importance for his chosen method.

First, potential significance for generated formal theory results from this researcher’s applied qualitative grounded theory methodology to understand and explain strategic planning in higher education. He organizes his dissertation and the literature review’s three contexts using its strategies. Analysis of them helps him establish the foundation for development of formal theory.

Preliminary analysis is conducted on the literature review’s situational, social, and historical contexts’ axial codes whose categories are “raised to concepts” (Charmaz, 2006, p. 139) to refine further analysis (see
chapter 4). For example, chapter two’s situational context section conveys how strategic planning evolved via military strategy analysis common to most models. It illustrates and explains the military, business, and higher education strategy analysis process executed in each discipline’s strategic planning. All three strategy analysis processes collectively comprise a qualitative “dimension” (Strauss & Corbin, 1998) that contains a shared subcategory of within and between variables. The military, business, and higher education analyze them to determine significance for their specific political, economic, ideological, and social (PEIS) and political, economic, social, and technological (PEST) quantitative variables, which this researcher explains (see chapter 4).

Axial codes embed contexts deeper and organize a more complete understanding of the research topic and clarify the relationship between it, the study’s objective, and analysis of primary data. This study’s axial codes are presented, analyzed, and explained in chapter 4. However, all contexts found throughout this dissertation help ground the qualitative significance for strategic planning in higher education.

Moreover, potential significance for generated formal theory has important implications for faculty members’ understanding who are stakeholders in strategic planning in higher education. To illustrate, Dooris and Lozier (1990) conducted a case study at Penn State with “specially appointed strategic study groups – with heavy representation of the faculty”
These groups “had been used to address planning issues that cut across organizational boundaries” (p. 11). Specifically, Pennsylvania State University’s Strategic Planning Guide

... indicated that strategic planning would be an evolutionary process and that adjustments would be made annually to incorporate both internal and external changes. Each fall from 1985 through 1988 an update to the guide was issued by the office of the president. Using this framework, both Pennsylvania State University as a whole and each college and major administrative unit of the university initiated a systematic and ongoing evaluation of strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats. (p. 11)

Additionally, Dooris (2002) conducted a “longitudinal case study” (p. 26) that elaborated on the readiness and ability for Penn State University to implement strategic planning in higher education.

These two examples represent a more prominent and accepted beginning for qualitative evaluation of strategic planning in higher education when and where faculty members (as stakeholders) were involved.

Significant here, this dissertation builds upon the possible extension of other applications derived from previous qualitative studies – the “theoretical parameters of the research” (Marshall & Rossman, 2006, p. 202). What this means is that the concept of faculty stakeholder involvement in strategic planning in higher education began with qualitative case studies. They now extend to grounded theory studies on the same topic (i.e., this dissertation) to help close the gap between research and practice in higher education.
How do the two research questions relate to the identified potential significances for this dissertation to make a contribution to formal theory? The first research question relates to the potential significance for generated formal theory because it investigates the link between practice in higher education and theory. Grounded theory helps develop a foundation for strategic planning in higher education theory on faculty stakeholder involvement in it.

The first research question identifies and elaborates how universities initially relied on strategic planning based on quantitative analyses: “Within planning, the activity of theory building itself draws on two sources – first, the empirical domain of planning practice and second, theoretical advances in planning-related disciplines” (Chettiparamb, 2006, p. 71). Two articles demonstrated its relevance in the “empirical domain” identified above. The first one addressed the issue of whether or not strategic planning in higher education works and concluded that a quandary arises when trying to quantitatively measure it (Dooris et al., 2002). A second article discussed how strategy measures were ineffectively used to evaluate strategic planning as a construct. Problems ranged from inaccurate identification of variables, to validity issues; to difficulty explaining how best to operationalize strategic planning in higher education (Boyd & Reuning–Elliott, 1998).

The second research question relates to the potential significance for generated formal theory because it augments existing social (Rogers &
Oakes, 2005; Spencer, 1979), policy (Gumport & Pusser, 1999; Heller, 2001; Serow, 2004), and educational (Cutright, 2001; Dewey, 1926) theories of external stakeholders’ influences on university strategic planning. How does this dissertation accommodate for this interdisciplinary phenomenon? Its qualitative grounded theory methodology parallels sociological theory with its “strategy for handling data in research [and] providing modes of conceptualization for describing and explaining” (Denzin & Lincoln, 2001, p. 230). For example, Athens (2010) argued that “naturalistic studies” generated theory from Blumer’s (1969) “naturalistic inquiry” and “symbolic interactionism” (Athens, p. 87) to ground data. Theory generation was not solely confined to Glaser’s (1967) or Strauss and Corbin’s (1990) grounded theory approach. For this dissertation, qualitative grounded theory “cut[s] across fields” and presents “theoretical ideas with grab” that “reach farther than treatment of a specific empirical problem” (Charmaz, 2006, p. 153).

Moreover, this dissertation author applies grounded theory strategies that identify, describe, and analyze similarities in strategic planning that cut across disciplines. He also explains both research questions to increase understanding of this phenomenon and to minimize any struggle that readers/academicians may have with conceptualization of its significance.

Second, potential significance for higher education research and practice emanate from qualitative research on strategic planning in higher education to help academicians close the gap between them. Many existing
studies that address higher education practice are quantitative and relate student affairs, retention, outcomes, and assessment of undergraduate student performance (Astin, 1992, 1993a, 1993b, 1998; Astin, Keup, & Lindholm, 2002; Terenzini, 1996; Terenzini, Cabrera, Colbeck, Bjorklund, & Parente, 2001; Terenzini & Pascarella, 1991).

Some authors discussed and related accountability practice in higher education to outcomes of campus activities (Burke, 2002, 2005; National Commission on Accountability in Higher Education, 2005; Zumeta, 1998). Others, related its quantitative analysis used in planning to university budget expenditures, investments, and allocations executed in cost–benefit analysis that provided fiduciary accountability (Burke & Associates, 2005; Burke & Serban, 1998). Szutz (1999) specifically found that strategic planning traditionally provided an “empirical foundation” that “bring[s] greater clarity to the administrative context of the institution or system” (p. 89). Another author claimed that strategic planning aids operational decision making through improving “understanding [of an] institution’s environment, competition, strengths, and weaknesses” (Peterson, 1999, p. xvii). Tierney (1993), however, attributed the “problem with strategic planning” (p. 89) to rest with its dichotomous and quantitative qualities that Keller (1983) identified.

Chaffee (1985) was one of a scant number of higher education authors who wrote about strategy in its strategic planning: a new area for qualitative
study. She questioned how it differs in higher education from business and noted that strategy in the former cannot be implemented as a top-down process as it can in the latter. Her rationale: “In the absence of research findings, the validity of differentiating higher education strategy from business strategy is unknown. That void would be less troublesome if more research on strategy, as it occurs in higher education, existed” (p. 138). The sparse literature on qualitative studies about developed and implemented strategy in higher education demonstrates significance for this dissertation. Potential significance for higher education practice might also have pertinent implications for faculty members’ understanding who are stakeholders in strategic planning in higher education.

If quantitative studies on strategic planning in higher education led to inconclusive dichotomous findings (i.e., it is/is not successful/useful), then qualitative grounded theory can reveal and explain not only how it is most useful/appropriate, but also social issues that are incurred in it.

How do the two research questions relate to the identified potential significance for this dissertation to make a contribution to practice in higher education? The first research question relates to this potential because it examines how the general analysis process in strategic planning in higher education is understood by faculty members who are stakeholders. It investigates the link between practice in higher education and research on its strategic planning.
The literature revealed that, for example, Rowley and Sherman (2001) began chapter one in their *Forces of Change and the Importance of Strategic Planning* book with an important example. It portrayed an actual occurrence of a university president who was losing his job for “not developing and implementing an effective strategic plan[: the mandate when they hired him]” (p. 4). Their scenario depicted faculty members laughing and making fun of his “enigmatic behavior . . . [and] . . . pompous personality” (p. 3).

To this researcher, this demonstrated the vital imperativeness for all stakeholders in strategic planning in higher education to thoroughly understand the general analysis process in strategic planning. How? He believes that resulting misinterpretations of strategic planning strategy often stifle university progress to attain collective goals embodied in its mission statement. For him, these points partially illustrate how higher education may inadvertently help perpetuate the societal status quo (see tacit theory, chapter 3).

Additionally, Kezar’s (2000) national study had implications for this dissertation’s potential significance to make a contribution to practice in higher education. It “examined whether a gap exists between researchers’ and practitioners’ ideas about what constitutes significance and usefulness in content, methodology, and format in higher education literature” (p. 444). She applied action research as her research method where two of her five claims have significance for this dissertation: (a) “there is a gap between
research and practice” (p. 444) and disagreement exists between (b) “higher education [as a] professional field” and higher education as “a discipline” (p. 444).

The second research question relates to the potential significance for practice in higher education by describing and analyzing participants’ perceptions: Two authors claimed that higher education focused on “the process of strategy formation . . . because . . . of the long recognized significance of processes that gain the commitment of faculty who are largely responsible for implementation of change” (Presley & Leslie, 1999, p. 79).

If universities inadvertently help perpetuate societal status quo by not understanding strategic planning in higher education, then it elicits a critical social issue to be analyzed with grounded theory.

Context regarding significance for practice (i.e., shared stakeholder understanding) was identified earlier in this chapter (see p. 9) and illustrated (see pp. 10–11). This qualitative context exemplifies a “paradigm shift” (Guba, 1990) and has significant implications for this dissertation’s social context (see chapters 2 and 4). It further indicates that strategic planning in higher education is not yet thoroughly developed. Academicians initially referred to it as planning. Planning preceded strategic planning, possessed broader interpretation, and evoked a “patterned” (Wildavsky, 1973) political affiliation which contributed to its uncertainty. To this day, it is a concept
that frequently incites defensive postures and behaviors on ambivalent perceptions about strategic planning:

Planning protrudes in so many directions; the planner can no longer discern its shape. He may be an economist, political scientist, sociologist, architect, or scientist. Yet the essence of his calling − planning − escapes him, he finds it everywhere in general and nowhere in particular. Why is planning so elusive? (p. 127)

Planning evolved from military planning and evaded definitive shared comprehension. Its terminology was borrowed by both strategic planning in business and higher education without being tailored to either and rendered it more difficult to describe, grasp, and successfully apply. Further, its concepts and definitions used by business already generate acquiescent disagreement among its higher education faculty stakeholders.

Adopted military strategy, strategic planning concepts, and specific terms are more often appropriate for applications, specialties, and among different professionals − befitting soldiers, commanders, managers, accountants, marketers, administrators, and faculty members. Military science, management science, and philosophical logic, for example, each exercise strategic planning (Frentzel, Bryson, & Crosby, 2000; Mintzberg, 1994; Rowley et al., 1997): They also provide other frameworks for military, business, and higher education execution of strategy to help achieve their specific goals.
Why, then, does this researcher seek to write his dissertation and design its qualitative grounded theory study on strategic planning in higher education? He found that bias and friction exist on this topic within academe and amongst academicians, particularly those working in education and business. However, as a student who earned degrees in both disciplines and/or fields of study, he understands the professional need to clarify existing confusion over the intricacies of strategic planning, further advance development and application of new knowledge, and help close the gap between research and practice.

Third, potential significance for policy resides in this dissertation’s immediate application for stakeholders and policymakers to improve higher education policy and strategic planning in higher education. This dissertation’s established framework and generated model should increase such awareness to incite development of new higher education tactics, strategies, and goals (Stainer, 2006) relevant to “market forces – [which] reshape the academy” (Pew Higher Education Roundtable, 1994, p. 1A).

For example, the Spellings Commission proposed that “improved accountability is vital to ensuring the success of all the other [access, affordability, and quality] reforms” (USDOE, 2006, p. 4). This Commission was one major strategic planning in higher education external influence. It attempted to measure postsecondary and higher education students’ learning across public universities similar to how it mandated measuring student
learning for K–12 through No Child Left Behind (Brint, 2008; Graff & Birkenstein, 2008; Hamilton & Banta, 2008; Perley, 2007). The federal government mandated public universities to demonstrate increased accountability and was effectuated, to a large extent, by Ohio’s Ten Year Strategic Plan for Higher Education. In turn, this state strategic plan altered policy in higher education and policy makers’ need to continually help implement change through accountability, access, affordability, and quality goals.

How do the two research questions relate to the identified potential significance for policy? The first research question relates to the potential significance for policy because analyzed and explained participant responses help policy makers better understand and fulfill the “need to broaden access to education” (Rowley et al., 1997, p. 300).

The second research question has potential significance for policy in higher education because analyzed and explained primary data enable readers to understand its strategic planning. Policymakers’ increased comprehension can better “develop alternative courses of action” to aid “systematic evaluation of their potential costs and benefits” (Friedberg, 2007, p. 49). Further, the participant’s responses referenced or inferred the accountability measures of the Ohio Ten Year Strategic Plan and paralleled Spellings’ four goals of accountability, access, affordability, and quality. The participant’s responses also signaled change in higher education policy where
the state attempted to “increase state government capacity for data collection and analysis” (Zumeta, 2000, p. 61); in other words, accountability.

How does context here portray significance for policy? Higher education institutions present a prominent environment for students’ exposure to and acquisition of cultural diversity. They also provide students with the opportunity to participate in future assimilation by increasing their social mobility, status, and personal earning power: Higher education directly and indirectly modifies how class structures maintain societal status quo.

To illustrate, the Spellings Commission’s report, *A Test of Leadership* (USDOE, 2006), reintroduced human capital as a means to focus universities’ efforts on improving and increasing state economic development and growth through increasing social mobility. Five years before this report was released for public consumption, “affordability, access, and accountability” (Heller, 2001, p. 1) were identified as pertinent future strategies to higher education success. This report included Heller’s same recommendations with a fourth, *quality*, added. Finally, this Commission, an external stakeholder, linked a societal issue (social mobility) to tertiary educational attainment, inferred future economic growth’s contingency upon it, and asked all higher education institutions to help alleviate social *immobility*, a societal problem not confined to community colleges (American Association of State Colleges and Universities [AASCU], 2002, 2005, 2008; Heller, 2001).
Fourth, potential significance for contributing to scholarly higher education research results from this dissertation and its study augmenting existing strategic planning in higher education literature. Traditional reliance upon strategic planning rests with its general strategy process used to determine variables’ significance and exemplified a paradigm shift in 2010 from quantitative evaluation to a qualitative one. This is evident in the literature where Heracleous (2003) identified how the “interpretive paradigm” informs change in the “functionalist paradigm” (p. 113). It meant that any attempts to modify institutional culture needed to include discourse of appropriate contexts beyond numerical analyses of behaviors to avoid duplicitous claims about organizational realities (Heracleous). Herein lies potential for another and future qualitative grounded theory study! For this dissertation, however, Heracleous identified the significance for conducting a qualitative grounded theory that explores the complexity of strategic planning in higher education and its variables.

The literature also revealed that discourse in planning had been quantitatively studied from a Student Affairs perspective of undergraduates (Gumport & Bastedo, 2001). However, Donaldson and Townsend (2007) reported that other studies on discourse in planning for this same sample (undergraduates) contained qualitative case studies. This identified a shift from quantitative analyses that determine significance to a qualitative one where “thinking about thinking and knowing” (Schwartz & Ogilvy, 1979, p. 4)
permitted more thorough understanding of strategic planning in higher education.

How do the two research questions relate to the potential significance for contributing to scholarly higher education research? The first research question relates because it investigates and expounds on the link between literature in strategic planning in higher education and qualitative research studies performed on it. The literature gap has yet to be closed between strategy and strategic planning in higher education, especially since all strategy preceded strategic planning. Further, this researcher understands and is cognizant that there is a possibility that this literature gap in strategic planning in higher education might derive from accompanying social and/or political issues.

The second research question relates to this potential significance for contributing to scholarly higher education research because it provides new knowledge to existing literature regarding specific internal stakeholders (i.e., faculty members). This dissertation, its study, and analyses and explanation of a participant interview, the social, situational, and historical contexts, patterns, themes, and metaphors contribute "epistemologically [to] the validity of knowledge and ontologically [to the] view of social reality" (Layder, 1998, p. 10).

Context here derives from qualitative grounded theory that helps to increase stakeholders' shared understanding of strategic planning in higher
education. It was demonstrated by efforts to organize and better align colleges’ and departments’ mission with their institution’s mission. Existing strategic planning in higher education differs by colleges and departments within universities and complicates any unison effort to achieve university mission goals. Often, it is curtailed by each one misconstruing how college and departmental missions collectively help fulfill the institution’s strategic plan since each college’s and department’s strategies are individually designed for specific units/subunits. This researcher’s ability to increase shared understanding of strategic planning in higher education represents his contribution to scholarly higher education.

“So why bother?” (Morphew & Hartley, 2006, p. 456). Morphew and Hartley conducted a thematic analysis of mission statements and deemed them “ubiquitous in higher education” (p. 456): “Accreditation agencies demand them, strategic planning is predicated on their formulation, and virtually every college and university has one for review” (p. 456). A third author, Scott (2006), identified university mission statements in the twentieth century to be concerned with social issues where “institutions, employers, policy-makers, and legislators, can benefit from a deeper understanding of how and why the university mission has evolved” (p. 1). This poses a challenge to this researcher to demonstrate the power and usefulness of qualitative grounded theory as a viable research method that can and does resolve real, complex problems. His general questions follow.
General Research Questions

1. How do internal stakeholders (i.e., faculty members) describe their university’s social responsibility?

2. How do they describe their university’s strategic planning?

3. How do faculty members understand their accountability in higher education and/or their university’s accountability?

4. How do these internal stakeholders understand their university strategic planning to help fulfill social responsibility?

Importance for general research questions is portrayed in the literature review and “demonstrates the underlying assumptions” (Marshall & Rossman, 2006, p. 43) for the potential significance of this dissertation study and its design. These questions further suggest that there might be implicit factors, such as social responsibility and accountability, which influence a participant’s responses to interview questions.

Researcher’s Assumptions

This researcher understands that the general strategic planning process common to most strategic planning models involves strategy development and analysis. He ascertains that all Ohio four−year public state universities not only practice strategic planning, but also participate in Ohio’s Ten Year Strategic Plan to develop a statewide university system. This researcher expects that strategic planning in higher education implicitly and explicitly involves university practices and policies. Further, he deems
faculty involvement as crucial to successful implementation of university strategic planning mission, vision, and goal attainment. This represents his philosophical qualitative ontological assumption to his study. Specifically, it depicts the “nature of reality” (Creswell, 1998, p. 75) for an interviewed faculty member who is a stakeholder in his Ohio public university’s strategic planning. That ontological essence will be coded and analyzed along with emergent themes from primary data to help develop a framework to generate future substantive and/or formal theory (objective of the study).

The researcher postulates four additional assumptions specifically about social issues incurred in strategic planning in higher education that arise from using grounded theory:

First Assumption: This researcher believes that higher education best represents the vehicle that provides its graduates with income, respect, responsibility, autonomy, and intellectual attainment which improve the workforce and economy.

Second Assumption: This researcher assumes that social immobility contributes to maintaining the societal status quo where some are privileged (the haves) and some are not (the have nots). Further, he believes that poor curriculum and instruction as identified by authors (see, for example, Dagostin-Kalniz, 2008; Dewey, 1924, 1926, 1976; Freire, 1970, 1994; Freire & Faundez, 1989) can lead to ineffective learning (Graff & Birkenstein, 2008) in American higher education.
Third Assumption: This researcher assumes that the former U. S. Secretary of Education exemplified a key federal stakeholder. For this dissertation, this individual is Secretary Margaret Spellings (USDOE, 2006) who desired development of state systems in American public higher education as an outcome.

Fourth Assumption: The researcher interprets the Spellings Commission’s report, (USDOE, 2006) to have three possible causal relations: (a) social mobility, (b) postsecondary and higher educational attainment, and (c) future economic growth’s contingency upon it. That report asked all public institutions in higher education to help alleviate social immobility; a societal problem not confined to community colleges (AASCU, 2008; Heller, 2001). Further, the author bracketed (Ahern, 1999; Crotty, 1996; Porter, 1993) the above assumptions to avoid their biasing the study (see chapter 3), but will return to their discussion in the conclusion (see chapter 5).

**Delimitations and Limitations**

This study is delimited to developing a grounded theory method that can be implemented further by this researcher or others but has the flexibility to adopt other theories’ strengths when writing or interpreting analysis. For example, Charmazian grounded theory (2006) provides support for developing this dissertation’s framework where explained/described contexts based on secondary data ground and validate qualitative significance. Her approach creates a preliminary structure for coding the
literature review to better prepare readers for this researcher’s analysis of his study in chapter 4. Elicited and extant texts can also be used as either “primary or supplementary sources of data” (p. 35). The former “involve research participants in producing written data in response to a researcher’s request and thus offer a means of generating data” (p. 35). The latter “consist of varied documents that the researcher had no hand in shaping” (p. 35).

A second delimitation evolved after data collection with three interviews with faculty members who were stakeholders in strategic planning in higher education: This researcher’s application of qualitative rigor provided an overabundance of primary data and did not necessitate that he interview 15 or more participants in order to develop a framework and model. Consequently, the researcher focused on one interview and also analyzed the situational, social, and historical contextual data to lay a foundation for development of future theory. Such substantive and/or formal theory development would require many more interviews.

External validity is limited for two reasons: First, because generalizability is not a goal associated with grounded theory studies: “no qualitative studies are generalizable in the probabilistic sense [but] their findings may be transferable” (Marshall & Rossman, 2006, p. 37). Second, for a study to be applicable beyond the selected sample and better represent the population, it would require applied “methods, sources, analyst, or
theory/perspective triangulation” (Patton, 2002, p. 556). Triangulation “involves the use of multiple and different methods, investigators, sources, and theories to obtain corroborating evidence” (Onwuegbuzie & Leech, 2007b, pp. 239–240). However, this dissertation will serve as a springboard for future studies researching its transferability (Charmaz, 2006) and applicability beyond this dissertation’s scope to other scenarios (e.g., case studies, focus group studies, quantitative follow up studies).

This study is also limited to a grounded theory method with flexibility to adopt other theories’ strengths when writing or interpreting results; for example, metaphors help clarify how strategy and strategic planning are perceived and understood within the military, business, and higher education. Despite these limitations, this dissertation serves as a springboard for future studies that research its “transferability” (Charmaz, 2006) and/or work towards generating/developing formal theory. This researcher believes that this could more easily apply to other scenarios that relate to case, ethnographic, focus group, mixed method, and quantitative studies.

Organization of Dissertation

Chapter 2 embodies a review of strategic planning in higher education literature divided into three sections (a situational, social, and historical context). The first section provides the situational context and describes and discusses the relationship between military, business, and higher education
strategy and strategic planning. This literature review’s second section identifies the social context and describes the federal influence on strategic planning in higher education through Congressional Acts. Its third section, and historical context, describes how Ohio’s Ten Year *Strategic Plan for Higher Education relates* to national strategic planning in higher education influences. Combined, all three sections strengthen the researcher’s argument and help ground his study. Chapter 3 discusses this study’s research design and applied methods that obtain primary data from interviews and further organize them into coded transcriptions for analysis, interpretation, and explanation.

Chapter 4 thoroughly analyzes one participant interview; explains how this researcher’s ten stage process model evolved and was applied to this faculty stakeholder; and discusses its situational, social, and historical contexts. Chapter 5 summarizes the first four chapters, recapitulates the evolution of this study, and follows with researcher discussion of his findings, implications for further research, and conclusions. Appendix A provides definitions for essential terms used throughout this dissertation, especially those for grounded theory methodology; however, definitions for terminology occurring in the first three chapters immediately follow. Appendices B, C, and D present a copy of the letter of permission, letter of interest, and consent letter used by the researcher to inform potential participants and secure commitment from those who were to be interviewed.
Definitions

**Accountability in Higher Education.** Accountability in higher education is defined as the state’s “willingness to think anew about social problems” (McLendon, Heller, & Young, 2005, p. 365). It traditionally has been characterized by “performance funding, performance budgeting, and undergraduate assessment policies” (p. 366).

**Aligning.** Aligning is the act of “recognizing and exploiting knowledge about an institution’s strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats to achieve congruity between the institution and the environment” (Rowley et al., 1997, p. 14) through strategic planning in higher education.

**Core Values.**

Core values are enduring beliefs that your institution and the people who inhabit it hold in common and endeavor to put it into action; [they] guide your institution’s faculty, staff, administrators, and to some degree students in performing their work . . . [and] lead individuals within organizations to believe that some goals or ends are more legitimate or correct [while] others . . . are wrong. (Sevier, 2000, p. 84)

**Differentiation (A).** Differentiation occurs “by market, product, [or] service [and] is achieved through more than mere “communicating values, ideals, and purposes – it is achieved by creating value added” (Alfred, 2006, pp. 140–141).

**Differentiation (B).** Differentiation has “the purpose [of] building customer loyalty through an image of excellence regarding the organization and its products and services” (Rowley & Sherman, 2001, pp. 89–90).
**Fit.** Fit, a grounded theory term, is the first “criteria in evaluating substantive/formal [critical] theory [that provides] the link between the theory and the arena where it will be used to provide insight [which] needs to be clear” (Grbich, 2007, p. 81).

**Goals.** Goals are “generally the major milestones that have a 3 to 5 year, or even longer, horizon” (Rowley et al., 1997, p. 106).

**Grounded Theory Study.** Grounded theory study is a qualitative study where the researcher generates an abstract analytical schema of a phenomenon that explains some action, interaction, or process; this is accomplished in higher education through collecting interview data, making multiple visits to the field (theoretical sampling), attempting to develop and interrelate categories (constant comparison) of information, and writing a substantive or context-specific theory. (Strauss & Corbin, 1990)

**Mission Statement.** A mission statement is a relatively short, clear statement of the primary purpose(s) of the organization [university]. It might include the reason for being, what the organization does, how it does it, and how the organization is different from its competitors. The mission should reflect the values or the basic beliefs to which the organization [university] and its stakeholders have agreed. (Baker, 2007, p. 151)

**Objectives (Business).** Objectives are “specific targets to be achieved at various points within the planning period with an indication of the target and the means by which it will be achieved; they can be organized into a hierarchy of primary and secondary objectives” (Baker, 2007, p. 151).

**Objectives (Higher Education).** Objectives are “generally outcomes of no more than one year; they tend to be time bound (due date assigned) and
are measurable activities (meaning that their achievement can be
unambiguously determined) that keep the organization or unit heading
towards its strategies and goals” (Rowley et al. 1997, p. 106).

**Phenomenon.** A phenomenon is “the central concept being examined
by the phenomenologist; it is the concept being experienced by subjects in a
study, psychological concepts such as grief, anger, or love” (Moustakas, 1994).

**Process.** Process is “the sequence of steps, relationship
transformations, and interpersonal and intellectual transactions needed to
reach an end state or outcome” (Quinn as cited in J. Moore, 1992, p. 257).

**Stakeholders.** Stakeholders are “individuals or a group who either
have some input into decision-making about a social problem or are affected
by policy decisions on that problem (policy perspective)” (Majchrzak, 1984, p.
104).

**Strategic Business Unit (Business).** A strategic business unit is “an
operating unit or a focal point for planning that provides a distinct set of
products or services to a distinct group of customers and competes within an
identifiable group; it is the point at which business-level strategy is focused
and developed” (Hax & Majluf, 1984, p. 294).

**Strategic Business Unit (Higher Education).** A strategic business unit
is a group of university department chairs/deans who partake in “a
coordinating role between the corporation and the segment managers to help
facilitate vertical and horizontal communications” (Ensign & Adler, 1985, p. 113).

**Strategic Planning (Business).** Strategic planning is “a rational approach to assessing and redefining linkages of the firm with both its business and societal environments” (Ansoff as cited in J. Moore, 1992, p. 23).

**Strategic Planning (Higher Education).** Strategic planning is a process of relating an organization and its people to their changing environment and the opportunities and threats in the marketplace; it is a process in which purposes, objectives, and action programs are developed, implemented, monitored, evaluated, and reviewed. . . . It is particularly concerned with anticipating and responding to environmental factors, taking responsibility for change, and for providing unity and direction to an organization’s activities; a tool for ordering one’s perceptions about future environments in which one’s decisions may be played out. (Corrall, as cited in Baker, 2007, p. 17)

**Strategic planning in higher education.** Strategic planning in higher education is the process that results in a “plan that indicates how institutions’ purpose and direction might change over time or adapt to changes in the environment” (Chorn, 1991, p. 20).

**Strategy (Military).** Military strategy “represents the political aim of war as reflected in the strategic aims, and the shape of strategy has been under the direct influence of policy” (Lider, 1983, p. 205).

**Strategy (Business).** Strategy is the pattern or plan that integrates an organization’s major goals, policies, and action sequences into a cohesive whole . . . it helps to marshal and allocate an organization’s resources into a unique and viable posture based on its relative internal competences and shortcomings, anticipated changes in the environment, and contingent
moves by intelligent opponents. (Quinn as cited in J. Moore, 1992, p. 256)

Subjectivity.

requires that we delve more deeply into the desires resonating within the locations of the other (evil); it is the move beyond acknowledgement of voice within experience to that of actual engagement. . . . Subjectivity is formed through a range of discursive practices – economic, social, aesthetic, and political – and meanings are sites of creation and struggle, subjectivity linked to performance. (Madison, 2005, p. 174)

Substantive Theory. Substantive theory is “a low-level theory applicable to immediate situations; the theory evolves from study of a phenomenon situated in ‘one particular situational context’ (Strauss & Corbin, 1990, p. 174)

System. A system is “a collection of public institutions of higher education with a governing board and a central staff . . . systems . . . functioning depends ultimately on how faculty members choose to conduct themselves” (Chafee, 1989, pp. 3–4).

Tacit Theory. Tacit theory is “one’s personal understanding” (Marshall & Rossman, 2006, p. 31).

Tactics (Business). Tactics are “the operational methods that form the building blocks used to implement the strategy” (Rowley et al., 1997, p. 106).

Tactics (Military). Tactics are “the ordered arrangement and maneuver of units in relation to each other and/or to the enemy in order to use their full potentialities” (Keane, 2005, p. 198).
Chapter two presents a literature review that describes and discusses strategic planning in higher education in three sections, complements this dissertation’s purpose, and embodies the theoretical framework. The first section conveys how strategic planning evolved via the military strategy analysis process common to most models and embodies chapter 2’s situational context (see figure1). It is written in a partial narrative style until strategy and strategic planning in higher education, the focus of this dissertation, are described and explained. At that point, a more traditional literature review is presented that “justifies the importance of the study and creates distinctions between past studies and a proposed study” (Creswell. 2003, p. 81). There, the researcher discusses the importance of other dissertation studies for this scholarly thesis. Upon its conclusion, the researcher states his deduced argument.

He then portrays how Congressional Acts influenced strategic planning in higher education in section two, the social context. This is significant because it illustrates how the federal government is a major stakeholder in strategic planning in higher education. Even though such official legal responsibility for public higher education is constitutionally delegated to each state, there is an historical federal influence. The third section explains the
Figure 1. Literature review map.
Ohio Ten Year Strategic Plan in Higher Education’s four goals – the state’s strategic plan for implementing a system of higher education. This historical context demonstrates how that strategic plan’s goals parallel those initiated by the federal government in 1862, reintroduced in 1944, and contained in the Spellings Commission’s report, A Test of Leadership (USDOE, 2006). For illustrative purposes only, figure 1 above, indicates the need for future studies to generate a substantive theory (see bottom right) en route to developing a formal theory. At the end of section 3 in chapter two, the researcher iterates his deduced argument from the literature review.

Collectively, all three sections organize a more complete understanding of the research topic and clarify the relationship between it, the dissertation’s purposes, the study’s objective, and research questions. They also better prepare the reader for the analysis of primary data and this study’s findings. Finally, chapter two segues into the revealed gap in the literature and preceded the discussion of dissertation studies on strategic planning in higher education important for this study. This gap justified writing a scholarly thesis and conducting its investigation. Description and discussion of military, business, and higher education strategy helped explain strategic planning in higher education and follow next.

Military, Business, and Higher Education Strategy Introduction

This first section of the literature review conveys, describes, and discusses the general analysis process common to most strategic planning
models. It delineates how higher education strategic planning evolved to where it is today, this dissertation’s situational context. Secondary data (what others have already researched, analyzed, and written about) revealed strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats (SWOT) analysis to originate in military strategy.

Military SWOT analysis incited a core framework for business and higher education strategy and strategic planning through evaluation of its political, environmental, ideological, and social (PEIS) empirical variables. It initially grouped variables into PEIS categories often derived from specific battlefield internal and external environmental attributes. Business and higher education, however, initially group variables into political, economic, social, and technological (PEST) categories derived from specific market internal and external environmental attributes. PEIS and PEST categorizations could then be separated according to quantitative nominal, ordinal, interval, and ratio variables and scales. But only their interval and ratio numerical measurable amounts/values were applied to statistical formulas to determine their quantitative predictive power.

This analysis was further modified by business (see Mintzberg, 1990a, 1990b, 1994; Mintzberg, Ahlstrand, & Lampel, 1998) and higher education (see Dolence & Norris, 1994; Sevier, 2000). It became the analytical process applied in most strategic planning models (see military, business, and higher education strategy sections). Business strategy (see Welch as cited in Ocasio
& Joseph, 2008) and higher education strategy (see Dolence & Norris, 1994) formed a joint construct (theoretical relationship) with PEST quantitative variables.

To illustrate, General Electric’s strategic business unit (SBU) strategy documented a successful application of identified PEST variables pertinent to business strategy’s analysis and core design process (SWOT analysis). This strategy devised a better means/method to allocate resources based on SBUs (company divisions) in its strategic plan: “A single strategic plan for GE would be useless and 170 strategic plans [1 for each of its SBUs] would be unwieldy” (Digman, 1986, p. 157). Two results ensued. First, company internal competencies and shortcomings (strengths and weaknesses) identified “the largest segment that allows for proper assessment of internal strengths and environmental opportunities” (p. 158). Second, significant PEST variables applicable to all 170 of its SBUs were analyzed, resolved its SBU problem, and reorganized company strategic planning “for planning purposes only around the markets it serves” (p. 157).

Dolence and Norris (1994) presented an example of the 1970s General Electric strategic business unit strategy concept adapted and applied to higher education strategy. They used their theoretical higher education strategic planning model – The Strategic Planning Engine. This model identified PEST variables pertinent to analysis of higher education strategy’s core design process (SWOT analysis). Here, its strategy analysis process
equated the specific SBU in higher education to be the academic department where departmental costs were measured and analyzed by PEST expenses (see Higher Education Strategic Planning Section).

Collectively, military, business, and higher education SWOT analysis variable categorizations differed only in one classification. The military had a group for ideological empirical variables (I in PEIS) whereas business and higher education had a group for technological empirical variables (T in PEST). Both PEIS and PEST categories were further differentiated into nominal, ordinal, interval, and ratio variables whose distinct values would then be analyzed to determine quantitative significance, strength, and predictive power. All three disciplines interpreted variables’ significance, quantitatively exhibited strategic planning’s shared context, and elicited how strategic planning traditionally focused (and still focuses) on quantitative research and analyses.

The researcher next describes the military, business, and higher education applied strategy pattern, analysis process, communication style, and purpose in this literature review’s first section (situational context). Here, SWOT analysis patterns range from military to business to higher education. These patterns are SWOT analysis processes “consistent with [their] military inceptions” whose “strategy tends to require and advance plan, the resources necessary to implement [them], and an ability to [understand] that modification may be required” (Chaffee, 1985, p. 134).
Military Strategy

The lay person might be more familiar with how military strategy formed a construct with its strategy analysis and emanated from widely borrowed/promoted strategic ideas and images. For example, illustrations of this concept include board game tactics (i.e., chess and backgammon), venues of operation (i.e., schools, universities, hospitals, and businesses), sport tactics (i.e., baseball’s hit and run, basketball’s full court press, football’s pass blitz, and boxing’s combative stinging jab), and higher education policy (i.e., “wait and see approach”) (Modarai, 2007, p. 68).

Military strategy established the precedent for use of planning where its analysis embedded the process that preceded all planning, strategic planning, and strategy development. “The first recorded statement on military strategy: [was] that of Sun Tzu written in China around 360 B.C. [in The Art of War]” (Erad as cited in Griffith, 1971, p. 61). Defined, military strategy “draft[ed] the plan of war . . . [and] shap[ed] the individual campaigns . . . [for] individual engagements” (Clausewitz & Howard, 1976, p. 177). Its analysis process evolved from devised battlefield strategy where demonstrated imperativeness for assessing one’s internal and external environment in the theater of war arose. It determined and evaluated the enemy’s strengths and a weakness, identified opportunities for executing a surprise attack, eliminated or controlled for threats, and is presented next.
Process. The military strategy process for its strategic planning presented by Collins (2002) consists of six steps (see figure 2). The researcher identifies, illustrates, and explains steps one through four to increase the reader’s understanding of how strategy analysis evolved. He also clearly identifies how all six steps collectively comprise what became the embedded strategy analysis process, SWOT, in most strategic planning models. The researcher refers to the Gulf War as his example throughout where Coalition forces united to eliminate the international threat posed by Saddam Hussein and his regime. He consistently uses it to help illustrate the first four steps. The researcher does not have exact quantitative data for the last two steps and only identifies and explains them.

Step one was labeled “national interest” (Collins, 2002, p. 5) and demarcated how military purpose aligned with established strategies to accomplish specific goals in war. To illustrate, Coalition forces “ordered arrangement and maneuver of units” to “apply military power” (Keane, 2005, p. 198), defeat the Iraqi army, and capture Saddam Hussein. This fulfilled a national interest and military goal to eliminate an international threat to peace and stability. It further sought to protect Iraq’s people from its own dictatorial president who was charged with war crimes against humanity.

Generally, the goal of military planning in the Gulf War required military commanders to make the most efficient use of “available forces and
resources (means)” (Collins, 2002, p. 3) and determine who to target. In this scenario, the goal of the Coalition forces was to capture that “who” – Saddam Hussein. Military goals are known as objectives. Defined, objectives are “the physical objects of the actions taken, for example, a definite tactical feature,
the seizure or holding of which is essential to the commander’s plans” (Keane, 2005, p. 141). Military strategy applied here developed an organized and thought out plan of action that executed exact tactics against the enemy. How did step one relate to the general analysis process of SWOT? In step one, commanders evaluated the internal environment of the Coalition forces: the needed military personnel and equipment (i.e., strengths and weaknesses) to fight the enemy that would accomplish their plan.

Step two was labeled “appraise position” (Collins, 2002, p. 6) and determined what needed to be done to “safeguard security interests against present and projected threats, both foreign and domestic” (p. 6). To demonstrate, military application of SWOT analysis occurred with drafted battlefield strategy in Desert Storm. Coalition commanders first studied and appraised enemy position and strongholds during this war and planned sought out military objectives (what business and higher education would term as goals). How did step two relate to the general analysis process of SWOT? In step two, commanders examined the external environment of Coalition forces in theater of war. This enabled them to study enemy positions in greater detail and better develop a plan of organized action against the enemy predicated on opportunities and threats.

Step three was labeled “identify key objectives” (p. 7) and “prioritized short, mid, and long range objectives” (p. 7). Here, only the immediate/short range objective is illustrated: Coalition troops quickly acted and created an
element of surprise “two hundred miles to the west [from where] the real
strike force of Desert Storm was located” (McNeilly, 1996, p. 23). Troops
were initially launched “exactly where Saddam Hussein expected it; along the
most direct route the Americans could take to liberate Kuwait” (p. 23). Iraqi
militia was distracted away from an ensuing second attack behind them that
carried their “confusion and inability to respond effectively” (p. 53) – applied
vertical envelopment. Defined, vertical envelopment is a tactical maneuver
where troops “attack the rear and flanks of an enemy force with the objective
of cutting off or encircling [it]” (Keane, 2005, p. 211).

Coalition forces generally exploited enemy weaknesses and maximized
use of military strengths (i.e., air power and communication technology) to
gain more immediate capture of Saddam. Vertical envelopment was the
immediate objective where the Coalition forces applied this tactical planning
feature by the Coalition army. It defeated the amassed Iraqi army and
permitted more precise maneuvers to accomplish future objectives (i.e., mid
and long term objectives). Examples of future objectives for Coalition forces
include liberating city by city from the Iraqi regime’s oppressive control and
helping to establish a democratic government in Iraq. How did step three
relate to the general strategy analysis process of SWOT? In step three,
commanders organized their plan according to exact tactics and strategies
that would be executed to achieve and obtain specific objectives according to
an established timeline.
Step four was labeled “formulate strategies” (Collins, 2002, p. 7) and exemplified “the art and science of operations” (p. 7). Strategy was an art where strategies were designed to be executed using precise military tactics which each had specific purposes. Military tactics “teaches the use of armed forces in the engagement” and the military strategy taught “the use of engagements for the object of the war” (Clausewitz, 1976, p. 128). “As opposed to strategy, tactics are concerned with the application of military power, not the ultimate objective such power is expected to obtain” (Keane, 2005, pp. 198–199). The Science of operations involved the mathematical calculations for those PEIS variables deemed significant and imperative for development of strategy.

To illustrate, military tactics designated the “what and why” of “perceived requirements (ends)” (Collins, 2002, p. 3) requisite to attack based on available war resources for use (i.e., available ammunitions and military hardware). They coincided with “how, when, and where (ways)” (p. 3) to execute specific actions and accomplished a specific objective. For example, the Coalition Army used the tactic of speed (i.e., what) to evoke a powerful opportunity (i.e., why) and rendered victory when troops swiftly attacked the enemy’s vulnerability and deceived Iraqi forces. The Coalition’s speed provided a surprise attack two hundred miles to the west that the real strike force of Desert Storm was located . . . the Coalition Army bagged thousands of
prisoners . . . and brought Iraq to the peace table . . . in one hundred hours. (McNeilly, 1996, p. 23)

Deception occurred by Coalition forces first attacking “exactly where Saddam Hussein expected it: along the most direct route the Americans could take to liberate Kuwait” [i.e., how] (p. 23). This distracted Iraqi attention away from a second attack behind them (i.e., when) and led to further Iraqi “confusion and inability to respond effectively” (p. 53).

The Iraqi army failed to anticipate a surprise attack (a strategy) of “deception and foreknowledge” (Sun Tzu as cited in McNeilly, 1996, p. 53) from Coalition forces who first engaged a frontal attack (i.e., where). Imminent defeat resulted from the Iraqi army lack of foreknowledge to expect differently or know how to plan better: it eradicated a likely international threat. How did step four relate to the general strategy analysis process of SWOT? In step four, soldiers implemented exact tactics and strategies to achieve specific military objectives. However, before those tactics and strategy were effectuated, imperative PEIS variables in both the internal and external environments were analyzed to determine the most significant ones to implement to obtain success.

Step five was labeled “allocate resources” (Collins, 2002, p. 7). Here, “military strategists, in collaboration with logisticians and budget specialists, compare resource requirements with present and projected capabilities to confirm or deny the feasibility of strategic and tactical plans” (pp. 7–8).
The above military personnel convey the realistic ability for generals, commanders, and/or sergeants to commit specific battalions and munitions to combat. Strategies and tactics planned to accomplish military objectives are assessed for the environment of the immediate theater of war before troops are sent into battle. This permits the military’s top-down communication process to ensure that military forces attain the greatest success and incur the least amount of casualties.

How did step five relate to the general strategy analysis process of SWOT? In step five, appropriate military personnel provided feedback from analyses of significant PEIS variables to generals, commanders, and/or sergeants: It permitted the effective design and actuation of a plan that exploited the enemy’s weaknesses and maximized the military’s strengths (e.g., air power and communication technology).

Step six was labeled “reconciliations” (p. 8) and represented specific actions to take:

- “reduce waste” (p. 8)
- “compress or discard objectives” (p. 8)
- “reshape strategies” (p. 8)
- “mobilize more assets” (p. 8)
- “decrease reliance on military power” (p. 8)
- “withdraw” (p. 8)
How did step six relate to the general strategy analysis process of SWOT?
Step six provided examples of how the general strategy analysis process is continuous and flexible and adjusts to internal and/or external environmental changes: If analyses deduced that one specific military strategy and/or tactic would not work, then further evaluation of others was pursued until another one that could was attained.

All strategic planning derived from the concept of strategy and “strategy that is unclear or incapable of being understood will meet with resistance . . . people will not commit to something they cannot understand” (Alfred, 2006, p. 208). This identification of the misunderstanding strategic planning coincided with the dissertation’s first purpose to explicate strategic planning in higher education and its general strategy process so that they are better understood. Moreover, the scope of this literature review focused on how strategic planning in higher education evolved from military strategy and provided its situational, social, and historical contexts to ground analysis. However, if accountability and/or social responsibility in higher education concepts/themes emerge from analyzed transcripts for postsecondary strategic planning, then the researcher will conduct a literature review of those also at that time. Second literature reviews are often required of many grounded theory methodological studies (Charmaz, 2006). Business’s applied analysis process, communication style, and purpose are discussed and described next.
Business Strategy

Business strategy emanated from the military SWOT analysis construct and applied military terminology to business operations. It created a unique lingo within its specializations: management and marketing implemented price wars and defensive maneuvers to practice defensive strategies. For example, position defense, mobile defense, preemptive defense, and counter offensive defense offset frontal attacks, flanking attacks, guerrilla warfare, and encirclement (Ryans & Shanklin, 1984) were other terms frequently used. What do they mean? Grattan (2002) referred to strategy defined many different ways as “the problem of semantics” (p. 75).

His claim paralleled Mintzberg and Quinn (1991) who declared the multiple terms in strategic planning and their use across different disciplines as problematic: “A good deal of confusion stems from contradictory and ill-defined uses” (p. 19). This was mentioned in chapter one where discipline-specific terminology isolated individual comprehension and neither promoted collective shared understanding nor imparted meaning to experts in different disciplines. Both authors helped validate this researcher’s tacit theory that universities may inadvertently help perpetuate the societal status quo by not understanding how strategic planning’s shared context applies to higher education.

Mintzberg & Quinn (1991) also simplified business strategy’s many meanings and defined it five ways: “a plan, ploy, pattern, position, and
perspective” (p. 4). Strategy as a plan identified and categorized behavioral attributes into quantitative variables where the “fundamental issue of cognition” measured “how intentions are conceived in the human brain” (p. 18). As a result, businesses evaluated how behavioral attributes influenced, affected, and related to their strategy because they were quantifiable and more easily measured significance. This strategy directly linked the already explained PEIS and PEST variable categories and pattern portrayed earlier in this chapter with the SWOT analysis dimension: First, identify and categorize quantitative variables, then analyze them to calculate significance (power), and lastly determine how those variables significantly predict or control for variance in the null and alternate hypotheses.

Strategy as a ploy elicited company intentional behaviors to “outwit an opponent” (p. 13) through deception, threats, and specific proposed actions. It also “suggests that strategy can be a maneuver intended to outwit or confuse the opposition” (Grattan, 2002, p. 11). The following three examples illustrate this point. First, deception in strategy demonstrated such behavior when companies purposefully implemented strategy that caused their competitor(s) to take immediate action: It elicited business competition to respond and react in a manner that ultimately benefitted the company initiating the behavior (i.e., price wars). Second, implementing threats in strategy also demonstrated such behavior when a business profited from instilling fear in customers and potential customers. Third, specific proposed
action in strategy demonstrated such behavior when Rite Aid entered the Toledo, Ohio market and built several new pharmacies (buildings) within close proximity of each other. This likely provided an immediate perceived psychological awareness of market dominance and discouraged competitor market expansion.

Strategy as a pattern “focuses on action” (p. 18) and actions are traceable back to specific measurable behaviors. This strategy occurred when “Henry offered his Model T only in black” (p. 13). Identifiable and ascribable behaviors resided in and emerged from Ford’s possible attempt to control buyer behavior and increase profits through promotion of the Model T. Customers could purchase any Model T for the same low price – as long as it was black! Strategy as position referred to how organizations behaved “in order to meet competition, avoid it, or subvert it” (p. 19) usually based on analysis of their external environment (opportunities and threats).

Market introduction of the Egg McMuffin, for example, represented strategy as position. Here, McDonald’s defended decision to expand into the fast food breakfast market segment for whatever reason (i.e., increasing its market differentiation and/or sales profit) through evaluated SWOT analysis that influenced managerial/company behavior.

Strategy as perspective “consists of a chosen position[,] an ingrained way of looking at the world” (Mintzberg et al., 1991, p. 16), and focused on “intention and behavior in a collective context” (p. 19). Here, empirically
measurable behavioral variables extended beyond one individual to include an entire group. For example, it is more probable that McDonald’s restaurant franchises collectively maintained a steadfast and resolute stance on their decision to generate increased sales revenues by offering and selling fast food to customers for breakfast. Table 1 provided these five types of strategy definitions for business which were summarized by Mintzberg, Quinn, and James (1988) and Alfred (2006) who used those same strategy names that Mintzberg et al. (1988) generated but applied them to higher education.

All strategic planning derived from the concept of strategy and “strategy that is unclear or incapable of being understood will meet with resistance . . . people will not commit to something they cannot understand” (Alfred, 2006, p. 208). This literature review helps fulfill this dissertation purpose to communicate the general process of strategic planning with the hope that it becomes better understood, learned, and practically applied.

Collectively, these five definitions of business strategy, their properties, and their attributes presented “new pieces to the research puzzle” (Charmaz, 2006, p. 14) discovered in axial codes (i.e., categories and subcategories). During axial coding, tactics and strategy were a means to compare, contrast, and explain specific differences within military planning
Table 1

**Five Strategy Types in Business vs. Higher Education**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy as Plan</th>
<th>Strategy as Play</th>
<th>Strategy as Position</th>
<th>Strategy as Perspective</th>
<th>Strategy as Pattern</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aggressive &amp; Preventive</td>
<td>Deceptive</td>
<td>Differentiation</td>
<td>Mission Development</td>
<td>“Wait &amp; See Approach”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product Positioning</td>
<td>Suggestive Selling</td>
<td>Brand/Product/Service</td>
<td>Shared/Understood Collective</td>
<td>Pass &amp; Complacent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy</td>
<td>Strategy</td>
<td></td>
<td>Organizational Culture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion Strategy</td>
<td>Promotion Strategy</td>
<td>Promotion Strategy</td>
<td>Promotion Strategy</td>
<td>Promotion Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(= Shared Context)</td>
<td>(= Shared Context)</td>
<td>(= Shared Context)</td>
<td>(= Shared Context)</td>
<td>(= Shared Context)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Business Definitions**

- “intended course of action”
  - “specific maneuver”
  - “intended to outwit”
  - “an opponent or competitor” (Mintzberg, 1988, p. 14)

- “introduces the notion of intention”
  - “emphasizes conscious leadership” (Mintzberg, 1988, p. 14: 319)

**Higher Education Definitions**

- “consciously intended course of action”
  - “specific maneuver”
  - “intended to outwit”
  - “an opponent or competitor” (Alfred, 2006, p. 44)

- “made in advance of action”
  - “any viable position”
  - “adopted by organization”
  - “whether or not” (Alfred, 2006, p. 44)

- “to which it applies and”
  - “a commitment to”
  - “a way of acting”
  - “and to a way of responding” (Alfred, 2006, p. 44)

- “explicitly stated in a plan”
  - “a pattern in a stream of actions”
  - “with consistency in behavior”
  - “intended or not” (Alfred, 2006, p. 49)

and strategic planning in business higher education. They were further comprised of quantitative measured military PEIS and business and higher education PEST variables deemed significant. Collectively they identified “the form and nature” of “polarities” (Huberman & Miles, 2002, p. 322) in strategic planning and enabled their relationship with specific codes to be further explained in chapter 4. For now, it will suffice to see the sections on military, business, and higher education strategy where the difference between tactics and strategy as an element within and between the strategy process dimension are demonstrated.
Business, as a discipline, was the first to borrow and modify the military SWOT analysis construct to suit its own planning process. Companies analyzed strategy’s empirical variables in its SWOT process using multiple regression, analysis of variance, Z score calculations, and other formulae. Results often helped better inform decision making and sometimes led to terminated employees, eliminated programs, and reduced departmental budget allocations. Other times, interpreted empirical results were applied to strategic planning and determined feasibility of company expansion into another market segment or modified its mission statement (i.e., McDonald’s and Rite Aid). Higher education followed business and did the same to its general strategic planning analysis process, often conveyed using military and business terminology. Summarily, business strategy not only acquired its framework for the general strategic planning process from military strategy, but it also borrowed and modified military top-down communication processes. Business SWOT analysis in 2009 remained the core process to many strategic planning models and continues to serve as a preliminary stage to the development of strategic planning.

**Process.** Business SWOT analysis in 2010 remained the core process to many strategic planning models; a preliminary stage to developing strategic planning. Traditionally, SWOT analysis identified, measured, and evaluated empirical strategic planning variables (i.e., business PEST
variables) and provided valuable feedback in strategic planning decision making.

For example, figure 3 illustrates Mintzberg et al.’s, (1998) Basic Design School Model of business strategy formation for strategic planning. Their model focused on “strategy formation as a process . . . of conception” (p. 5) and depicted SWOT analysis at its core.

Step 1: Business strategy implemented assessed company strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats based on two appraisals: performance within an environment (external appraisal) and another on company resources (internal appraisal).

Step 2: Appraisals of companies’ surrounding market and community identified and evaluated threats and opportunities from their external environment that affect profitable performance. Threats often emanated from probable competitor actions and/or imposed liabilities from taxes, laws, and regulations: they tended to decrease company market share and erode revenues from sales. Opportunities were prospects for obtaining a positive and profitable outcome that ensued from implementing specific actions (i.e., key success factors). Discovered key success factors often ensued from companies’ analyzed external environment that yielded opportunities and threats.
Figure 3. Strategic planning basic design school model (Mintzberg et al., 1998, p. 26).

Defined, key success factors were quantitative variables (i.e., monetary costs or savings) derived from planned actions (i.e., acquisition of a company, development of a joint partnership, or merger between two companies). When analyzed for significance, they helped companies adapt to change in their external environment, maintain current market share, and generate profits (an opportunity). For example, the reengineering of one’s distribution process resulting from a firm’s need to cut costs might occur by changing
in–house delivery routes and existing outsourcing of delivery carriers to initiate acquisition of a company (i.e., Kinko’s by FedEx). Federal Express initially had kiosks in selected Kinko’s stores to provide its delivery service to Kinko’s customers as an option. It bought Kinko’s in 2004, renamed FedEx Kinko’s to FedEx Office, and those stores now mainly serve as additional distribution centers for Federal Express.

Step 3: Internal appraisals identified and evaluated a company’s strengths and weaknesses within the company (i.e., material, equipment, and human resources) that might affect its profitable performance. Strengths were those valuable employee attributes that maintained efficient, productive, and profitable company operations and incited its optimal functioning. Weaknesses were found liabilities in a company’s material, equipment, and/or human resources that prevented, impeded, or hindered its ability to attain optimum performance, profit, or return on investment.

Beneficial results arose from a company’s analyzed internal environment and resided in discovered strengths and weaknesses that led to its identified distinctive competencies. These were individual employees’ excellent skills requisite to performing specific work tasks that helped companies adapt to external environment change, maintain current market share, and generate increased future profits (strength). They often measured PEST quantitative empirical interval or ratio behavioral variables.
Step 4: Created strategy for both the external and internal appraisals occurred at the intersection of key success factors and distinctive competencies and was influenced by company managerial values and social responsibility. Managerial values emphasized a company’s expressed importance on its exercised practices to develop income generating strategy that maximized profit, incurred the least cost, and promoted brand image. They were usually balanced with societal need for greater public accountability; they monitored “behaviors, actions, and values to . . . receive either rewards or sanctions based on [an] expected evaluation” (Hall et al., 2003, p. 33). Other societal wants/expectations from companies might include greater public transparency and social responsibility.

Step 5: Social responsibility enveloped a firm’s obligation to “use its resources in ways to benefit society through committed participation as a member of society” (Kok, van der Wiele, McKenna, & Brown, 2001, p. 287). Such company social obligations were contained in their articles of incorporation (what universities would recognize and term as charter). See the Strategic Planning Engine (Dolence & Norris, 1994) in the Higher Education Strategy Section for compared similarities and differences.

Step 6: The creation of strategy coupled with managerial values, and social responsibility informed and influenced choice of strategy through evaluation.
Step 7: Implementation of strategy was the last step in Mintzberg et al.’s (1998) model where strategic planning ideally should be “a continuous process that involves attempts to match or fit the organization with its changing environment in the most advantageous way possible” (Digman, 1990, pp. 4–5).

This Strategic Planning Basic Design School Model admirably illustrated how the general strategic planning process operated in business. It also presented the pertinence and value for stakeholders’ in higher education (i.e., faculty members’ and universities’) understanding of emerging changes in their internal and external environments. Lastly, it permitted and facilitated better recognition of true market potential and needed operational adjustment to fulfill societal need/demand via strategic planning, the strategy process, and mission implementation.

Communication. Communicated business strategy often emphasized a control structure for strategic planning and adhered to a top–down process. Managers “cannot talk about the process of strategy formulation except in social and political terms” (Bower & Doz, 1979, p. 165) to maintain strategic planning control and ideally minimize its costs. Although stakeholders might not have been in a managerial position, their feedback and input into company strategic planning were essential. Often, final decisions on business strategy involved hierarchical communication where managers and chief executive officers retained ultimate control of company direction.
To demonstrate, General Electric sought improved productivity and generated profit through its established vision of “a boundaryless company” (Wilson, R., 2000, p. 40). This meant that all employees, from top managers to assembly line workers, communicated so that everyone understood, felt, and believed that they were not limited by job function, responsibility, and/or duty. General Electric implemented a new company goal predicated on recognizing its employees as valuable stakeholders who, when treated well and listened to, helped fulfill the company president’s vision of “profit [being] a result rather than a goal” (41). Although SBU strategy guided large businesses in successfully restructuring their operations, it was Rowley et al. (1997) who developed postsecondary strategic planning beyond this concept in their Strategic Planning Engine (see higher education strategic planning section).

Business strategy’s purpose designed company plans “to marshal and allocate an organization’s resources” “based on [its] relative internal competences and shortcomings [with] anticipated changes in the environment” (Quinn as cited in J. Moore, 1992, p. 256). Often, companies’ plans to effectuate “major goals, policies, and action” (p. 256) also sought expansion of their niche – one’s “competitive position in the marketplace (Rowley & Sherman, 2001, p. 85). For example, General Electric’s SBU strategy cultivated the theoretical relation between business and higher education from identified PEST variables pertinent to business strategy’s
analysis. It initially formed a joint construct with higher education through Dolence and Norris’s (1994) Strategic Planning Engine that presented the 1970s General Electric SBU strategy concept effectively applied to higher education strategy. This might help explain the preponderance for military strategy analysis to have incited a core framework for business and higher education strategy and strategic planning. It also represented this researcher’s finding of SWOT analysis to be a dimension (see discussion of the strategic planning general analysis process).

The above example illustrated how elements enhanced categories, dimensions, and patterns and occurred within one specific strategic planning context – place of operation, execution, and implementation (i.e., military, business, higher education). This context identified the set of circumstances within these fields’ internal and external environments that, when analyzed, enveloped strategic planning as a phenomenon. Higher education’s applied analysis process, communication style, and purpose are discussed and described next.

**Higher Education Strategy**

Higher education strategy was the third discovered strategy pattern in this literature review and emanated directly from business. Business adopted strategy use and implementation from the military (McNeilly, 1996) and higher education borrowed it from business. For example, Chandler’s (1962) business strategy definition became the one that Chaffee (1985) used
for describing higher education strategy in her Linear Strategy Model that “focus[es] on planning” (p. 140) and top–down management’s “capacity to change the organization” (p. 140). She further claimed that business strategy determined “basic long term goals and objectives . . . , the adoption of courses of action, and the allocation of resources necessary for carrying out these goals” (p. 13).

Chaffee’s research from 1962 to 1982 evolved into organization of her Linear, Adaptive, and Interpretive Strategy Models. She first conveyed her finding of the strategy literature as “incorporating a great deal of the business literature [that] understandably permits a fuller view of the concept of strategy permissible from examining only the more limited higher education strategy” (p. 138). Importance for higher education strategic planning emanated from these models’ identified similarities with business strategy: they both apply the same general strategy development process to better inform their strategic planning.

**Linear strategy model.** The linear strategy model depicted managers as practicing a top down communication process to ensure that important decisions related to strategic planning goal attainment were implemented. Defined, linear strategy is “the determination of basic long–term goals of an enterprise, the adoption of courses of action, and the allocation of resources necessary for carrying out these goals” (Chandler, 1962, p. 13). Here, managers controlled change in a company’s direction in response to
environment volatility: They individually analyzed company strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats before taking action: “They identify their goals, generate alternate methods of achieving them, weigh the likelihood that alternative methods will succeed, and then decide which ones to implement” (Chaffee, 1985, p. 140). Competitors were recognized as inhabiting their external environment, a “necessary nuisance out there” (p. 140) to eventually deserve managers’ time, worry, and resources.

Chaffee’s (1985) Linear Strategy Model focused on university “competitive forces,” “goal achievement,” and “change in markets/products” (p. 141) when developing higher education strategy—specific elements of SWOT analysis. Here, managers practiced a top–down communication process to ensure that decisions were implemented pertinent to strategic planning goal attainment. “They identify their goals, generate alternate methods of achieving them, weigh the likelihood that alternative methods will succeed, and then decide which ones to implement” (p. 140): a control process for changing company direction. She essentially claimed that managers individually analyze company strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats before taking action. Competitors were recognized as inhabiting the external environment, a “necessary nuisance out there” (p. 140) to eventually deserve managers’ time, focus, and resources.

This model’s “technical, economic, informational, psychological, and political variables” (Chaffee, 1985, p. 142) indicated the complexity in
applying quantitative measurement concepts for predicting significance of empirical variables. It represented an amalgamation of military (PEIS) and business (PEST) variables without having first established a relationship between the two. This might help explain the importance of military strategy analysis having incited a core framework for business and higher education strategy and strategic planning (see Discussion of the Strategic Planning General Analysis Process).

The original appeal of the linear strategy model was its perceived simplicity. However, inclusion of “technical, economic, informational, psychological, and political variables” (Chaffee, 1985, p. 142), similar to Rowley et al.’s (1997) identified and used PEST variables, made it a complex and less appealing model. Chaffee (1985) assumed that “the organization is well insulated from the environment” (p. 141) which led her to believe that companies that applied this strategy “deal with the environment” (p. 143). She later found the environment’s “competitive forces” (p. 146) to be most conducive to linear strategy analysis where the need for other analyses generated her development of the Adaptive and Interpretive strategy models.

**Adaptive strategy model.** Adaptive strategy analyzed “consumer preferences” (Chaffee, 1985, p. 146) and was defined as being concerned with the “development of a viable match between the opportunities and risks present in the external environment and the organization’s capabilities and resources for exploiting those opportunities” (Hofer, 1973, p. 3). This model
did not explicitly focus on organizational goals but instead continuously monitors an organization’s environment to enable companies to “make simultaneous changes” (Chaffee, p. 142). Such changes extended beyond the linear model’s emphasis on companies altering their products to adapting the company’s “style, marketing, and quality” (p. 142) to its environment.

Significance for her Adaptive Strategy Model resided in its focus on university “consumer preferences,” “coalignment with the environment,” and “change [in] style, marketing, [or] quality” (Chaffee, 1985, p. 144). Adaptive strategy analyzed “consumer preferences” (p. 146) and was “concerned with the development of a viable match between the opportunities and risks [threats] present in the external environment and the organization’s capabilities and resources for exploiting those opportunities” (Hofer, 1973, p. 3).

Her identified analysis continually monitored, evaluated, and determined significant variables in organizations’ external environment (opportunities and threats) through SWOT analysis to help companies “make simultaneous changes” (Chaffee, 1985, p. 142). Such changes extended beyond the Linear Model’s emphasis on companies altering their products to adapt the company’s “style, marketing, and quality” (p. 142) to its environment. Business (Mintzberg, 1990a, 1990b; 1994; Mintzberg et al., 1998) and higher education (Dolence & Norris, 1994; Sevier, 2000) referred to such analyses as SWOT analysis (see discussion of the strategic planning
general analysis process). Might have this been an overlooked opportunity for qualitative researchers to apply grounded theory to strategy in higher education?

This literature revealed two problems with Chaffee’s (1985) Linear and Adaptive Strategy Models: First, her Linear Strategy Model focused on environmental “competitive forces” (p. 146). Second, her Adaptive Strategy Model emphasized “coalignment with the environment” (p. 144). Both of these models were more conducive to her Interpretive Strategy Model. These two models included university external factors in the general strategy analysis process and led to her adapt and implement a more qualitative inquiry for higher education strategic planning in her Interpretive Model. Significance for Chaffee’s Interpretive Strategy Model resided in its focus on “stakeholder perceptions,” providing/establishing “legitimacy,” and “developing symbols and improving interactions and relationships” within strategic planning in higher education.

**Interpretive strategy model.** Interpretive strategy analyzed “stakeholder perceptions” (Chaffee, 1985, p. 146) and were organized into “metaphors [that] motivate behavior expected to produce favorable organizational results” (p. 146). Might have this been a second overlooked opportunity for qualitative researchers to apply grounded theory to strategy in higher education?
Three more higher education strategic planning authors, Rowley et al. (1997), distinguished between *strategic management* and *strategic planning* when they discussed higher education strategy. To them, strategic management required that an “institution's attention and focus [be] applied to maintain an optimal alignment with the environment” (p. 15). Strategic planning emphasized the “formal process designed to help an organization identify and maintain an optimal alignment with the environment” (p. 15). Consequently, Rowley et al. (1997) identified strategy development in higher education to be dependent on categorizing PEST variables to substantiate beneficial quantitative research. They addressed this issue more in their book, *Strategic Change in Colleges and Universities Planning to Survive and Prosper*, and where they applied Dolence and Norris’s (1994) Strategic Planning Engine Theoretical Model.

This theoretical model developed higher education strategic planning beyond the strategic business unit strategy concept first identified by General Electric in the 1970s. It also further elaborated on what Mintzberg (1994) and Chaffee (1985) presented about business strategic planning and is explained in greater detail in the Higher Education Strategic Planning section. Important for this strategy in higher education section, its purpose was to help colleges and universities “engage in effective strategic planning processes that will lead to strategic management” (Rowley et al., 1997, p. xiv). To these three authors, strategic management became the specific part
of strategic planning SWOT analysis process that analyzed *external environmental factors* (opportunities and threats) and represented their insight to strategic planning’s future at that time.

**Higher Education Strategy Process**

Strategy’s shared context produced the first thread for chapter two where SWOT analysis remains the general process woven through many business and higher education strategic planning models (Dolence & Norris, 1994; Mintzberg, 1994; Mintzberg et al., 1998; Rowley et al., 1997; Sevier, 2000; Steiner, 1969). The process of higher education strategy related to strategic planning’s “empirical analyses conducted on an organization’s internal and external environments” (Szutz, 1999, p. 88). Universities’ alignment with their internal environment, external environment, and stakeholders helped ensure their “long term stability and survival” (Gilbert, 1993; Porter, 1980, 1985; Steiner, Miner, & Gray as cited in Rowley et al., 1997, p. 37) and exemplified successful higher education strategic planning attempts (Keller, 1983, 1997; Rowley et al., 1997; Rowley & Sherman, 2001).

Dolence & Norris (1994), created the Strategic Planning Engine quantitative theoretical model for strategic planning in higher education (see figure 4). It consisted of 10 steps and solely emphasized identification and measurement of a university’s PEST variables. This model focused on how the process for analyzing these variables determined strategy formation in universities.
The Strategic Planning Engine 10 step model transcended beyond applying SBU strategy to academe (top-down) style with their employees as managers do, but they also used horizontal communication with their faculty colleagues (employee to employee of the university).

This model further dissected SWOT analysis into an external and internal assessment relative to an organization's specific threats, opportunities, strengths, and weaknesses determined by significant PEST
variables – key performance indicators. Key performance indicators (KPIs) were identified as quantifiable measures of “an essential outcome of a [specific] performance activity for a precise [university] condition (Rowley et al., 1997, p. 108). They were first identified and specifically defined using terms that signaled quantified amounts (i.e., number of, percent, total, and value) before they were measured. Significant KPIs were those important internal and external environment factors critical to analyzing university strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats.

For example, quantitative assessment analyses were conducted on “ratio, rate, dollar revenue, SAT score, dollar value of endowment” (Rowley et al., 1997, p. 113): key performance measures. Their KPIs of the higher education internal environment were grouped by “organizational performance, organizational design, and organizational strategies” (p. 104). These indicators referred to a university’s PEST variables that were coded, assigned a value, and ranked by the outcome of their quantitative assessments (i.e., financial or organizational performance) prior to cross impact analyses. This examination “monitors measurable means of performance [variables] over time” (p. 142) for higher education PEST variables (see figure 4).

This analysis process measured significance for university external environmental variables weighed and ranked by importance by a university’s written identification (i.e., mission or vision statement goals). It was first
conducted on its opportunities and threats. Specifically, the generating ideas process (number 5 in figure 4) produced “strategic thinking and strategic decision making” (Rowley et al., 1997, p. 265) and optimized application of significant variables. As “KPIs are identified, approaches for shaping change emerge from the assessment and analysis of strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats” (p. 265). This step preceded strategy development, its formulation of ideas and possibilities, and involved analyses of university PEST variables to determine their significance for helping aid decision making.

Higher education strategy development used PEST variables in Dolence and Norris’s (1994) Strategic Planning Model (strategic Planning Engine). There, significant PEST empirical variables were measured and aided strategic planning decision making. This model portrayed the traditional reliance on using quantitative variables in strategic planning in higher education SWOT analysis. It also identified and conveyed how PEST variables were organized into specific company internal and external environments and integrated the SWOT analysis process: “The strategic planning engine provides a theoretically simple method for building the strategic planning process” (Rowley et al., p. 102)

To demonstrate, Rowley et al. (1997) metaphorically depicted the strategic planning in higher education analysis process with simpler terminology and imagery. It clarified how “SWOT analysis (strengths,
As one of the authors likes to say in his training sessions, managing the strategic plan is analogous to steering a ship. Rather than changing course with a hard-right rudder, where everyone on board feels the shift, in strategic planning the process gently changes course a few degrees at a time in response to internal (fuel) and external (weather) elements. The result is that people on board may not notice the change at all. Yet, over time the ship reaches the desired port—a different port than the one for which it was originally headed. (Rowley et al., p. 39)

Here, the captain gradually changed a liner’s course (external appraisal) so passengers did not immediately notice nauseating motion sickness arising from it. They did not lose balance, fall down, or struggle to participate in activities from sudden movement of the ship’s turn. Slight steering of the rudder (distinctive competence) in response to “internal” factors (“low fuel”) and “external” conditions (i.e., severe storms ahead on this liner’s charted route) continued. His decision (implementation of strategy) resulted in taking an alternate route that went undetected. The final outcome ensued after the ship reached a different/alternate port away from tempestuous weather (external environment threat) and preserved passengers’ and crew members’ safety (creation of new strategy for future similar scenarios).

This metaphor’s internal and external environmental conditions were analogous to universities’ self-evaluation of “internal and external factors” (Rowley et al., 1997, p. 131) that affected their performance. Internal
scanning identified an institution’s “strengths and weaknesses” (p. 133) to be weighed against its goals while external environment scanning evaluated and measured its opportunities and threats that arose from the university’s external environment. For higher education, this resulted in beneficial feedback from measurement of its internal and external strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats. Specifically, SWOT analysis assisted with operational decision making that determined which university programs, departments, and/or processes needed to be reduced or modified and those that required further investment for survival.

External environment scanning helped design and create marketing strategy that emphasized service differentiation. Here, a university that conducted external environment scanning more often understood its local community’s PEST needs and tended to incorporate them as part of its mission. Sometimes inclusion of its local community’s needs (i.e., job creation and economic development) also established differentiation where it distinguished itself from other universities in relation to its mission – what Rowley et al. (1997) referred to as “surveying the environment” (p. 140). Differentiation was also what the Ohio Board of Regents (2008b) partly attempted to accomplish by having all Ohio public universities establish “Centers of Excellence” (p. 38) (see the higher education local context section).

**Communication.** Higher education strategy development used PEST variables in Dolence and Norris’s (1994) Strategic Planning Model (strategic
Planning Engine) where PEST empirical variables were measured to aid strategic planning decision making. This model portrayed the traditional reliance on using quantitative variables in higher education strategic planning SWOT analysis. It also identified and conveyed how these PEST variables are organized into specific company internal and external environments and integrated the SWOT analysis process.

Again, Boyd and Reuning–Elloitt (1998) claimed that “a major criticism of the strategy domain is that researchers spend substantially more effort examining the interrelationships between variables vs. the conceptualization and measurement of individual constructs” (p. 181). This researcher disagrees with them based on qualitative grounded theory principles. Arguably, this researcher’s explanation of strategy’s relationship and interaction of elements/properties exemplifies implemented and imperative grounded theory strategy to aid current/future generated formal theory of strategic planning in higher education.

**Purpose.** The purpose of higher education strategy was specific to the strategic functional unit – department, college, or office. Graduate schools, for example, might focus their SWOT analysis on where a “field is headed and the research method[s] necessary to advance knowledge” (Rowley et al., 1997, p. 135). University departments might analyze strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats to modify their individual unit mission statement.
The Strategic Planning Engine (Dolence & Norris, 1994) augmented this researcher’s claim that his dissertation also grounds the foundation for future formal theoretical development and/or generation by researchers (i.e., SWOT analysis as a qualitative dimension). For example, the “Linear Strategy Model” (Chaffee, 1985) represented a mix of military (PEIS) and business (PEST) variables without first establishing a relation between the two. This might help explain the predominance for military strategy analysis to have incited a core framework for business and higher education strategy and strategic planning. It also represented this researcher’s finding of SWOT analysis to be a dimension (see discussion of the strategic planning general analysis process). Finally, this strategy in higher education analysis model qualitatively illustrated how elements enhanced categories and patterns within one unit of operation, execution, and implementation. It identified a set of circumstances within university internal and external environments that enveloped strategic planning as a phenomenon and provided contexts for analysis in chapter 4.

**Conclusion for the Three Patterns of SWOT**

Military, business, and higher education strategy each formed a pattern where its analysis process measured and analyzed quantitative variables. Common among all three was how they applied the same SWOT evaluation process where each field determined significant variables in its internal and external environments. For example, the military attempted
variable quantification for analytical purposes with identified PEIS behavioral attributes (Lider, 1983). Business and higher education attempted quantification and measurement of variables with PEST behavioral attributes. However, business’s analyses of them remained primarily with Mintzberg (1978, 1979, 1990a, 1990b, 1994; Mintzberg et al., 1998; Mintzberg & Quinn, 1991) discussing business strategy and strategic planning. Higher education’s analyses of them rested with Dolence and Norris’s (1994) Strategic Planning Engine theoretical model (see all strategic planning sections).

More specifically, the literature review thus far revealed the origin of SWOT analysis as a construct in military strategy. It developed into a core strategic planning process in business and higher education strategy. Shared context (synthesized understanding) derived from military, business, and higher education strategy patterns where military planning and business and higher education strategic planning evolved from its applied strategy. The military strategy SWOT analysis construct also initiated the military planning and business and higher education strategic planning shared context since strategy development preceded them. Further, each field’s (i.e., military, business, and higher education) general strategy analysis process better informed its planning/strategic planning, which are discussed and described next.
Military Planning and Business and Higher Education Strategic Planning

Military strategy’s SWOT analysis process developed into a theoretical framework for strategy, planning, and strategic planning in the military, business, and higher education. It revealed a theoretical relation of the shared construct between all three fields (military, business, and higher education) that evolved from application of its PEIS empirical variables (see chapter 4). Constructs eventually form an image, idea, or theory from elements that wholly comprise them. While context is the set of circumstances that envelop phenomena; strategic planning in higher education comprises one specific context only.

This researcher’s application of grounded theory in chapter 4 simultaneously enabled him to “refine, extend, challenge, [and] supercede extant concepts” (Charmaz, 2006, p. 169). For example, the existing quantitative paradigm in strategic planning involved analyses of measurable variables to determine their significance. He discovered that military PEIS variables paralleled those of business and higher education PEST variables. Planners identified and organized them into grouped nominal, ordinal, interval, and ratio data requisite prior to being examined and evaluated.

To demonstrate, military SWOT analysis also explicitly incited a core framework for business and higher education strategy and strategic planning through its evaluated PEIS empirical variables. This military strategy analysis process initially grouped variables into PEIS categories often
derived from specific battlefield internal and external environmental attributes. However, business and higher education strategy evaluation adopted, adapted, and applied this military strategy analysis process to their PEST market segment variables. The two initially placed variables into PEST categories obtained from specific market internal and external environmental attributes. Both PEIS and PEST categorizations were then separated according to quantitative nominal, ordinal, interval, and ratio variables and scales. Nonetheless, only their interval and ratio numerical measurable amounts/values were analyzed to determine their quantitative predictive power to aid decision making.

This quantitative examination and evaluation further carried over to and was adapted by business (Mintzberg, 1990a, 1990b, 1994; Mintzberg et al., 1998) and higher education (Dolence & Norris, 1994; Sevier, 2000) as the analytical process applied in most strategic planning models (see military, business, and higher education strategy sections). Noteworthy, business strategy (see Welch, 1981 as cited in Ocasio, and Joseph 2008) and higher education strategy (Dolence & Norris, 1994) formed a joint construct (theoretical relation) with PEST quantitative variables.

Consequently, the SWOT analysis process common to strategic planning in business and higher education was identified earlier by this researcher to form a construct (theoretical relationship). Their already organized and explained categories, contexts, properties, and patterns formed
a theoretical dimension. This represents a more current portrayal of a qualitative context that provided qualitative significance for this scholarly thesis that derived from existing strategic planning in higher education in 2010. It is a phenomenon where universities no longer solely rely on quantitative studies of strategic planning to guide them. Research now extends to qualitative applications and analyses that create a foundation for building future formal theory (i.e., this dissertation) and better assist academicians in their work, research, and practice.

The researcher introduces this as the paradigm change in strategic planning in higher education as a phenomenon where universities no longer solely rely on quantitative studies of strategic planning to guide them. Research now extends to qualitative applications and analyses that transcend beyond reliance on quantitative analyses to determine significance. Qualitatively, “thinking about thinking and knowing” (Schwartz & Ogilvy, 1979, p. 4) permits a more complete understanding of a phenomenon where categories/themes are analyzed to better comprehend reality, encourage discovery, and generate new knowledge. He found that business and strategic planning in higher education SWOT analysis augmented their strategic planning decision making, helped modify company mission statements, and brought about company/university purpose. Instead of PEIS variables, they both applied PEST empirical variables.
To illustrate, General Electric examined specific PEST variables and evaluated only those determined to be significant for its SBU strategy. Its strategy devised a strategic plan to better allocate resources based on SBUs (company divisions): “A single strategic plan for GE would be useless and 170 strategic plans [1 for each of its SBUs] would be unwieldy” (Digman, 1986, p. 157). This company first identified internal competencies and shortcomings (strengths and weaknesses) with “the largest segment that allows for proper assessment of internal strengths and environmental opportunities” (p. 158). Then, the company analyzed the significant PEST variables applicable to all 170 of its SBUs, resolved its productivity problem, and reorganized company strategic planning “for planning purposes only around the markets it serves” (p. 157). These two steps successfully implemented relevant use and implementation of the general strategic planning analysis process that occurs during strategy development.

General Electric’s SBU strategy cultivated this theoretical relation between business and higher education from identified PEST variables pertinent to business strategy’s analysis. It initially formed a joint construct with higher education through Dolence and Norris’s (1994) Strategic Planning Engine that presented the 1970s General Electric SBU strategy concept effectively applied to higher education strategy. This higher education strategy model successfully identified PEST variables pertinent to analysis of higher education strategy. Its strategy analysis process
determined the specific SBU in higher education to be the academic department where costs were measured and analyzed by PEST expenses (see strategic planning in higher education section for more details). Business strategy analysis then correlated with higher education strategy analysis and both informed their strategic planning to better aid decision making. Investigators could more immediately “set agendas for research” (Mercer, 1991, p. 43) and seek to resolve very exact problems.

Collectively, military, business, and higher education SWOT analysis variable categorizations differed only in one classification. The military grouped ideological empirical variables (I in PEIS) whereas business and higher education instead included a group for technological ones (T in PEST). Both PEIS and PEST categories were further differentiated into nominal, ordinal, interval, and ratio variables whose distinct interval and ratio values only were analyzed to determine quantitative significance, strength, and predictive power. All three fields interpreted variables’ significance, quantitatively exhibited strategic planning’s shared context, and elicited how strategic planning has traditionally focused on quantitative research analyses.

Summarily, this shared construct (theoretical relation) exhibited four inherent characteristics of strategy in strategic planning. First, it integrated company goals, policies, and actions; second, it allocated organizational resources; third, it determined internal competencies and shortcomings; and
fourth, it adapted to changes in the environment. Each of these involved strategic planning through analyses of their strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats in making long term decisions. Herein abounds the base for future development of formal strategic planning theory in higher education where this finding on SWOT analysis (a dimension) can be researched and applied further. The situational, social, and historical strategic planning contexts explained and portrayed in chapter two can be more meticulously scrutinized and analyzed to ascertain additional “properties that pertain to a phenomenon . . . along a dimensional range” (Strauss & Corbin, 1990, p. 96). Discussion and description of strategic planning continues in this literature review section first with military planning and strategic planning in business and higher education following next.

**Military planning.** Military planning is complex and beyond this researcher’s expertise to provide a detailed explanation of its use and application. Such a description and explanation transcend beyond the scope of this dissertation and has been studied by military experts/historians (Clausewitz & Howard, 1976; Collins, 2002; Griffith, 1971; Keane, 2005; Lider, 1983; Tzu, 1963). For this dissertation, it will suffice to say that military planning constituted a basic form of strategic planning that had more focused and specific implications for local, national, and international policy (Lider). However, military planning influenced both strategic planning
in business and in higher education through measurement and analysis of its empirical PEIS variables (see military, business, and higher education strategy sections).

**Business strategic planning.** The inception of strategic planning in business began in the early 1970s first identified by Ansoff (1965) as “the thread that holds a business together” (p. 67). It was also recognized in 1969 but consisted of broadly defined concepts such as “company missions, long range objectives, policies, and strategies” (Steiner, 1969, p. 66). However, strategic planning in business became eminent with General Electric’s 1970 successful implementation of “strategic business unit strategy” (Heany, 1985, p. xii). Defined, a SBU embodied:

> An operating unit or a focal point for planning that provides a distinct set of products or services to a distinct group of customers and competes within an identifiable group; it is the point at which business-level strategy is focused and developed. (Hax & Majluf, 1984, p. 294)

SBU strategy guided large businesses in successfully restructuring their operations. The 1970s example of General Electric led to SBU strategy being “borrowed by higher education” (Chaffee, 1985, p. 135) where it further developed its strategic planning (see Rowley et al., 1997).

Further, a SBU was a group that included business managers who partook in “a coordinating role between the corporation and the segment managers to help facilitate vertical and horizontal communications” (Ensign & Adler, 1985, p. 113). Vertical communications took place between
employees and higher level managers and horizontal communications were those that occurred between one employee and another. This was significant for this dissertation because, as indicated in chapter 1, shared stakeholder understanding facilitated the strategic planning general strategy process.

**Strategic planning in higher education.** Seven authors wrote about strategic planning in higher education that had significance for this dissertation. Four authors (Keller, 1983; Rowley et al., 1997) described and portrayed how higher education strategy led to the inception of strategic planning while a fifth and sixth, Dolence and Norris (1994), discussed their theoretical strategic planning model – the Strategic Planning Engine. A seventh higher education author, Chaffee (1985), provided her interpretation of how business strategic planning was perceived and adopted by higher education (see higher education strategy section).

First, George Keller described and portrayed how higher education strategy led to the inception of strategic planning in higher education. He depicted strategy as an account of academic planning and strategic thinking in his (1983) book *Academic Strategy: The Management Revolution in American Higher Education.* Important for this dissertation, he introduced this topic to academe where he linked strategy to its use in the military: strategy etymologically derived from the “Greek verb stratego, meaning to plan the defeat of one’s enemies” (p. 74). This was a strength for this
dissertation’s secondary purpose which indicated that strategic planning evolved from military strategy.

He also identified how “some colleges applied the Boston Consulting Group Matrix to evaluate institutions’ programs” (Keller, 1983, pp. 154–155) but left detailed explanation of strategic planning to business management experts such as Mintzberg (1994), Porter (1980), and Quinn (1980). This was a strength for this dissertation because it demonstrated academe’s preference to leave strategic planning in higher education to other experts and its importance for decision making to quantitative analyses.

Qualitatively, Keller’s 1983 book exhibited elements of action research where he went into individual colleges and universities, talked with many involved in higher education planning, and wrote about them in an attempt to help bring about higher education change. This was a strength for this dissertation’s study which established a precedent for conducting qualitative research in strategic planning in higher education. Similarly, this researcher interviewed a participant from one Ohio four-year public universities to help develop a framework to generate future substantive and/or formal theory (objective of the study) from analyzed primary data.

Keller’s successive publications demonstrated the progress of strategic planning in higher education. For example, Keller (1995) witnessed “how higher education planners and leaders need to reinvent America’s colleges and universities for the changed conditions in the nation” (p. 354). This was
a strength for this dissertation’s two purposes. Here, Keller demonstrated that the university was a social institution and needed to better understand how its external environment affected its mission through strategic planning. By 1997, Keller was visibly frustrated with strategic planning in higher education as was evidenced in his work: *Examining what works in strategic planning*. This 12 page exposition comprised chapter Eight where he emphatically implied a relation between “strategic thinking” (p. 160) and the military, business, and higher education. He exasperatedly questioned the possibility and feasibility of academe even being capable of applying strategic planning to higher education without first having established “military or corporate hierarchy” (Peterson, Dill, Mets, & Associates, 1997, p. 161). This researcher saw this as a weakness where strategic planning in higher education was perceived as a controversial topic amongst academicians; however, it revealed strength in his personal subjectivity since he has earned degrees in business and higher education.

Keller also wrote the foreword of Rowley et al.’s book (1997) and praised their work as “a valiant effort to correct [the] scholarly neglect” (p. ix) that many researchers overlook with “strategy change in higher education” (p. ix). Keller (1983) agreed with their premise that “strategic planning has had to be invented anew in academia” (p. x).

The second, third, and fourth strategic planning in higher education authors, Rowley et al. (1997), distinguished between strategic management
and strategic planning when they discussed higher education strategy. To them, strategic management required that an “institution's attention and focus [be] applied to maintain an optimal alignment with the environment” (p. 15). Strategic planning emphasized the “formal process designed to help an organization identify and maintain an optimal alignment with the environment” (p. 15). Consequently, Rowley et al. (1997) identified higher education strategy development as being dependent on categorizing PEST variables to substantiate beneficial quantitative research. This issue was addressed in their book, *Strategic Change in Colleges and Universities Planning to Survive and Prosper*, and originated from Dolence and Norris’s (1994) Strategic Planning Engine Theoretical Model.

This researcher saw Rowley et al.’s (1997) identified higher education strategy development dependent on categorizing PEST variables as a strength. Their theoretical model developed strategic planning in higher education beyond the SBU strategy concept first identified by General Electric in the 1970s. It also further elaborated on what Mintzberg (1994) and Chaffee (1985) presented about business strategic planning, explained in greater detail in the strategic planning in higher education section. Important for this strategic planning in higher education section, this model’s purpose was to help colleges and universities “engage in effective strategic planning processes that will lead to strategic management” (Rowley et al., 1997, p. xiv). To Rowley et al. strategic management became the specific part
of the strategic planning SWOT analysis process that analyzed external environmental factors (opportunities and threats) and represented their insight to strategic planning’s future in 1997. Comparatively, the concept of strategic management being equivalent to strategic planning was identified earlier by Chaffee (1985).

The fifth and sixth strategic planning in higher education authors, Dolence and Norris’s (1994), created the Strategic Planning Engine quantitative theoretical model for strategic planning in higher education. Their model transcended beyond applying SBU strategy to academe and was presented and described in the strategy in higher education section.

**Conclusion to Military, Business, and Higher Education Strategic Planning**

Chapter 2’s situational context and first section described strategic planning and discussed how it originated from military strategy. It also completed the secondary purpose of this dissertation and communicated the general analysis process common to most strategic planning models. The researcher now reasserts his deduced argument ascertained from his literature review: Faculty members need to thoroughly understand the general strategic planning process and their role as vital stakeholders if universities are to pervasively apply it across the entire institution or system of institutions. Significance for this argument derived from confusion that arose when strategic planning strategies, concepts, and terminology were communicated without establishing a shared understanding by all
stakeholders. Strategic planning in higher education is not yet thoroughly developed – its borrowed military and business strategy, concepts, and terminology leave it open to individual discernment. Resulting misinterpretations stifle university progress to attain collective goals embodied in their mission statement and illustrate how universities may inadvertently help perpetuate the societal status quo (see tacit theory). The researcher next describes how the federal government influenced strategic planning in higher education through passed legislative acts, in this literature review’s second section and social context.

**Strategic Planning in Higher Education from National to Local Context**

This literature review comes full circle to set up this dissertation study historically before the term strategic planning was used in higher education and segued to this dissertation study’s research gap. This second section describes the federal influence on strategic planning in higher education through legislative acts (social context) that initiated university change in their overall institutional mission statement, accountability, strategy, and strategic planning. Financial accountability, as one such change, validated universities’ strategy analyses and directly related to their strategic planning. Here, “strategy is the extension of an organization’s mission” (Bryson, 1995, p. 130).

Acts that affected universities’ receipt of federal money related to strategic planning in higher education through accountability standards.
This was more easily seen when land grant universities, for example, fulfilled “external and internal purposes” (Spence, 2006, p. 103) and reported to the Department of Agriculture. There, accounting agencies “engage[d] in a strategic planning process that directly aligns resources with results” (U. S. Department of Agriculture [USDOA], 2007, p. iv). Both accountability and strategic planning regulated economic activity through cost accounting analysis (Carducci, Kisker, Chang, & Schirmer, 2007).

The former, financial accountability, required and obligated public universities to “report to others, explain, justify, [and] answer questions about how resources have been used and to what effect” (Trow, 1996, p. 310). For example, cost accounting was one popular accounting method often used by universities. It incorporated “a process for gathering and analyzing activity and cost data that can be used to continuously monitor and inform [a] college’s enactment of institutional mission priorities” (Carducci et al., 2007, p. 15).

The latter, strategic planning, was separate for each individual U. S. public and private university, community college, and land grant institution. They operated independently of each other; a national higher education system did not exist. Each institution had its own strategic plan, mission, and vision statement – excluding state university systems that shared a common one. However, the federal government, was one major higher education external stakeholder who exercised national influence on
university strategic planning. It modified university mission statements, accountability, and strategic planning – an overlooked context. Likely, this influence was not recognized or known; although, immediately perceived as influences were federal requests, goals, and mandates that required increased higher education access, accountability, and affordability. This researcher describes seven such federal acts and their influence(s) on strategic planning in higher education in the national context section that follows.

**National context.** For this dissertation, the researcher found seven direct federal influences on strategic planning in higher education that each affected its access, accountability, social responsibility, and affordability. Some focused more explicitly on one but included others. In each influence, he explains the relation of strategic planning in higher education to the implemented federal access, accountability, social responsibility, and affordability strategic planning goal. This provides context and qualitative significance for them and presents a clearer portrayal.

First, the earliest such undertaking occurred during the American Civil War with the 1862 Morrill Land Grant Act where federal legislation “foster[ed] access to useful public higher education” (Thelin, 2004, p. 75). It specifically mandated institutions to provide “members of the working class” a “liberal, practical education” and teach “agriculture, military tactics, and the mechanic arts” (West Virginia University, 2007). Since the Federal
government did not have money to apportion to states for higher education, it donated “thirty thousand acres of federal land for every senator and representative [in each state]” (Clemson State University, 2007). States sold it and “invest[ed] proceeds in an endowment” where generated interest was “used to establish . . . at least one college” (Brunner, 1962, p. 55).

Second, the federal government influenced higher education mission statements through the 1890 Morrill Land Grant Act because it demanded greater institutional accountability and social responsibility. This legislation dispersed “additional federal funding for the original land grants [and] create[d] seventeen more land grants that were predominantly black colleges in the southern states” (Clemson State University, 2009, p. 2). Accountability ensued when states monitored these funds to ensure that proceeds from the sale of granted federal land were used solely for their “appropriation” (Brubacher & Rudy, 1997, p. 227).

Land grant colleges and universities also demonstrated greater social responsibility when they applied this Act’s mandate to prohibit discrimination against applicants in the admission process. “No money shall be paid out under this act to any State or Territory for the support and maintenance of a college where a distinction in race or color is made in the admission of students” (USDOA, 2009).

Social responsibility was generally witnessed more in community college mission statements and land grant colleges and universities than in
other four–year universities. It was defined as “faculty work that [is] socially useful – linked to the greater good of the community and not the solitary pursuit of individual interest” (Peirce, 1976, p. 357). Traditionally, community colleges “focused on workforce development” (Dougherty, 2002, p. 301) and acquired their niche or “competitive position in the marketplace” (Rowley & Sherman, 2001, p. 85). They trained students who wanted to enter immediately into a specific trade upon graduation. They also had close ties with their external environment (surrounding community) and were more familiar with how its external stakeholders influenced their strategic planning.

Why pay attention to social responsibility in public universities? Successful university strategic planning was inclusive of its internal and external stakeholders (Rowley et al., 1997). Both the U. S. federal and state governments are major external stakeholders. For example, when the U. S. Secretary of Education’s Commission on Higher Education (USDOE, 2006) asked all postsecondary institutions to help alleviate social immobility; social responsibility was not confined to community colleges. Rather, public state universities and land grant colleges/universities had an equal, if not greater, duty to comply since the federal government provided higher education funding to each of the 50 state governments. Lastly, state governments appropriated these federal dollars to individual public state universities and land grant colleges/universities.
Third, the federal government influenced higher education mission statements via the “Servicemen’s Readjustment Act” (USDOE, 2006 a, p. ix) and created greater institutional access and social responsibility. This legislation better enabled returning veterans to transition from combat, be retrained, and reenter civilian work. Its passage depicted the U. S. federal government’s financial inception to help increase public access to higher education:

Known as Public Law 346, the Servicemen’s Readjustment Act . . . the 1944 bill guaranteed military personnel ‘A year of education for 90 days’ service plus one month for each month of active duty, for a maximum of 48 months. (Kiester as cited in Thelin, 2004, p. 63)

This law guaranteed access for returning servicemen and women to American colleges and universities with “the key barrier to access [being] the lack of enough money to pay the cost of higher education” (Wolanin, 2005, p. 40).

The United States federal government historically helped to initiate greater university social responsibility when Congress approved the above Act which was more commonly known as the 1944 G. I. Bill. This legislation originally focused on retraining returning servicemen and women but addressed increased public demands for access to four–year university education in 2010. These increased public demands led many Ohio community colleges to serve as a gateway to the state’s universities by providing their students with an equivalent to the first two years of baccalaureate coursework. For example, the 2008 Ohio GI Promise partly
fulfilled this public demand for increased access to four-year university education and provided “all veterans of the U. S. armed services, their spouses, and dependents who choose to attend Ohio colleges and universities . . . in–state tuition rates” (The University System of Ohio, 2008b, p. 1).

Evidence of university social responsibility was made publicly available more often in community colleges and/or land grant colleges and universities: both types of institutions emphasized it more in their mission statement (see Bringle, Games, & Malloy 1999; Harkavy, 2006). They also were required to report more frequently to the federal government to comply with federal mandates.

**The Higher Education Act and Reauthorizations (1965–2009).** Fourth, the federal government influenced higher education mission statements via the Higher Education Act (HEA) of 1965 because this act affected universities’ access and affordability. This was another, but later attempt to implement mass education as “a solution to provide higher education access” (Jones, 1997, p. xxxi). The federal government directly influenced strategic planning in higher education by increasing the “eligibility for Pell Grants and campus–based student aid” (Burd, 2004, p. A4). Historically, the HEA enabled increased public university access and affordability by making “Pell Grants, student loans, and Work Study” (Wolanin, 2005, p. 39) more available to financially disadvantaged students, for example, Senator Kennedy’s influence on “Pell Grants in 1972 to the Academic Competitiveness
and Smart Grants for high-achieving, low-income students in 2006” (Field, 2009, p. A36).

Higher education affordability emerged in the HEA of 2004 recertification proposal that called for “keeping the authorized level for the maximum Pell Grant, set by Congress in 1998, at $5,800 over the next five years” (Burd, 2004, p. A4). Eligibility requirements for universities’ participation in federal student aid programs necessitated that institutions be “licensed by a state to ensure quality, certified by the Department of Education, and be approved by an accrediting agency that meets federal [accountability] standards” (Wolanin, 2003, p. 42). “States provide the largest source of operating budgets for public institutions [and] are also requiring greater accountability from universities receiving this funding” (Lovell, 2000, pp. 109–110).

Strategic planning and accountability are both means to regulate economic activity through cost accounting analysis (Carducci et al., 2007). Cost accounting was “a process for gathering and analyzing activity and cost data that can be used to continuously monitor and inform [a] college’s enactment of institutional mission priorities” (p. 15), while financial accountability obliged universities “to report to others, explain, justify, [and] answer questions about how resources have been used and to what effect” (Trow, 1996, p. 310).
Further, accountability in higher education was recognized more for its quantitative financial budget analyses, assessment, and university accreditation than its qualitative measurement. It historically served as a change agent where fiscal constraint was practiced and enforced to control universities’ responses to external pressure. This was achieved when accountability acted as a buffer, increased its strategic planning goals, or adapted to external pressures and modified its plans (Cameron as cited in Jensen, 2001).

In the 1990s, measurement for accountability in higher education rewarded performance (Martinez, Farias, & Arellano, 2002). To demonstrate, a system of report cards was developed that measured universities’ education performance against five criteria. It provided graduating high school students with a basis for national comparison prior to applying at a specific institution. This system was called *Measuring Up* (The National Report Card on Higher Education) and graded colleges and universities on their performance in “preparation, participation, affordability, completion, and benefits” (Martinez et al., 2002, pp. 2–3). Each category was assigned an A through Incomplete.

Fifth, the federal government directly influenced strategic planning in higher education with the (2001) No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) and its mandated accountability. This law strongly recommended that universities modify their mission statements to reflect this accountability and it was the
first Act to explicitly say that one of its strategic planning goals increased “accountability” (USDOE, 2002, p. 6). No Child Left Behind also paralleled two other future strategic plans: The first one was the Spellings Commission’s report, *A Test of Leadership* (USDOE, 2006) at the national level. The second one was the Ohio Ten Year *Strategic Plan for Higher Education* (Ohio Board of Regents, 2008b) (local level). No Child Left Behind applied to higher education through its “revolutionary change . . . [that] serve[d] as the foundation for upcoming reforms in . . . higher education” (USDOE, 2002, p. 1), “accountability” (p. 2), and “access” (p. 7). Further, NCLB continued to implement higher education reform (2010) where, for example, colleges and universities provided high school graduates with increased access to enrollment in universities and offered more affordable tuition. Greater federal financial support for students was made available through loans, Pell Grants, Work Study, and scholarships.

Sixth, the federal government directly influenced strategic planning in higher education with the 1967 Truman Commission that affected social responsibility, access, and accountability. The Commission was appointed after World War II and “defin[ed] the responsibilities of colleges and universities in American democracy and international affairs” “in the light of the social role it has to play” [italics added]” (Perkins, 2006, p. 1). Its report proposed “massive expansion of access to college” while simultaneously ending “racial and religious discrimination [italics added]” (p. 1). Further, it
urged an increase in “federal aid to the states for higher education and new curricula to appeal to a broad range of American youth” (p. 1). This influenced higher education accountability. The Truman Commission Report exemplified a prominent societal call for increasing access to higher education. However, it could not have achieved such a goal without also implicitly and explicitly addressing how institutions would be held accountable. Nor could increasing access to universities be an issue without these institutions considering their social responsibility.

Seventh, the federal government influenced strategic planning in higher education when its access, accountability, and affordability goals incited universities to modify their mission statement with the 2006 Secretary of Education, Margaret Spellings. Her attempt to develop “America’s national higher education strategy” (USDOE, 2005, p.1) led to the formation of the Spellings Commission and its generation of its report: A Test of Leadership (USDOE, 2006). This Commission called for American higher education to help increase the education level of American citizens, their work productivity, and their benefit to America’s economy: “Our colleges and universities will be a key source of the human and intellectual capital needed to increase workforce productivity and growth” (USDOE, 2006, p. 7). This Commission’s report assessed American higher education and suggested reforming it to help implement its “access, affordability, quality, and accountability” (p. 6) goals. It also paralleled the access,
accountability, and affordability goals first established by the 1862 and 1890 Morrill Land Grant Acts, 1944 Servicemen’s Readjustment Act, 1965 Higher Education Act, and 2001 No Child Left Behind Act.

**Conclusion to the National Context**

The strategic planning in higher education national context section described the federal government’s influence on strategic planning in higher education. Further, it occurred through the 1862 Morrill Act, the 1890 Morrill Act, the 1944 Servicemen’s Readjustment Act, the 2001 No Child Left Behind Act, the Higher Education Reauthorization Act first passed in 1965 with additional reauthorizations to it still occurring in 2009, the 1947 Truman Commission, and the Spellings Commission’s report, *A Test of Leadership* (USDOE, 2006) (see table 2).

To illustrate, table 2 depicts an organized summary of those federal acts this researcher found in the literature that influenced strategic planning in higher education. These acts affected universities’ receipt of federal money related to strategic planning in higher education through their accountability standards. This was more easily seen when land grant universities, for example, fulfilled “external and internal purposes” (Spence, 2006, p. 103) and reported to Department of Agriculture accounting agencies who “directly align resources with results” (USDOA, 2007, p. iv). Significance for these five federal Acts and the Truman and Spellings Commissions derived from their collective influence on strategic planning in
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Federal Influence</th>
<th>Affect on Higher Education</th>
<th>Literature</th>
<th>Measurement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1862 Morrill Land Grant</td>
<td>Access</td>
<td>Prebache &amp; Rudy (2007)</td>
<td>30,000 Acres of Land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Brunsner (1962)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Thelin (2004)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1890 Morrill Land Grant Act</td>
<td>Access</td>
<td>Wolanin (2005)</td>
<td>Grant Funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Clemson University (2009)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td>Wolanin (2005)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Social Responsibility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td>Alexander (1998)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Social Responsibility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wolanin (2003; 2005)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Field (2009)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>U.S. DOE (2002)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td>Heller (2011)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Print (2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Graff &amp; Birkenstein (2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Perley (2007)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td># Graduating BA's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td># Graduating MA's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td># Graduating PPSSNLs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Research Dollars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Access (6 Metrics)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Quality (6 Metrics)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Affordability &amp; Efficiency (5 Metrics)/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Economic Leadership (5 Metrics)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Status of Facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Differentiation by Mission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Center of Excellence Goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>National Ranking</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
higher education: They modified university mission statements through mandated and expected increases in university access, accountability, affordability, and social responsibility.

The researcher next describes how strategic planning in higher education on a local context related to its national context in 2010. Here, the Ohio Ten Year *Strategic Plan for Higher Education* and the state’s four goals to increase higher education access, accountability, affordability, and economic development represented strategic planning for Ohio in 2010. Historically, increased access to American higher education occurred after the 1862 and 1890 Morrill Land Grant Acts. Explicitly, it ensued with the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education’s “expanded program of student financial aid that would increase to fifteen billion dollars annually by 1976” (Altbach, Berdahl, & Gumport, 1994, p. 106). Ohio’s Ten Year *Strategic Plan for Higher Education* implemented those same access and affordability goals but included accountability and quality goals proposed by the 2006 Commission on Higher Education at the local/state level.

**Local context.** The strategic planning local context section first described the Ohio Ten Year *Strategic Plan for Higher Education’s* access, accountability, affordability, and quality strategic planning goals. It then depicted the relation between them and those of the Spellings Commission’s report, *A Test of Leadership* (USDOE, 2006). The United States federal government influenced strategic planning in higher education on the local
(state) level through university systems (i.e., California, SUNY, and North Dakota Systems). For Ohio in 2010, this strategic plan was the Ohio Ten Year *Strategic Plan for Higher Education* that began as the University System of Ohio. The University System of Ohio was designed by then Ohio Governor Strickland and then Chancellor Fingerhut and will be the resulting culmination of the State’s Ten Year *Strategic Plan for Higher Education*. In this report, in a letter to the Ohio General Assembly, Governor Strickland wrote: “Much of what you will read in this report builds upon the principles I put forth last year in creating the University System of Ohio, which represents a new, cooperative framework for public higher education” (Ohio Board of Regents, 2008b, p. 3).

OBOR wrote the plan with the primary goal for the University System of Ohio to “lead the development of a highly educated workforce capable of meeting the needs of existing enterprises and creatively leading the development and growth of new [companies]” (The University System of Ohio, 2008a, p. 2). Further, the report for the University System of Ohio and its supporting documents, created programs, and shared goals were incorporated into the Ohio Ten Year *Strategic Plan for Higher Education*. Significant for this dissertation, the strategic plan paralleled the Spellings Commission’s (USDOE, 2006) goal for colleges and universities to increase generated, cultivated, and developed human capital.
For example, this state strategic plan predicated itself on the major goal “to raise the educational attainment of our state each year and to close the gap between Ohio and competitor states and nations” (Ohio Board of Regents, 2008b, p. 9). Not only did this parallel Spellings (USDOE, 2006) goal for increasing human capital, but it was supported by and implemented through three broad strategies to “graduate more students, keep more of our graduates in Ohio, and attract more degree holders from out of the state” (Ohio Board of Regents, 2008b, p. 9). These strategies promoted economic development, were woven throughout the Ohio Ten Year Strategic Plan, and established synergism amongst institutions.

Significance here resided in how Ohio’s four–year public universities’ collective action and effort enabled the Ohio Ten Year Strategic Plan to execute the U. S. Department of Education’s access, accountability, affordability, and quality goals for higher education. That Department’s goals were contained, for example, in the 2001 No Child Left Behind Act; 2002 Strategic Plan; and the 2006 Spellings Commission’s report, A Test of Leadership.

The first of these state goals increased higher education accountability and “access” (Ohio Board of Regents, 2008b, p. 104). Public demand for greater higher education accountability in Ohio was addressed by the Ohio Board of Regents’ (OBOR) Student Success Plan in 2007 and access by three programs from the University System of Ohio. Student Success Plans were
“clear, public statement[s] of the measurable learning outcomes expected of students attending an institution, published on the institution’s own web site” (Ohio Board of Regents, 2007b, p. 1). They related to accountability because OBOR’s Planning Committee on Higher Learning Accountability and Productivity deemed “grade point averages, certificates of completion, and graduation itself [to be] insufficient evidence of student success” (p. 1).

The first of three University System of Ohio programs that partly addressed the public demand for increased access to four–year higher education was the Ohio GI Promise. “All veterans of the U. S. armed services, their spouses, and dependents who choose to attend Ohio colleges and universities . . . [were provided] in–state tuition rates” (The University System of Ohio, 2008b, p.1). It also changed university strategic planning’s sole focus on inputs (Burke, 2002, 2005; National Commission on Accountability in Higher education, 2005; Zumeta, 1998) which affected both accountability and access and helped “strengthen Ohio’s strategic plan for higher education” (University System of Ohio, 2008b, p. 1).

The “30 mile promise” was another University System of Ohio program that partly addressed the public demand for increased access to four–year higher education. It made “high quality associate and bachelor's programs in core fields . . . available at a University System of Ohio campus within 30 miles of every Ohioan” (Ohio Board of Regents, 2008a, p. 1).
The “Seniors to Sophomores” program permitted “qualified high school students to spend their senior years on a college campus, then after their graduation enroll as sophomores in the system” (Ohio Board of Regents, 2008b, p. 10). The Ohio Board of Regents understood “Seniors to Sophomores” to be “a dual enrollment program, which enable[d] academically qualified high school seniors to earn both high school and college credit at the same time” (Ohio Board of Regents, 2008c, p. 1). All three of these University System of Ohio programs were incorporated into the Ohio Ten Year Strategic Plan for Higher Education and increased student access to universities.

Further, this first of four Ohio Ten Year Strategic Plan goals for higher education that increased both its accountability and access related to the Spellings Commission’s report, A Test of Leadership (USDOE, 2006). Specifically that report claimed that “higher education must change from a system primarily based on reputation to one based on performance . . . [and] accountability” (p. 21) “to meet the challenges of the 21st century” (p. 21).

The second of these state goals increased higher education “quality” (Ohio Board of Regents, 2008b, p. 104). Public demand for greater higher education quality in Ohio was addressed by the Ohio Ten Year Strategic Plan’s requirement that all Ohio four–year public universities create Centers of Excellence. The Ohio Ten Year Strategic Plan for Higher Education involved all Ohio public universities and community colleges working
collectively to achieve its mission and embodied the framework for strategic planning in higher education on the local (state) level.

This state strategic plan also permitted and encouraged each Ohio four-year public university to maintain a separate mission statement relative to its local region for differentiation. “Each of Ohio’s 13 public university main campuses will have distinct missions, which include a comprehensive, high-quality education, as well as the establishment of nationally recognized Centers of Excellence” (Ohio Board of Regents, 2008b, p. 38). Competition was replaced with the common strategy that all Ohio public colleges and universities created and established Centers of Excellence: “The only way for the system as a whole to raise its quality is for each institution to develop distinctive missions and recognized Centers of Excellence” (p. 38). These centers would “end the counter−productive competition among institutions for scarce resources” (p. 10). Further, they denoted “the historic strengths and traditions of our individual universities [that] will be drawn upon to create distinctive missions for each” (p. 10) and represent Ohio higher education institutions’ point(s) of differentiation.

For example, Ohio public universities each maintain their unique mission in spite of collectively helping fulfill the Ohio Ten Year Strategic Plan’s four access, accountability, affordability, and quality goals. To illustrate, 3 of the 13 four−year public universities in Ohio completed their strategic planning by 2009 and preserved their institution’s mission. These
universities (Youngstown State University, Wright State University, and Bowling Green State University) simultaneously implemented the state’s strategic plan. First, Youngstown State University (2009) remained “dedicated to outstanding teaching, scholarship, and service and to forging connections among these three interactive components of its mission” (p. 1). In contrast, Wright State University (2009) “transform[ed] the lives of our students and the communities we serve . . . engaging in significant community service” (p. 1). And yet different, Bowling Green State University’s (2009) mission “create[d] an academic environment grounded in intellectual discovery and guided by rational discourse and civility through the interdependence of teaching, learning, scholarship, and service” (p. 1).

This was significant for this dissertation because, collectively, these three universities also created Centers of Excellence that all Ohio four–year public universities need to do. The purpose of establishing such centers was to comply with the Ohio Ten Year Strategic Plan for Higher Education. These universities belonged to, collectively strove towards, and helped implement the Ohio Ten Year Strategic Plan for Higher Education. Yet, each university in the example provided above preserved its uniqueness via its institutional mission. However, each one differentiated itself amongst and from the others through their Centers of Excellence that addressed regional market demand and their local community needs.
Also significant was that Centers of Excellence ascertained increased quality through “measures of success” (Ohio Board of Regents, 2008b, p. 39). This researcher referred to these Centers’ measures as attributes. They were qualities or characteristics that the state could first organize into PEST categories and classify into nominal, ordinal, interval, and ratio data variables. Their interval and ratio variables could be further analyzed quantitatively to help aid decision making by determining their significance, strength, and predictive power (see quantitative analyses and strategic planning section of chapter 2). Reference to such variables here demonstrated, emphasized, and reiterated the traditional reliance on strategic planning quantitative analyses to determine their significance and aid decision making. For illustrative purposes only, table 3 depicts these measures of success or attributes. It portrays how they complemented its goals for increasing higher education access, accountability, affordability, and quality but differs by their five specific accountability metrics for each (total of 20).

The third of four Ohio Ten Year Strategic Plan goals for Higher Education increased “affordability and efficiency” (Ohio Board of Regents, 2008b, p. 104). Public demand for greater higher education affordability in Ohio was addressed by two programs that had their inception in the University System of Ohio. First, the Ohio G. I. Promise increased affordability and efficiency of Ohio universities because it “doubl[ed]
### Table 3

**The Ohio Ten Year Strategic Plan Accountability Measures**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Access</th>
<th>Quality</th>
<th>Affordability and Efficiency</th>
<th>Economic Leadership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interval and Ratio Scale</td>
<td>Total post-secondary enrollment</td>
<td>Improvement in actual graduation rate over expected graduation rate 2007 to 2007</td>
<td>Avg. out of pocket cost: An institution’s true affordability is not its sticker price, but how much the student actually pays</td>
<td>Industrially financed research per capita – national rank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interval and Ratio Scale</td>
<td>Total STEM degrees awarded</td>
<td>Number of first-time enrollees in top 25% SAT/ACT (at university main campus)</td>
<td>Tuition and fees of combined associate and bachelor’s degree offered on a community college or university regional campus - national rank</td>
<td>Total international students and Ohio students studying abroad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interval and Ratio Scale</td>
<td>Total enrollees age 25 and older</td>
<td>Percent of facilities in satisfactory condition or only needing only minor rehabilitation</td>
<td>State funding per FTE – relationship to national avg.</td>
<td>Invention disclosures filed plus university start ups attracting &gt;$1M in venture capital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interval and Ratio Scale</td>
<td>Total degrees awarded to first generation college students</td>
<td>Total size of endowments and foundations per FTE</td>
<td>Percentage of first-time enrollees below age 21 with equivalent of one semester or more of college credit earned during high school</td>
<td>Business satisfaction – measured through survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interval and Ratio Scale</td>
<td>Percent of degrees awarded to Black and Hispanic students</td>
<td>Federally financed research spending per capita – national rank</td>
<td>Percentage of bachelor’s degree recipients with at least one year of credit from a community college</td>
<td>Number of students engaged in internships and co-ops</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


college benefits for eligible troops and veterans, essentially guaranteeing full scholarships at any in-state public college or university, as well as providing monthly housing stipends” (The University System of Ohio, 2008b, pp. 1–2). All “soldiers, spouses, and their dependents [can] attend school in the State of Ohio and pay the instate rate” (Ohio Board of Regents, 2008, p. 1).
Second, the “Third Frontier” linked industry to university research through a “$122 million partnership between [this] project and the University System of Ohio to significantly increase the state’s investment in cutting-edge scholarship and centers of excellence at Ohio’s colleges and universities” (Ohio Board of Regents, 2007a, p. 1). It was the Third Frontier Commission, however, that led to the Ohio Ten Year Strategic Plan for Higher Education promoting the development of STEM areas for program of study and specific measurements of success for each. Further, this third of four Ohio Ten Year Strategic Plan goals for higher education increased “affordability and efficiency” (Ohio Board of Regents, 2008b, p. 104) and related to the Spellings Commission. Specifically, the Spellings Commission’s report, A Test of Leadership claimed that “affordability is directly affected by a financing system that provides limited incentives for colleges and universities to take aggressive steps to improve institutional efficiency and productivity” (USDOE, 2006, p. 10).

The fourth of four Ohio Ten Year Strategic Plan goals for Higher Education increased “economic leadership” (Ohio Board of Regents, 2008b, p. 104). Public demand for greater higher education economic leadership in Ohio was addressed by this strategic plan’s “intellectual and organizational infrastructure to measurably improve the economic outlook for all Ohioans” (Ohio Board of Regents, 2008b, p. 104). It was through this fourth goal that the “measurements of success” from each university’s Center of Excellence
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would create new companies who afforded their employees “greater earning power.” These individuals also would collectively “help fulfill society’s need for a more productive and educated workforce (i.e., human capital) (Ohio Board of Regents, 2008b; USDOE, 2006). Finally, the fourth of four Ohio Ten Year Strategic Plan (strategic planning) goals for higher education that increased the state’s economic leadership related to the Spellings Commission’s report’s, claim that “for the country as a whole, future economic growth will depend on our ability to sustain excellence, innovation, and leadership in higher education” (USDOE, 2006, p. 7).

The Ohio Ten Year Strategic Plan’s four “access, quality, affordability/efficiency, economic leadership” and “accountability measures” (Ohio Board of Regents, 2008b, pp. 103–104) parallel the Spellings Commission’s access, accountability, and affordability goals. The Ohio Ten Year Strategic Plan’s accountability, affordability, and access goals proceeded from, related to, and were federal influences of the Spellings Commission’s report (A Test of Leadership, USDOE, 2006), No Child Left Behind (2001), the Servicemen’s Readjustment Act (1944), and the Morrill Land Grant Acts of 1862 and 1890.

**Conclusion to the historical (local) context section.** Research on strategic planning in higher education has historically been based on contexts that are quantifiable and variables that are fixed or remain constant (e.g., full time equivalency for student enrollment used in cost benefit analyses).
When researchers and practitioners address strategic planning in higher education, what is often considered as the part of the strategic planning process often translates to their reasons for and/or preference of variable selection to help make strategic planning decisions (e.g., a specific strength, weakness, opportunity, threat, or combination). The historical (local) context section depicted a somewhat recent example of how the federal and state government (major strategic planning in higher education external stakeholders) can and do influence its planning. Further, this researcher’s study focused on the strategic planning in higher education accountability and social responsibility “local” (Fardon, 1995) constructs (e.g., Ohio G. I. Promise). However, it first located and placed them within the national strategic planning in higher education accountability and social responsibility constructs (e.g., Spellings’ Commission) and sought to determine the fit between them.

**Conclusion**

The first two sections enabled readers to better understand the shared context between military, business, and higher education strategy and military planning with business and strategic planning in higher education. They embodied the situational and social contexts of strategic planning in higher education and fulfilled this dissertation’s secondary purpose.

The third section describes the Ohio strategic planning in higher education context in 2010. It specifically delineates the relation between this
state’s goals for its Strategic Plan for Higher Education and those that preceded it at the national/federal level. This third section solidifies the researcher’s conceptual framework for conducting this dissertation’s study help develop a framework to generate future substantive and/or formal theory (objective of the study). It also corresponds with the historical context of strategic planning in higher education and its purpose. The third section of this literature review complements the first two sections and describes how federal influence on strategic planning in higher education relates to Ohio colleges and universities: The Ohio Ten Year Strategic Plan for Higher Education.

All three sections of this literature review helped achieve this dissertation’s twofold purpose and enabled the researcher to develop his deduced argument. Each of their contexts for this literature review can serve to ground headings in axial coding and analysis in chapter 4. Subsequently, this chapter segues into the identified gap from the literature review and collectively highlights the need for its study.

Research Gap

The literature review revealed a “gap found in higher education literature between research and practice” (Kezar & Eckel, 2000, p. 444) in its strategic planning. Higher education practitioners and researchers “read outside of higher education. . . [because] higher education did not assist in their day–to–day work” (p. 451). This gap continues today in 2011 and is
exacerbated by a “slow development of theory [that] . . . has hindered advancement” (Rudd, Greenley, Beatson, & Lings, 2008, p. 100). Significance here resides in the identified reverberating distance between faculty and administration: “The course of higher education in times of change and scarcity will be determined largely by how well administrators and faculties understand strategic management” (Chaffee, 1985, p. 164).

Chaffee (1985) claimed that the “literature is very short on analysis of how the nature and practice of strategy can procure [bring about] what colleges and universities need” (p. 138). Although she referred to strategy, this was significant because this researcher found that the exact same general strategy analysis process existed in most strategic planning models. Additionally, Grattan (2002) identified the significance for military and business strategy to hinge upon the difference between a specific paradigm to be followed and “a detailed account of the process” (p. 28).

Rowley et al. (1997) identified the strategic planning in higher education gap as higher education not having yet figured out how to maintain a balance between society’s wants and its limitations in providing services: “the growing gap between what the public wants and what education provides” (p. 21). This was significant because it identified strategic planning in higher education’s attempt to acquire better knowledge about its internal and external environments was not well comprehended by academicians. These authors verified that the literature gap had yet to be closed between
strategy and strategic planning in higher education, especially because all strategy preceded strategic planning.

Further, the above strategic planning in higher education authors implicitly support this researcher’s argument: Faculty members need to thoroughly understand the general strategic planning process and their role as vital stakeholders if universities are to pervasively apply it across the entire institution or system of institutions. Significance for this researcher’s argument emerged from the confusion that arises when strategic planning strategies, concepts, and terminology are communicated without establishing a shared understanding by all stakeholders. Strategic planning in higher education has not yet been thoroughly developed – its borrowed military and business strategy, concepts, and terminology leave it open to individual discernment.

Resulting misinterpretations stifle university progress to attain collective goals embodied in their mission statements and illustrate how universities may inadvertently help perpetuate the societal status quo (see tacit theory). Strategic planning in higher education metaphorically, according to the literature, remained underdeveloped and some universities consequently operated like “islands isolated from the crises and woes of their own communities” (Smith, 2004, p. xxi). This author further hinted at the possibility for the literature gap in strategic planning in higher education to possibly derive from accompanying social and political issues.
Strategic Planning in Higher Education Studies

Strategic planning is currently referred to as strategic management and had sparse published application to higher education other than some current dissertation studies. A review of dissertation abstracts on “strategic planning in higher education” revealed 511 mostly quantitative scholarly theses on administrators and strategic planning in higher education. No strategic planning in higher education studies existed that included faculty perceptions of the fit between the general strategic planning process and other aspects of university policies. However, the researcher did find seven studies conducted on strategic planning in higher education that had implications for his dissertation: Wirkkula (2007), Bacig (2002) Lovinguth (1996), Martin (1992), M. E. Moore (1992), Prinvale (1992), and Faith (1991).

Three of these were higher education quantitative dissertation strategic planning studies: Martin (1992), M. E. Moore (1992), and Prinvale (1992). The first of these three strategic planning in higher education dissertation studies was Martin (1992). He found that “limited studies exist that have considered the state of academic strategic management and social responsibility” (p. 76). This applied to the 2010 research gap in strategic planning in higher education. Specifically, social responsibility lacked being recognized by strategic planning in higher education and yet it was one of the federal government’s direct influences on it.
Martin’s (1992) quantitative study of university presidents “focused on investigating perceptions” (p. 1) which empirically analyzed “188 usable responses” (p. 1) from an approximate population of 400 institutions. Survey responses were measured using Likert scales to record community college presidents’ responses about postsecondary strategic planning. The importance of Martin’s dissertation for this study resides in how it demonstrated an overreliance on quantitative studies to generate significant results. This is especially true when quantitative responses represented individual perceptions where misrepresentations could occur through use of Likert scales.

Cohen and Lea (2004) indicated that problems frequently incurred with Likert scales arose from survey questions which “use numbers to measure in a way that is not as precise as measuring in inches” (p. 3). Categories were numbered on a scale usually 1 to 5 and did not have specific mathematical calculable intervals of length, but rather represented numerical selection of an answer from a range of provided possibilities (i.e., 1 = strongly agree, 2 = agree, 3 = no opinion, 4 = disagree, 5 = strongly disagree).

This problem was similar to that identified with business and higher education PEST variables (ordinal data) used for empirical analyses in their strategy development to help with decision making. Researcher choice of Likert scales to give the impression of more precise numerical representation
when measuring participants’ selected answers (i.e., providing a greater range of possibilities from which to select an answer) can lead to vagueness arising from impreciseness and uncertainty. In such a scenario, “all we can really be sure of is the order of responses – that as the responses progress from 1 to 5 to 1 to 10 there is more agreement with the statement” (Cohen & Lea, 2004, p. 3). Fallibility and overreliance on quantitative studies to generate significant results led to a second discovered quantitative dissertation with implications for this study.

The second quantitative study of strategic planning in higher education with implications for this study was M. E. Moore (1992). He, too, conducted a quantitative study but he applied regression statistics and z scores that identified variable significance/predictive power for indicators used in administrative strategic planning decision making. He referenced Schmidtlein and Milton and Keller to provide support for his claim that strategic planning in higher education suffered from a lack of “empirical evidence” (p. 6) to validate its worth and benefit.

M. E. Moore’s (1992) dissertation’s importance for this study resides in three areas. First, it identified the purpose of strategic planning as “bring[ing] the mission to its fullest potential with a concentrated focus on the realities of the external environment” (p. 2). Second, it conveyed strategic planning (1990s) external influences as being related to “the demand for efficient and effective use of resources in an environment of constraining
economic reality” (p. 4). Third, M. E. Moore (1992) demonstrated reliance on quantitative analysis for predicting significant variables. All three of these areas were subtopics described earlier in chapter 2 and related to the pertinence of stakeholder understanding for strategic planning in higher education.

To further illustrate M. E. Moore’s (1992) reliance on quantitative analyses for predicted significance using mathematical terminology, regression tests were limited by committing a Type I (rejecting a true hypothesis) or Type II (accepting a false hypothesis) error when calculating power. More simply, regression uses power to determine empirical statistical significance, the ability of an independent variable to predict the outcome on a dependent variable. Low independent variable correlation with the dependent variable restricts the former’s predictive ability, diminishes significance, and infers independent variables’ relational strength to the dependent variable: This test procedure would identify significance/power computed with multiple regression and/or correlation (Hinkle et al., 2003).

The third quantitative study strategic planning on higher education with implications for this dissertation study was Prinvale (1992). Seventeen years ago, she found strategic planning in higher education to “not [be] well defined” (p. v) and emphasized its need for quantitative studies. She applied analysis of variance/multiple regression to determine four independent
variables as significant predictors for strategic planning in higher education decision making by administrators:

the ratio of total assets to total liabilities (financial strength), the ratio of endowment income to total educational and general revenues (financial independence), the ratio of tuition and fee revenues to total educational and general revenues (tuition dependence), and the ratio of unrestricted funds balances to total educational and general expenditures plus mandatory transfers (liquidity) ] institution wide strategic planning. (p. vi)

The importance of Prinvale’s (1992) dissertation to this study resides in its identified significant predictors for strategic planning in higher education that aided administrators and were then compared to behavioral attributes. These behavioral qualities were “inherent in strategic planning [from] the assumptions about decision making behaviors in colleges and universities” (p. v). While this dissertation is qualitative, the researcher describes, discusses, and explains how overreliance on quantitative prediction predicated on significant variables in strategic planning in higher education represent a change in the qualitative paradigm.

Four of these seven published dissertation studies were qualitative: (Bacig, 2002; Faith, 1991; Lovinguth, 1996; and Wirkkula, 2007). The first of four qualitative strategic planning in higher education studies with implications for this dissertation study was Bacig (2002). She conducted a case study on the strategic planning communication process in higher education that studied “what the participation and communication roles play in determining how widespread participation needs to be” (p. 20). She also
claimed that both “participation” and “communication” were specialized terms and represented “two critical aspects of interaction between those with primary responsibility for a strategic planning process and the rest of the members” (p. 19). Importance for Bacig’s (2002) dissertation to this dissertation resides in strategic planning in higher education being characterized by its use of general, across-the-board, and specialized terminology. Additionally, terminology used in strategic planning in higher education often separated and distinguished those with more responsibility for implementing the plan and those who executed its process.

The second of four qualitative strategic planning in higher education studies with implications for this study was Faith (1991). She applied a qualitative ethnographic research method to her interpretive case study of one historically black college and university’s strategy, culture, and renewal. Strategic planning at LeMoyne–Owen College was studied over a four year period which she described as being “a linear type” with reference made to Chaffee (1985). Faith’s dissertation importance for this dissertation study resides in it being a qualitative strategic planning study that identified the occurrence of institutional top-down communication related to Chaffee’s linear strategy model: Chaffee’s Linear Strategy Model was designated as an implicit influence of constrained and limited resources on a university’s strategic planning. This had further implications for how quantitative significance was over relied upon to aid in strategic planning decision
making. Comparatively, this dissertation discusses how decisions made in strategic planning in higher education often are based on limited resources.

The third of four qualitative strategic planning in higher education studies with implications for this dissertation study was Lovinguth (1996). She conducted a qualitative dissertation case study at “five small, four-year, private colleges and universities” (p. 3) in order to:

- identify what, if any, institutional changes occurred, as indicated by enrollment patterns, financial condition (as measured by revenues, expenditures, and endowment indices), and programmatic changes (in the areas of academic affairs, student services, and external outreach); and how those changes related to the objectives and strategies specified in the plan document. (p. 5)

Her dissertation’s importance for the current study resided in its qualitative exploration of higher education administration and student affairs that used quantitative measures or “indices” to track strategic planning changes. Comparatively, this study focuses on higher education faculty and not administration where such indices and metrics for measurement of strategic planning goal progress are discussed in this researcher’s literature review.

The fourth of four qualitative strategic planning in higher education studies with implications for the current dissertation study was Wirkkula (2007). She applied a phenomenological method to research how administrators (deans) experienced strategic planning in higher education. Her rationale was that the strategic planning literature “documents
inconclusive findings on the success of strategic planning to effect improvement in the management of higher education” (p. 1). Additionally, her literature review found strategic planning and strategic management to differ in behavioral process which provided support for conducting her research study.

Wirkkula’s (2007) dissertation’s importance for this study ensues from its focus on determining quantitatively significant strategic planning behavioral variables. The current study does not examine specific strategic planning in higher education variables further; however, it does describe higher education’s existing strategic planning model, the Strategic Planning Engine (Dolence & Norris, 1994). These authors’s model professed that relevance for strategic planning in higher education resided in specific identified PEST empirical behavioral variables for quantitative analysis. Further, this dissertation justifies taking a qualitative approach to record perceptions of those faculty members who were involved as stakeholders in strategic planning in higher education: The researcher focuses on the general strategic planning process rather than on measuring specific behavioral variables of those who participated in strategic planning in higher education.

Collectively, these seven authors comprised the body of strategic planning in higher education dissertation research studies pertinent to the current dissertation and have two vital implications for its study: First, definitions for strategic planning in higher education remain broad: the
literature used specialized terminology and tended to emphasize its administrative communication process by presidents and deans. Second, strategic planning in higher education studies are more frequently oriented to quantitative methods. They often focused on one specific aspect of strategic planning in higher education that dealt with financial analyses (i.e., determining cost–benefit ratios as a means to measure effective strategic planning behavior) to help administrative decision making.

The literature review revealed a higher education quantitative theoretical strategic planning model (the Strategic Planning Engine) developed by Dolence and Norris (1994) and applied by Rowley et al. (1997). The latter authors also placed the strategic planning in higher education gap with how it is used, implemented, and applied in higher education to attain modified university goals. Here, fulfilling external stakeholders’ needs demonstrated that “the growing gap between what the public wants and what education provides [is] a gap that further disconnects the public from public education . . .” (p. 21). In other words, the strategic planning in higher education gap was that it had not yet figured out how to maintain a balance between society’s wants/needs and its limitations in providing services.

Chapter one already established the importance for strategic planning in higher education to communicate using shared terminology and for its stakeholders to understand the general strategic planning process (strategic planning’s shared context). It further described how context restricts
quantitative research studies and explanations. The above literature review on quantitative strategic planning in higher education supplied reasons why quantitative methods are not conducive for this study. Individually or collectively, they would not appropriately measure significance for this dissertation study because they created a framework from which other researchers can generate a future substantive and/or formal theory on a social phenomenon. Here, that phenomenon was identified by this researcher as the fit between the general strategic planning process and other aspects of university policies as described by faculty members. Moreover, this dissertation focused less on “examining the interrelationships between variables [and more on] the conceptualization and measurement of individual constructs” (Boyd & Reuning–Elliott, 1998, p. 181). This was evidenced with inclusion, description, discussion, and explanation of the situational, social, and historical contexts for this scholarly thesis.

Summarily, this chapter and the entire dissertation consistently applied Creswell’s (2003) identified three “use[s] of literature in a qualitative study” (p. 31): First, it “frame[d]’ the problem in the introduction” (p. 31). Second, the literature review was presented as a separate section as a review of the literature. Third, literature was presented as “a basis for comparing and contrasting findings of the qualitative study” (p. 31). The literature review also introduced how strategy preceded all strategic planning. It then described, portrayed, and explained how strategic planning in higher
education related to public universities’ accountability through its situational, social, and historical contexts.
Chapter 3

Research Design and Methods

Chapter Three presents this study’s “strategies . . . [and] flexibility of design” (Marshall & Rossman, 2006, p. 51) in its research method. It discusses grounded theory as the applied theoretical research tradition, justifies conducting qualitative research, provides this researcher’s assumptions, and is immediately followed by this dissertation’s strategy, rationale, and genre. The researcher then supplies his detailed subjectivity, brackets his biases, and follows with his data management and analysis plans. Overall, this chapter presents an approach for conducting qualitative grounded theory analysis on the phenomenon of the general strategy analysis process for strategic planning in higher education. The researcher then demonstrates that approach with participant data in chapter 4.

Theoretical Tradition

“Biography, phenomenology, grounded theory, ethnography, and case study” (Creswell, 1998, p. 65) methods comprise qualitative research tradition dimensions. The method used in this dissertation is grounded theory (Charmaz, 2006; Glaser, 1967, 2001, 2002a, 2002b; Strauss & Corbin, 1990) and permits the investigator to execute “theoretical analysis of the [primary] data” (Charmaz, 2000 as cited in Denzin & Lincoln, 2001, p. 265). The researcher realizes that grounded theory also would enable him to
generate a “middle range [or substantive] theory” (Charmaz, 2006, p. 7)
“grounded in the data” (Creswell, 1998, p. 65). Instead, however, he used it
to develop a framework to generate future formal and/or substantive theory.

Grounded theory methodology falls within the interpretivist and
positivist paradigms’ “two definition[s] of theory” (Charmaz, 2006, p. 126). It
also exemplifies “two contrasting and competing traditions in sociology:
Columbia University positivism and Chicago school pragmatism and field
research” (pp. 6–7).

Theory in sociology is a strategy for handling data in research,
providing modes of conceptualization for describing and explaining.
The theory should provide clear enough categories and hypotheses so
that crucial ones can be verified in present and future research; they
must be clear enough to be readily operationalized in quantitative
studies when these are appropriate. The theory must also be readily
understandable to sociologists of any viewpoint, to students, and to
significant laymen. Theory that can meet these requirements must
fit the situation being researched, and work when put into use. By
‘fit’ we mean that the categories must be readily (not forcibly)
applicable to and indicated by the data under study; by ‘work’ we
mean that they must be meaningfully relevant to and be able to
explain the behavior under study. (Denzin & Lincoln, 2001, pp.
230–231)

This “conceptualization” can be seen in chapter 4 when this researcher
reports on how he transcribes, codes, and analyzes one participant interview
( primary data) that illustrates his ten stage process model. He executes
open, axial, and selective coding of the transcript and simultaneously
fractures and constantly compares data until saturation occurs. Data
saturation occurs when “no new information can be found [that] adds to the understanding of the category” (Charmaz, 2006; Strauss & Corbin, 1990).

**Grounded theory.** This study proposes and demonstrates an approach for applying grounded theory (Charmaz, 2006; Glaser, 1967, Strauss and Corbin, 1990) coding and analysis to the primary data gathering of this researcher's data. He applies a constant comparative approach (Glaser & Strauss, 1967) that first “generates explanation of the phenomenon” (Strauss & Corbin, 1990). It then “generates successively more abstract concepts and theories through inductive processes of comparing data with data, data with category, category with category, and category with concept” (Charmaz, 2006, p. 187). This enabled this researcher to implement Charmaz’s advice for the constant comparative method in grounded theory: “The literature review can serve as valuable sources of comparison and analysis” (p. 165).

For example, the researcher qualitatively analyzed the situational, social, and historical contexts from chapter 2 and presents his discussion of them in chapter 4. His rationale for this is to establish a guide for future comparative analysis of findings from significant contexts in the primary data to the existing literature. As will be seen in chapter 4, he illustrates comparison of the relationship within and between “other scholars’ evidence” (p. 165) to demonstrate how “their ideas illuminate [his] theoretical categories” (p. 165). This represents one area where this researcher implemented “flexibility” in his qualitative study.
The researcher implements grounded theory for its epistemological strength to help accomplish this dissertation’s dual purpose. First, grounded theory permits this researcher to explicate strategic planning in higher education and its general strategy process so that they are better understood (see chapter 2). Second, grounded theory enables the researcher to establish a framework for future the development of a substantive and/or a formal theory (see chapter 4).

Generally, grounded theory methodology analyzes “abstract analytical schema of a phenomenon that explains some action, interaction, or process” (Strauss & Corbin, 1990) (i.e., strategic planning in higher education). This juncture usually arises after primary data (i.e., interviews) have been coded, examined, and documented for recurring emergent themes, categories, and concepts. Again, maximizing similarities and differences of analyzed data (constant comparison) promotes “theor[etical] development until no new properties emerge” (Charmaz, 2006, p. 96): It also produces “saturate[d] categories” (Creswell, 1998, p. 65), and clarifies the relevance for this researcher’s developed framework. This analytical process helps the researcher develop theoretical explanation from data, not existing or pre-established conceptual arguments (Glaser 1985, 1999, 2001, 2002a, 2002b, 2004; Glaser & Strauss, 1967).
Justification for Qualitative Methodology

Three reasons constitute this researcher’s rationale for why he chose grounded theory for his study. First, grounded theory permits the researcher to develop and generate a model from analysis of primary data where he begins to “saturate’ categories and detail a theory” (Creswell, 1998, p. 65).

Second, grounded theory gives the researcher “partial control” (Glaser & Strauss as cited in Denzin & Lincoln, 2001, p. 234) and flexibility to “adapt . . . based on the training . . . of the researcher” (Glaser, 1999, p. 837). This means that the primary research approach (grounded theory) is complimented by aspects of ethnographical analysis, pattern, and critical theory. To illustrate, the researcher’s lens “link[s] parts to a whole” (Neuman, 1991, p. 38) and permits him to better describe, discuss, and explain strategic planning in higher education. He then depicts the “interconnected set of concepts and relationships . . . using metaphors or analogies so that relationships make sense” (p. 38). Finally, triangulation and/or thick description provides qualitative validity for contexts: an application less common in grounded theory and used more in ethnography. Collectively, these parts comprise the whole of his strategies applied in his grounded theory study.

Third, grounded theory enables the researcher to explain the general strategic planning process and strategic planning in higher education. As a
result, this dissertation contributes a model of qualitative grounded theory analysis that can be used to generate future substantive and/or formal theory.

However, the research questions are formed by concerns of critical theory, this study’s ideological perspective (Creswell, 1998, pp. 78–80). These interests derive from the Spellings Commission’s (USDOE, 2006) perception of urgency regarding its findings on American public higher education’s current status and critical theory’s “emancipatory imperative” (Underwood as cited in Willis, 2007, p. 48).

**Setting, Population, and Phenomenon**

The setting for this dissertation study is Ohio four−year public universities where the location of each is imperative to its strategic planning external environment (i.e., community and economic goals). The researcher’s tacit theory claims that universities inadvertently help perpetuate the societal status quo by not understanding how strategic planning’s shared context applies to higher education. The original objective of this study was to generate a substantive theory that had immediate application to help close the gap between higher education and practice. The revised and current objective emerged and, instead, permitted this researcher to generate a model for rigorous qualitative analysis of primary data that can be used to develop future substantive and/or formal theory.
**Population.** This dissertation’s population consists of all faculty members who are stakeholders in strategic planning in higher education in the thirteen Ohio four–year public state universities.

The researcher developed a purposeful sampling method where three or four Ohio four–year public state universities were to be selected. Then, two to three faculty members who were stakeholders involved in strategic planning in higher education at those universities would be interviewed. The above process of participant selection would be used to establish stratified purposeful sampling “according to categories one develops from one’s analysis and these categories are not based on quotas; they are based on theoretical concerns” (Charmaz, 2006, p. 101). More explicitly, theoretical sampling, which is purposeful sampling, “seeks pertinent data to develop your emerging theory” (p. 96).

The objective of generating a substantive theory from many interviewed participants changed to creating a framework for conducting rigorous data analysis in grounded theory that evolved from the data. As a result, one interview with a faculty member who was a stakeholder in strategic planning in higher education at his university was used to illustrate the developed and applied qualitative methodology. Secondary data was also used to help locate the situational, social, and historical contexts pertinent for future comparative analysis. This researcher contends that pertinent
information and analytic results to generate a theory will emerge from transcribed, coded, chunked, and analyzed primary data from transcribed interviews after saturation occurs.

**Phenomenon.** The phenomenon under investigation in this dissertation study is the general strategy process in strategic planning in higher education and other aspects of university policies as described by faculty members. For purposes of illustration and clarity, the researcher divides the phenomenon into a conditional matrix where he demonstrated how concepts are related (see table 4).

**Strategy, Genre, and Rationale**

Grounded theory with a constant comparison approach (Charmaz, 2006; Glaser, 1967; Strauss & Corbin, 1990) is used to focus on developing theory that “generate[s] explanation of the phenomenon” (Strauss & Corbin, 1990). The researcher already discussed his grounded theory strategies applied in this dissertation and its study in the “Justification for Using Qualitative Methodology” section earlier in this chapter. However, strategy patterns discovered in the literature (i.e., what others have already researched, analyzed, and written about) emerged from military, business, and higher education. Secondary data depicted how planning originated with drafting military strategy, evolved into the general strategy process of strategic planning process used in business strategic planning, and was
Table 4

*General Conditional Matrix of Phenomenon*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Concepts</th>
<th>Items Needed to Conduct Study on Strategic Planning in Higher Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Methodology</td>
<td>Grounded theory to describe, analyze, and explain the phenomenon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purposeful Sample</td>
<td>Ohio four-year public universities that completed their strategic plan by 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documents</td>
<td>The current strategic plan of each selected site and a list of stakeholders who participated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRB Permission from Each Participating University</td>
<td>CITI training and other possible certification(s) need to be taken, passed, obtained, granted, and/or provided for each site prior to interviewing at that university</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forms</td>
<td>Approved consent forms, interview protocol, letters of interest, and thank you letters with copies of originals mailed to each participating site's IRB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Equipment</td>
<td>Digital recorder with fresh supply of extra batteries, transcribing software, and laptop computer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

borrowed by strategic planning in higher education.

The goal of grounded theory is to “go from substantive theory to formal theory . . . to a theory of socialization done by theoretical sampling and constant comparisons” (Glaser as cited in Bron & Schemmann, 2002, p. 324).

For this dissertation, grounded theory enabled this researcher to explain the general strategy process in strategic planning in higher education and other
aspects of university policies. He also developed a model for applying rigorous qualitative analysis. A substantive and formal theory and a theory of socialization that derive from the analysis of many more interviews are left for future studies.

**Participant selection.** Criteria for participation include involvement in strategic planning in higher education within the past three years at the university level. Potential participants could be identified through public record and the appropriate office of each university (i.e., Provost, President, or Faculty Senate [see Appendix B for letter of permission]) would then be sent a letter of interest (see Appendix C) followed up by phone, email, or certified letter to determine if they would be willing to participate. This was the procedure followed for the participant in this dissertation study, Professor Y. After his interest was confirmed, a consent letter (see Appendix D) was taken to the interview itself and given to the participant to sign before the data were collected.

**Recruitment.** The President, provost, or other appropriate individual would be contacted at each of the three universities in the study to obtain a list of faculty members. Lists of potential faculty members who are strategic planning stakeholders at their university were obtained from the institution’s actual strategic plan and lists of names from faculty senate meetings.
Data Collection

Data collection was made through interviews with selected participants. The researcher conducted three interviews total although data from Professor Y’s interview only are used in the current analysis. Why? It became evident that Professor Y’s interview was the only one needed to portray rigor in qualitative analysis. Therefore, his analyses were generated from one interview with a faculty member who was a recent stakeholder in strategic planning in higher education. The interview was tape recorded so the researcher could focus on what the participant said. Length of interview was held to one hour and verbatim transcription was completed within one week after the interview. A follow-up interview would have been scheduled if initial post interview coding and analysis required additional information pertinent to theoretical sampling.

Dissertation Study Interview Questions

This researcher conducted a pilot interview with the sole purpose to help inform this dissertation study’s interview questions: He discovered where and how he needed to modify questions, to possibly include new questions, and delete some existing ones (see pilot interview section). Consequently, the researcher developed seven final interview questions:

1. How did you become involved here in the strategic planning process at the university level?
2. What are your perceptions of the strategic planning process at this university?

3. What are your perceptions of how that strategic planning process has related to other aspects of your university’s policies and procedures?

4. When you reflect back and think about the process that you participated in, does anything come to mind about what was happening at the federal or state levels at that time that influenced the strategic planning process here?

5. How would you describe aspects of your faculty position that extend beyond teaching (i.e., service and research)?

6. What are your perceptions of how those other aspects of your faculty position that extend beyond teaching (i.e., service and research) might be related to university strategic planning and/or its policies?

7. When you reflect back and think about your teaching responsibilities here and those other aspects of your faculty position that extend beyond teaching (i.e., service and research) does anything come to mind about what your university’s mission statement proclaims?

A start list was developed to categorize themes and initial patterns that were assigned codes to “identify an emergent theme [and] explanation” (Miles & Huberman, 1994, p. 69). This list also identified possible social
issues incurred in strategic planning in higher education and coded them. This is significant because those codes represent possible social issues that might emerge in the data analysis. After emerging themes were coded and thematically analyzed in the next chapter, interpretation was written that led to my findings and questions for further research (see chapters 4 and 5).

Theoretical validity can be obtained from “theoretical explanation developed from a research study’s fit with data, making it credible and defensible” (R. B. Johnson, 2006, p. 282).

This Dissertation’s Start List Codes:

I. Involvement in the Strategic Planning Process (ISPP)
   A. Historical (H)
   B. Academic (A)
   C. Social Mobility (SM)
   D. Community Development (CD)
   E. Selected or Assigned (SOA)

II. Perceptions of the Strategic Planning Process (PSPP)
   A. “General Strategic Planning Process” (GSSP)
   B. “Inclusive and Incremental” (I and I)
   C. “Evolving and Flexible” (E and F)

III. Perceptions of Strategic Planning Process Related to Other University Policies (PSPP ROUP)
   A. “Declining Enrollment” (DE)
   B. “Increase Diversity” (ID)
   C. “Base for Strategic Initiative Funding” (BFSIF)

IV. Perception of What was Happening at Federal or State Levels that Influenced Strategic Planning at Your University (POWWH F and SL ISP @ U)
   A. “Missions were Redefined after Legislature Established the University System of Ohio” (MR after LE USO)
      1. “Annual Performance Reports” (APR)
2. “Declines in State Subsidies” (DISS)
3. “Push for Collaboration, Implementation of Transfer Module, and Defining Academic Content Standards” (PF C, IOTM, and DACS)
4. “Assessment at All Levels for Federal Government” (AAAL FG)

V. Describe Your Faculty Position that Extended Beyond Teaching (i.e., Service and Research) (DFP EBT)
   A. “Very Integrated” (VI)
   B. “Heavy Teaching and Advising Loads” (HT and AL)
   C. “Expertise is Closely Involved with Scholarship, Research, and Teaching” (ECI W SR and T)

VI. Perceptions of How Other Aspects of Faculty Position Might be Related to University Strategic Planning and/or its Policies (PH OAOFP MBR USP or P)
   A. “Integration of Teaching, Scholarship/Research, and Service is Facilitated by the Strategic Plan” (IOT S/R and S FBSP)
   B. “Faculty are Expected to be Involved in the Community” (FE IIC)

VII. Perceptions About What Your University’s Mission Statement Claims in Relation to Your Teaching (PA WYUMSC RTYT)
   A. “Integration of Teaching, Scholarship/Research, and Service” (IOT S/R and S)
   B. “Emphasis on Communication Between University and External Community” (EOCB U and EC)
   C. “Student–Faculty Interaction Tied to University Mission” (S–F IT to UM)

Rationale for this researcher’s code list began with interest in applying grounded theory to the study; so an inductive approach was taken. This list sequentially organized data and revealed how development of theory is emergent. When applied to the transcript, the list also chunked data into similar groups and served to “code to recontextualize data” (Cofey & Atkinson, 1996, p. 31). This above start list was formed from the seven
interview questions and related to what this researcher deemed as possible social issues incurred in strategic planning in higher education. All and any contexts, concepts, and constructs could be further developed into specific variables/codes. They represented one categorization/classification away from specific variable/code identification (i.e., type of social responsibility, type of strategic planning method, type of stakeholder involvement, type of faculty involvement with strategic planning, and type of societal status quo).

**Researcher Subjectivity**

Accounting for one’s subjectivity is essential to conducting and reporting on qualitative research; therefore, it is provided here. Subjectivity is “the quality of your self-awareness of the potential effects of self on your research” (Glesne, 2006, p. 109). I, the researcher, assume that societal status quo permeates throughout American higher education, sometimes taking the form of poor instruction and ineffective learning (Graff & Birkenstein, 2008) and other times presenting itself through direct, indirect, formal, and/or informal communicated messages by faculty members, administrators, staff, and even students (see tacit theory). For the remainder of this section, the researcher communicates in first person to demonstrate ownership of his ethical principles and his interdisciplinary knowledge.

My subjectivity informs the study through my knowledge derived from and about the hidden curriculum, academic freedom, tenure, collective
bargaining, prominent leaders’ persuasive communication, managerial styles, leadership behaviors, and higher education history. Knowledge gained from personal experiences, formal academic coursework, and scholarly research enables me to “move [from] acknowledgement of voice within experience to that of actual engagement” (Madison, 2005, p. 174). This means that I better understand how political issues can interfere with academicians’ attitudes, beliefs, and even prejudices towards my dissertation topic.

My focus intently remains on demonstrating and executing my professional competence, integrity, and ethical standards throughout the entire dissertation journey. I am writing this scholarly thesis and conducting it study to advance new knowledge and help close the gap between research and practice in higher education. I have no interest in any monetary gains. My sole personal interest, other than to do my best work and present a quality dissertation worth publishing, is to fulfill the last requirement for earning my Doctor of Philosophy degree in Higher Education.

Through awareness of my subjectivity, I have learned to respect what participants tell me and not to make judgments, permitting me to objectively interview without becoming personally involved. Awareness also increases my confidence to pursue this dissertation study through to its completion. I did not overcome 41 years living with others’ biases, stigma about, discrimination against, naïveté towards, and other ignorant social reactions
against my epileptic complex partial seizures by placing these experiences in a vacuum; to the contrary. I learned to be patient, listen, and be more empathetic.

From my experiences with how others treated/mistreated me, I learned that listening is a valuable skill that improves communication and understanding differences between people, increasing one’s diversity and productiveness. Every single personal experience contributes positively to my personal, intellectual, emotional, and social growth. I am not intimidated by issues but rather have greatly matured from them and developed mental fortitude; actively listening now to practically apply my 23 years of university schooling and experiences to this dissertation’s study.

Many of these experiences provide me with abundant “purposeful . . . intuitive and empathetic” (Schram, 2003, p. 98) insight valuable to my subjectivity. Purposeful insight derives from having interviewed company presidents who explained how they perceive and value their employees. Their value for and understanding of how their employees treated customers was requisite to each business’s increased sales, profit generation, satisfied returning customers who became loyal repeat purchasers, and their growth and financial success.

I also intuitively recognize that the faculty tends to be an ignored strategic planning in higher education stakeholder group despite its
involvement in both teaching university students and assisting in community development through research and service. My more than two decades of being a university student and lifetime of experiences with epilepsy’s imposed limitations enables me to better empathize with faculty members. I thoroughly appreciate how faculty is extremely important to higher education and yet might be taken for granted and/or ignored.

Intuitive business insight arises from eight years of undergraduate study and serves as transitional experience where I not only learned the importance of respect for cultural differences but also acquired a better understanding of how all culture is foundational to individuals’, groups’, businesses’, and societal behavior and performance. Undergraduate specialization in international business provides me the competence to apply a broader, more inclusive perspective to strategic planning across disciplines.

Ten years of study at the master’s level provided time for me to assimilate my formal business schooling with higher education: experiencing, observing, learning, and witnessing how faculty issues compare with those in business. For example, academic freedom ensures specific rights and privileges for faculty and limits what professors can and cannot say when teaching a course. Business unionization protects workers/employees from mismanagement and discrimination by providing them with specific rights and privileges. Interestingly, university employee unionization not only
provides them with rights and privileges but quite possibly and inadvertently segregates, classifies, and/or categorizes faculty from administrators and staff.

In this section, I have “bracketed” (Ahern, 1999; Crotty, 1996; Porter, 1993) my assumptions. Defined, bracketing is “the means by which researchers endeavor not to allow their assumptions to shape the data collection process and the persistent effort not to impose their own understanding and constructions on the data” (Crotty as cited in Ahern, 1999, p. 407). Awareness of my subjectivity also helps me focus on applying a grounded theory methodology to develop a framework for generating future substantive and/or formal theory and generating a model.

Rapport

Rapport is the relationship that the researcher has with his participants: “the quality of your interactions to support your research” (Glesne, 2006, p. 109). He values remaining neutral and objective more than engaging in general discussions. Over–rapport can lead to research data management hazards. First, “data bias can result from a somewhat unconscious subjective selection process [whereby] researchers are tempted to talk primarily with people they like or find politically sympathetic.” Second, “researchers are constantly aware of their best data sources, but they are denied access to some of them because of their friendship with others.”
Third, “research participants over identify with the researchers [and] may begin to act in ways that they perceive the researchers want them to act or in ways that impress them” (p. 102).

**Pilot Interview**

The researcher conducted one pilot interview for this dissertation’s study with the sole purpose to fine tune interview questions. In it, he explained that he was a doctoral student writing his dissertation on strategic planning in higher education. He also explained that the purpose of this pilot interview was only to help inform his dissertation study’s existing interview questions: where and how to modify questions or possibly to include new questions and delete some existing ones. The four questions asked of the participant focused on the context of the general strategy process in strategic planning in higher education. They inquired about how that process was understood by the interviewee and his perception of how that process may relate with other university policies. No content from the pilot interview was used in the dissertation study. However, data from that interview were transcribed, coded, and analyzed in order to inform existing dissertation interview questions and/or generate additional ones. For the selected participant, the researcher explained the purpose of the pilot interview and the requisite procedure for obtaining informed consent. The researcher then
asked if the potential participant had any questions and answered them. A similar procedure was followed for the interview conducted for this study.

Upon obtained verbal consent, a list of the seven interview questions was given to the participant to review one week ahead of the scheduled interview. An interview day and time were then scheduled with the understanding that signed consent would be obtained immediately prior to the start of the interview. After obtained signed consent, the participant was asked to choose a pseudonym to help protect confidentiality and identity. Interviews were held to one hour; three were conducted, but only one was used. Importantly, the general strategy process that this researcher used to transcribe his pilot interview and establish its preliminary organization was also applied to his study. Its significance here is for illustrative purposes because it helps inform the reader of what transpired during the study.

The researcher’s level of transcribing accuracy was verbatim; however, to best represent the interviewee some personal grammatical use/style attributes (i.e., uhms) and false starts were omitted. The former did not affect the content or substance of what was said but interrupted fluency of expressed thoughts, perceptions, and opinions. False starts were not included to avoid misrepresenting data and detracting from the narrative’s flow. Phonetic spellings were not used. Representation decisions are significant because they determine how qualitative researchers analyze their
data (i.e., through transcribed and coded interviews; figures; tables; metaphors) to establish credible description, context, and evaluation. Representation, for this researcher, referred to how he used narrative to write about contexts that helped establish qualitative significance and provide validity in this dissertation and for its study. It also included this researcher concealing his interviewees’ identity and protecting their confidentiality.

**Discussion of transcript.**

*Date of Scheduled Interview:*  Friday, April 24, 2009  

*Scheduled Time of Interview:*  9:00am – 10:00am  

*Modifications:*  Participant was late so the interview began at 9:40am  

*Scheduled Location of Interview:*  Professor’s Office  

*Additional Modifications:*  Participant asked if the interview could be conducted outside because of the nice sunny day and warm temperature. The researcher responded that he wanted to remain inside in a quiet room where there were no interruptions to maintain clarity in the audio recording. Experience had taught him that those other researchers who interviewed outside incurred difficulty when transcribing because of increased extraneous noise (i.e., birds chirping, traffic, people talking, and increased potential for external distractions). The participant agreed and both he and the researcher moved to another office bigger in size and more conducive to a face-to-face interview.
Participant’s Chosen Pseudonym: Professor X

Pilot Interview Questions

This researcher identifies the general strategy process used in strategic planning in higher education to include, at a minimum, some variation of SWOT analysis in its strategy development where assessments are conducted on its internal and external environments; especially noting that all strategy precedes strategic planning.

1. How did you become involved here in the strategic planning process at the university level?  *(Understand Strategic Planning Process)*  (CW  RQ1)

2. What are your perceptions of the strategic planning process at this university?  *(Understand Strategic Planning Process)*  (CW  RQ1)

3. What are your perceptions of how that strategic planning process has related to other aspects of your university’s policies and procedures?  *(Relationship and Policy)*  (CW  RQ2)

4. When you reflect back and think about the process that you participated in, does anything come to mind about what was happening at the federal or state levels at that time that influenced the strategic planning process here?  *(Relationship and Policy)*  (CW  RQ2)

Analysis of Pilot Interview

Start list.

1. Faculty Distrust of Administration
2. Strategic Planning to Fulfill State Initiatives
3. Mainly Top-down Strategic Planning Process
4. Faculty Tend to be Excluded Stakeholders
5. Faculty Fulfillment of Teaching, Research, and Service Variables is Not Recognized by Strategic Planning Process

Code list and rationale.

I. Reason for Strategic Planning (RFSP)
   A. Development of STEMM (DOSTEMM)
   B. Required by State Guidelines (RBSG)
   C. Implement Budget Constraints (IBC)

II. Strategic Planning Process (SPP) (Descriptions)
   A. Top-down (SPPTD)
      1. Process – Top-down (SPPTD)
      2. Substantive – Research Priorities (SRP)
   B. Low Faculty Inclusion (LFI)
   C. Assess Internal Environment (AIE)
   D. Assess External Environment (AEE)
   E. Exclusion of Humanities (EOH)
   F. Exclusion of Social Sciences (ESS)
   G. Exclusion of Education (EOE)
   F. Outsourcing of Degree Programs (OODP)

III. Faculty Involvement with Strategic Planning (FIWSP) (Specifically faculty as stakeholders)
   A. None (N)
   B. Only Because of Position (OBOP)

Rationale for the pilot code list began with interest in applying grounded theory to my future study; so an inductive approach was taken. An inductive approach in grounded theory permits the researcher to “go from specific experiences and pieces of data to a more general explanation of an idea” (Schram, 2005, p. 21). This code list represents a process that sequentially organizes data as it is revealed. When applied to the transcript my list chunked data into similar groups and served to “code to recontextualize data” (Cofey & Atkinson, 1996, p. 31). Charmaz (2006) refers
to code definitions serving as a start point for defining categories: “your definition of the category starts by explicating its properties or characteristics” (p. 82). Finally, this code list developed in the pilot process structurally informed the researcher’s coding of data in his dissertation study and provided an initial idea of possible categories that might arise in chapter 4.

**Data Management**

Analyses for this dissertation were conducted in two phases: The first phase evaluated one individual faculty stakeholder’s perceptions of the general analysis process for strategic planning in higher education and how he understood that process and its significance. The second phase analyzed contexts in the secondary data (i.e., situational, social, and historical contexts from chapter 2). Both phases are located in chapter 4 and together embody, illustrate, and implement grounded theory in this dissertation and augment its purpose to establish a base for formal theory. Overall, data management in chapter 4 evaluated Professor Y’s, a faculty stakeholder’s, understanding and perceptions of the strategic planning process in higher education and any relationship both have to policy. There, analyses permitted the researcher to organize data in his ten stage process model and to more thoroughly illustrate and explain it.
Another data management strategy was memoing. Memoing enabled this researcher to write down his ideas about the interviewed participant regarding the latter’s understanding/perceptions about strategic planning in higher education. This strategy allowed the researcher to increase validity with this faculty member and stakeholder in strategic planning in higher education’s transcript data. More specifically, the researcher constantly compared his memos, transcripts, codes, emerging themes, developed categories, established causal relationships, and contexts. The “constant comparison” (Charmaz, 2006; Glaser, 1967; Strauss & Corbin, 1990, 1998) method of grounded theory began with gathering data and continued until analyses were finished.

Data were organized into groups, nodes, and units according to found similarities. This researcher looked for “links, associations, and relationships” (Willis, 2007, p. 307) between already organized groups, nodes, and units to discover causal relations between them. Broader explanations were developed from discovered relations, analyzed, and written about to allow theory to emerge. The above steps were repeated (Willis) until emerging categories and themes were saturated. For this dissertation study, this meant that categories evolved from the data of one interview which were rigorously analyzed until no new categories and/or the same ones arose.
Specific elaboration of organized groups, nodes, and units were made after the data were collected, coded, and analyzed.

**Data Analysis**

Grounded theory analysis is performed on “abstract analytical schema of a phenomenon that explains some action, interaction, or process” (Strauss & Corbin, 1990) (i.e., strategic planning). More often, analysis is conducted after primary data have been coded, examined and documented for recurring emergent themes/categories in all interviews, and data saturation has been reached – the “point where no new information can be found [that] adds to the understanding of the category” (Charmaz, 2006; Strauss & Corbin, 1990).

The one interview was coded and a code list was generated from initial groups, categories, and themes that arose (as would be done in multiple interviews in future studies). The purpose of such a list was to outline a process involving an inductive approach where data were sequentially organized as they were revealed. When applied to the participant’s transcript, this outline chunked data into similar groups and served to “code to recontextualize data” (Cofey & Atkinson, 1996, p. 31). Here, application of grounded theory as this researcher’s method permitted him to “go from specific experiences and pieces of data to a more general explanation of an idea” (Schram, 2005, p. 21). It also enabled him to work towards fracturing the data after applying open and axial coding during analysis of the study.
Open coding was applied to interview transcripts to process categories from which a new theory could be generated; axial coding allowed proposition development of a central phenomenon (Strauss & Corbin, 1990) while “selective coding” (Creswell, 1998, p. 65) permitted the researcher to refine his theory. Open coding was first be performed to “form initial categories” (Creswell, 1998, p. 57) on the fit between the general strategic planning process and other aspects of university policies as described by faculty members. Open coding enabled the researcher to focus on preliminary concepts, theories, and categories that emerged from coded transcripts. This permitted forming a central category that is most related to strategic planning in higher education and faculty members’ understanding of it; the category that “holds the most conceptual interest, is most frequently discussed by study participants, and is most ‘saturated with information’” (pp. 150–151). This study then applied axial coding to the emerging categories that appeared after open coding was conducted.

In order to generate a substantive theory of this study’s phenomenon in a future study, identified causal relationships would be further studied to determine how they relate to the researched phenomenon, what internal and external influence(s) these relationships have on the phenomenon, the context of intervening strategies, and the consequences for this phenomenon (Creswell, 1988). Data analysis that is preceded by the researcher
exhausting categories and themes will lead to theory generation (Marshall & Rossman, 2006).

Axial coding begins after open coding is finished and links the just determined central category to “all subcategories which contribute to it” (Grbich, 2007, p. 79). Transcript data were studied to find a continuum of each property of its outermost relation with strategic planning in higher education. Axial coding also followed open coding to help answer ‘when, where, why, who, how, and with what consequences’ (Strauss & Corbin as cited in Charmaz, 2006, p. 60) Ohio public four–year state university faculty were involved in strategic planning in higher education. Constant comparison and breaking down the data from transcripts into categories were generated until the only new properties emerging were recurring ones and causal relationships were identified. When no new information added to the understanding of the fit between the general strategic planning process and other aspects of university policies as described by faculty members, saturation occurred.

Axial coding enabled the researcher to expound on discovered strategic planning in higher education theory categorical and causal relationships found in the interview transcript after data had been “fractured during initial coding to give coherence to the emerging analysis” (Strauss & Corbin as cited in Charmaz, 2006, p. 60). Fracturing refers to breaking down data (i.e., from
transcripts) into common themes generated until there are no more themes; the only themes emerging are recurring ones. Similarly, when no new information adds to the understanding of fit between the general strategic planning process and other aspects of university policies as described by faculty members, saturation occurs. Theoretical sampling would permit future researchers to interview faculty whose transcript data will “contribute to evolving theory” (Creswell, 1998, p. 118) (see stage 7 in chapter 4).

**Trustworthiness features.** Trustworthiness features collectively included ethical issues and delimitations, risks to subjects, and credibility regarding the viability of both this study and the researcher’s ability to successfully complete it.

**Ethical issues.** This researcher’s purpose was to objectively code, organize, analyze, and explain his study’s data as they related only to the dissertation topic, problem, and purpose. His initial primary responsibility was to acquire Institutional Review Board permission from The University of Toledo to conduct this study; informed consent was obtained from the interviewees.

**Risks to subjects and confidentiality.** All risks to subjects were minimal; no minors were interviewed and the researcher maintained subjects’ confidentiality. Confidentiality was maintained but complete anonymity could not be guaranteed. Field notes, transcriptions, and
document collections were discussed only with the dissertation advisor. All personal identifiers (i.e., telephone / fax / social security numbers, email addresses, zip codes) were removed; tapes were kept securely locked. Harm and/or discomfort were none to minimal; the researcher is competent in qualitative research, ethics, and he is an exceptional listener. This researcher made every effort to maintain confidentiality. Consent forms with signatures were kept separate from responses and did not include names, only pseudonyms. See also the above paragraph on “risk to subjects” that pertains to confidentiality.
In chapter 4, the researcher analyzes the participant interview; the general analysis process for strategic planning in higher education; and its situational, social, and historical contexts. As a result, he presents a framework to generate future substantive and/or formal theory (objective of the study). More explicitly, chapter 4 presents this study’s analysis embodied in two phases. This first phase evaluates Professor Y’s, a faculty stakeholder’s, understanding and perceptions of the strategic planning process in higher education and any relationship that those have to policy: Professor Y’s data are woven through this researcher’s discussion of his ten stage process model to more thoroughly illustrate and explain it. This led the researcher to develop a model that can be used as a framework for the development of future substantive and/or formal theory. The second phase analyzes the situational, social, and historical contexts from chapter 2. It establishes a guide for future comparative analysis of findings from significant contexts in the primary data to the existing literature. Together, these two phases embody, illustrate, and implement grounded theory analysis in this chapter.

For example, memo writing can, often does, and ideally should occur in each stage; detailed analyses and scrutiny of the memos increase as one progresses from stage 1 to stage 10. In his model, the researcher verifies Fleishman’s (2006) claim that “theory is essentially an explanation used to guide the research, which is then supported or challenged by research” (p. 88): The researcher explains how he applied his ten stage process model for conducting grounded theory analysis to primary data obtained from Professor Y’s responses to seven interview questions. For purposes of logical presentation, he explains his analysis by interview and research question and how they relate to each stage.

As a result, the researcher first clarifies each stage and then provides subsequent analysis for Professor Y’s verbatim coded transcript. This permits him to tell the story of strategic planning in higher education.
Figure 5. Ten stage process model of grounded theory analysis.
This researcher interviewed Professor Y on September 16, 2009 and all quotes in the following analysis are from that transcript.

**Stage one.** In stage 1, the researcher read all answers to each of the seven questions from Professor Y’s verbatim transcribed interview and coded them line-by-line to “chunk” data. He organized this participant’s “specific experiences and pieces of data” (Schram, 2005, p. 21) to clarify his written analysis and to aid open and axial coding later executed in stages 3 and 5: These experiences were manifested in specific concept codes that emerged from line-by-line coding for Professor Y and occurred in the first three stages (see table 5). Significantly, this table illustrates and provides a frame that facilitated comparison of his seven interview questions to grouped concept codes, concepts, and categories for this participant.

To illustrate, the key word in stage 1 that emerged from Professor Y’s transcript was “involved.” This word was “recontextualize[d]” (Coffey & Atkinson, 1996, p. 31) as shown in table 5 where fracturing data and conceptualizing them demonstrated how recontextualization was executed for the first two interview questions. The following paragraphs clarify this analytic process. Importantly, it can also be witnessed for the remaining five interview questions by following this same procedure and referring to that table when and where it facilitated constant comparison. However, the researcher deemed this illustration of recontextualization for the first two
interview questions and stage 1 sufficient at this point. The results from this process are more evident for all.

Table 5

*Data from Stages 1 through 3.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interview Question #</th>
<th>Professor Y Concept Codes</th>
<th>Professor Y Key Words</th>
<th>Professor Y Concepts [C]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Descriptive Concepts [DC]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Relational Concepts [RC]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IQ1</td>
<td>(SLC/TD)</td>
<td>&quot;Involved&quot;</td>
<td>Qualified [DC]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[IQ1 CW RQ1]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Competent [DC]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Political [RC]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IQ2</td>
<td>(DBOP) (NAMP)</td>
<td>&quot;Very Involved&quot;</td>
<td>Others' Responsibility [DC]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[IQ2 CW RQ1] (Understand SFP)</td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;Inclusive&quot;</td>
<td>Quantitative [DC]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;Cyclic&quot;</td>
<td>Causal [RC]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;Continuous&quot;</td>
<td>Analytic [DC]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Predictable [DC]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IQ3</td>
<td>(ANAB) (VORD) (AEG)</td>
<td>&quot;Dynamic&quot;</td>
<td>Qualitative [DC]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[IQ3 CW RQ1 &amp; RQ2]</td>
<td>(SIVSVA)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Non Scientific [DC]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Understand SFP) &amp;</td>
<td>(G&gt;HS) (SP=MAC &amp; EVAL)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Non Empirical [DC]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Relationship &amp; Policy)</td>
<td>(SPP RT DE)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Causal [RC]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IQ4</td>
<td>(MT&amp;E DCOEa) (HTS BNS HI INA)</td>
<td>&quot;Same Old Same Old&quot;</td>
<td>Time Consuming [DC]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[IQ4 CW RQ2] (Relationship &amp; Policy)</td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;Faculty lv Personal Goals&quot;</td>
<td>Dedicated [DC]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Going Through the Motions [DC]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not Important [RC]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IQ5</td>
<td>(WTTBTS)</td>
<td>&quot;Vague&quot;</td>
<td>Repetitive [DC]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[IQ5 CW RQ2] (Relationship &amp; Policy)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Redundant [DC]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Traditional [DC]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Uninformative [DC]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Disagreement [RC]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IQ6</td>
<td>(CLAF) (SP SA AD &amp; NAI)</td>
<td>&quot;Isolated&quot;</td>
<td>Confusion [DC]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[IQ6 CW RQ2] (Relationship &amp; Policy)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Expect Immediate Results [DC]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(CTCC BDNC WYD)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Façade [DC]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reality [RC]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IQ7</td>
<td>(SP AWW) (WS AHAOT MOEW)</td>
<td>&quot;Arbitrary&quot;</td>
<td>Intentionally Broad [RC]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[IQ7 CW RQ1 &amp; RQ2]</td>
<td>(Understand SFP) &amp;</td>
<td></td>
<td>Strive for Perfection [DC]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Relationship &amp; Policy)</td>
<td>(IMS TTDG &amp; O)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Strive for Exactness [DC]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Detailed [DC]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

seven interview questions in stage 9 where he tells the storyline analytically for strategic planning in higher education.
Here, analysis of the first interview question specifically revealed Professor Y’s involvement in the strategic planning process at the university level: The first interview question (IQ1) corresponded with the first research question (RQ1) and established a comparative starting point that identified *when* and *how* the participant understood his university’s general strategic planning process (i.e., via concept codes).

The former (*when*), portrayed that Professor Y attributed his involvement in strategic planning in higher education to his years of experience where the university “selected [him] to do it.” The latter (*how*), provided descriptive concepts about this participant’s expertise in his discipline and his work with assessment: Those concepts exhibited a “qualified” and “competent” faculty stakeholder. Further, these two descriptive concepts derived from line-by-line coding were also “recontextualize[d]” (Coffey & Atkinson, 1996, p. 31), as shown in table 5 above, to facilitate constant comparison: An evaluation procedure that does not cease at a specific stage; but rather, incessantly compares primary data throughout.

For example, constant comparison proceeded from the above analysis from stage 1 to stage 2. However, recontextualization occurred before analysis of the second interview question (IQ2) and subsequent constant comparison that revealed how the participant understood the general
strategic planning process at his Ohio four-year public university. This second interview question also corresponded with the first research question (RQ1). However, the former differed by the participant’s perceptions that the second interview question acquired (i.e., concept codes) of the general strategic planning process that he participated in at his university. What did the constant comparison of data manifest? See stage 2.

**Stage two.** In stage 2, the researcher fractured and broke down data (i.e., from transcripts) into common themes generated until there were no more emerging themes; only recurring ones (Creswell, 1998). He also continued to build on earlier executed line-by-line coding and began constant comparisons because stages 1 and 2 overlap. Again, the researcher read each transcript a second time and further analyzed the extracted key words first identified in stage 1: Line-by-line coding in stage 1 revealed Professor Y to understand his participation in strategic planning at his university to be “very involved.” However, here, in stage 2, the researcher applied line-by-coding the same way as in stage 1 but it differed from stage 1 because he conducted more focused analysis: It first unveiled how the participant elaborated on the words “very involved.” Then this second stage allowed the researcher to expound on Professor Y’s understanding of this concept’s meaning through simultaneous comparison of codes to key words.
Data in stage 2 revealed that Professor Y first perceived the strategic planning process at his university as “very involved:”

The whole process starts out with high hopes and very involved. We had people from the outside community; we had people representing all areas of the academic sector, administrators, and some faculty members. I think that everyone starts off with a very positive expectation that a plan is going to be followed as a plan and that it will result in at least some strategic benefits. We actually had a couple of coaches that would look at each of the individual items, brainstorm, and creatively think what each of the areas should look like. That part of the experience I think was very positive and we walked away thinking this is going to have an impact and be something that is worthwhile.

Designated stakeholders, committee members, and others comprised a group of competent individuals whose purpose was to help organize and implement strategic planning in their university. They were committed, engaged, and confident with genuine and sincere intentions for betterment to advance their university’s excellence.

This faculty stakeholder later expounded on how he understood the general strategic planning process at his institution and revealed more detailed reasons for that committed and engaged involvement. Although Professor Y did not use the words “very involved” here, he clearly described what, to him, such involvement should resemble:

If I invested the time and effort to make the plan, it should have somehow built into it a mechanism for determining whether or not the plan is successful and what the next step ought to be in the plan. To me, the plan cannot be a static event, it has to be dynamic. I make one step, how do I know to make the second step unless I know
how the first step occurred and what the results of that first step were.”

Professor Y further comprehended the strategic planning process at his university to lack elements which, as a faculty member, he associated with assessment used for accreditation. He then compared his perceptions of the strategic planning process to “the Higher Learning Commission which accredits [them].” As a result, this participant concluded that for him, assessment followed a “cyclic” pattern that “should be very similar” to analysis in strategic planning. He believed that evaluation in assessment was “continuous” and “inclusive” of all appropriate constituents. His self-identified pattern of assessment’s cyclical measurement process always required faculty stakeholders to have “some concrete material to look at” “measure[d] through instruments.” Results determined where and/or how modifications needed to be made to improve outcomes.

Collectively, the five concepts identified in table 5 (row 3, column 4) further comprised Professor Y’s operational definition for assessment that followed a three step pattern: First, original analysis of the situation generated ideas of how to improve it. Second, those ideas would apply a mechanism to implement change. Third, evaluation of the effectiveness of those ideas would generate appropriate feedback to aid further decision-making. Outside of this operational definition, for him, the strategic planning process was a “quantitative” one for which “analytic”
calculations should demonstrate the “causal” relations to fiscal accountability and was “others’ responsibility.” Lastly, “predictable” was the fifth concept and conveyed that traditionally, at least quantitatively, this participant understood that the strategic planning process in higher education had always relied upon obtained measurable results.

**Stage three.** In stage 3, the researcher applied open coding to hone his focus on preliminary concepts, theories, and categories that emerged from coded transcripts and “form initial categories” (Creswell, 1998, p. 57). Open coding designated initial categories generated from Professor Y’s key words and concepts that related to the general strategic planning process in higher education and other aspects of university policies. This process also permitted the researcher to form a central category that related most to strategic planning in higher education and how this faculty stakeholder understood it. This central/core category was the one that “holds the most conceptual interest, is most frequently discussed by study participants, and is most saturated with information” (pp. 150–151).

To illustrate, the researcher originally defined concepts from the participant’s key word(s). Then, he developed initial categories from concept codes, key words, and preliminary concepts that emerged (see table 6). This table portrays how grounded theory analysis consecutively built on these concept codes, key word(s), and concepts to further generate categories
implemented from line–by–line coding first executed in stages 1–3. Not only did this represent how this Model’s stages of analysis may overlap, but it also preserved data integrity and portrayed a natural progression of qualitative analysis for the first three stages.

As a result, the concepts that emerged from the line–by–line coding process from the first three stages were applied to the open coding process that continued throughout stage 4. This meant that the earlier revealed concepts of “qualified,” “competent,” and “political,” for example, which connoted specific reasons for participant Y’s being selected in the strategic planning process, now had new significance. From these same concepts, the researcher developed the initial categories of “power relations,” “individual expertise,” and “political prowess” (again, see table 6).
Table 6

**Initial Categories from Data in Stages 1 through 3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interview Question &amp; Concept Code</th>
<th>Professor Y Concept Codes</th>
<th>Professor Y Key Words</th>
<th>Professor Y Concepts [C]</th>
<th>Professor Y Initial Categories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IQ1 (SLCTD)</td>
<td>&quot;Involved&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>Qualified [DC]</td>
<td>POWER RELATIONS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Competent [DC]</td>
<td>INDIVIDUAL EXPERTISE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Political [RC]</td>
<td>POLITICAL PROFESS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IQ2</td>
<td>&quot;Very Involved&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>Others' Responsibility [DC]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(NAMPFM)</td>
<td>&quot;Exclusive&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>Quantitative [DC]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;Cyclic&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>Causal [RC]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;Continuous&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>Analytic [DC]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Predictable [DC]</td>
<td>INDIVIDUAL EXPERTISE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>POSITIVIST PARADIGM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IQ3 (ANAB)</td>
<td>&quot;Dynamic&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>Qualitative [DC]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(VORKD)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Non-Scientific [DC]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(AED)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Non-Empirical [DC]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSBSVA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Causal [RC]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IQ4 (G-IS)</td>
<td>&quot;Same Old Same Old&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>Time Consuming [DC]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(SFP:MAG &amp; EVAL) &amp;</td>
<td>&quot;Faculty by Personal Goals&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>Going Through the Motions [DC]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(SFP ET DE)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not Important [RC]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IQ5 (WTRBR)</td>
<td>&quot;Vague&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>Repetitive [DC]</td>
<td>BUREAUCRATIC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Relationship &amp; Policy)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Redundant [DC]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Traditional [DC]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Uninformative [DC]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Disagreement [RC]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IQ6 (CIAAP)</td>
<td>&quot;Isolated&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>Confusion [DC]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(SPSA AD &amp; NAD) &amp;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Expect Immediate Results [DC]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(CTUC HDUC WYD) &amp;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Facade [DC]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Relationship &amp; Policy)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reality [RC]</td>
<td>STATUS QUO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IQ7</td>
<td>&quot;Arbitrary&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>Intentionally Broad [RC]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(SM AWNO)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Strive for Perfection [DC]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(SM TDG &amp; O)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Strive for Exactness [DC]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Detailed [DC]</td>
<td>Detailed [DC]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>COMMUNICATION</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The remaining generated concepts in this table for each interview question produced their respective initial category(ies) in the fifth column and are presented and analyzed next.
The Relationship of the Core Category to Each Initial Category

The core category for this dissertation study was “communication” and arose from key responses that Professor Y had to the seven interview questions posed by this researcher. To iterate, this core category was the one that “held the most conceptual interest, [was] most frequently discussed by [this] study participant, and [was] most saturated with information” (Creswell, 1998, pp. 150−151). Further, 10 initial categories emerged from analysis of concept codes, key words, and concepts that related to the core category: (a) Power Relations, (b) Individual Expertise, (c) Political Prowess, (d) Positivist Paradigm, (e) Measurement, (f) Bureaucratic, (g) Status Quo, (h) Communication, (i) Capricious, and (j) Revolution. The researcher expounded on each one’s relationship to the core category of “communication” below.

The first relationship of this dissertation study’s core category to the first intermediate category, “Power Relations,” revealed that the communication process in strategic planning in higher education remained top−down:

We spent a good amount of time and effort last year developing Centers of Excellence also required by the state now. We set up committees to evaluate which ones of those we would push forward. Our provost comes in one day and says we have identified four that we are going to promote.
The participant’s response demonstrated that there is one person or a few key individuals who control(s) the overall strategic planning process in higher education and its final decisions.

The second relationship of this dissertation study’s core category to the second intermediate category, “Individual Expertise,” demonstrated that the communication process in strategic planning in higher education was inclusive. To illustrate, Professor Y was a strategic planning in higher education stakeholder with approximately 18 years of teaching experience prior to that. The expertise he possessed in his discipline equipped him with valuable knowledge to participate in his university’s strategic planning process. However, “people from the outside community” and “people representing all areas of the academic sector, administrators, and some faculty members” also participated in that process. This indicated to the researcher that the strategic planning process at this participant’s institution involved both internal and stakeholders (i.e., university employees and community members) and constituents (i.e., coaches who were consultants).

Further, this response demonstrated how Professor Y understood the strategic planning process at his university to include two elements. First, his institution involved stakeholders from the internal and external community and, therefore, was perceived as being inclusive. Second, in his opinion, that strategic planning process followed a pattern that, for him, was
associated with assessment and not strategic planning or its quantitative analyses: That assessment included some original analysis, an idea of how to improve the situation, and a mechanism for change and evaluation.

The third relationship of this dissertation study’s core category to the third intermediate category was “Political Prowess.” It demonstrated and revealed that the communication process in strategic planning in higher education emerged from “action that occurred in response to changed conditions” (Strauss & Corbin, 1990, p. 171):

We are now putting in the first of what we hope will be several Ph. D. programs. We were, and I think Fingerhut says this very well, historically we were not only discouraged from thinking about Ph. D. programs but we were actually physically discouraged from doing it. We could not do it. Now all of a sudden because of that title change [in type of university they are] we can. I guarantee that our strategic plan did not say anything about a Ph. D. program before.

This response demonstrated how Professor Y understood the strategic planning process at his university to be influenced by a major external stakeholder: Chancellor Fingerhut of the Ohio Board of Regents who reported directly to Governor Strickland. Both men designed the University System of Ohio and promoted it to develop further from their Ohio Ten Year Strategic Plan for Higher Education. They wrote it with the primary goal for the University System of Ohio to “lead the development of a highly educated workforce capable of meeting the needs of existing enterprises and creatively
leading the development and growth of new [companies]” (The University System of Ohio, 2008a, Electronic Citation, p. 2). Further, the report for the University System of Ohio and its supporting documents, created programs, and shared goals were incorporated into the Ohio Ten Year *Strategic Plan for Higher Education*. Significant for this dissertation, this state strategic plan paralleled the Spellings Commission’s (USDOE, 2006) goal for colleges and universities to increase generated, cultivated, and developed human capital.

Lastly, the implemented Ph. D. programs were perceived as very positive changes to his university that were initiated by the state and the Ohio Ten Year *Strategic Plan*. The researcher deduced that there was initial distrust and fear about the Ohio Ten Year *Strategic Plan for Higher education* during its inception. He also understood that the state’s strategic plan for higher education began to eliminate some of the longstanding traditional barriers that had helped preserve a status quo in higher education.

The fourth relationship of this dissertation study’s core category to the fourth intermediate category was “Positivist Paradigm.” It revealed that the communication process in strategic planning in higher education needed to improve how it conveyed evaluated significance (i.e., quantitatively, qualitatively, or both):

I can tell you that we received word a couple of months ago that that reallocation needs to be cut by 5% across the board. I might have
done a lot of good things with my five percent as a faculty member, but again, it always goes back to a lack of feedback. There was nothing in the strategic plan that said we need to cut this 5% across the board. Should not there be some areas where in a strategic way we should support more and unfortunately maybe then in some other non strategic areas we should support less. Where in the plan says across the board? We do budget cuts across the board. We do everything across the board. You see that as a faculty member occurring [and] you certainly get the idea that if I had not been involved in the strategic plan and somebody came in and asked you about the strategic plan, I would say that we do not have any.

The researcher inferred that Professor Y’s above response referred to how the strategic planning process in higher education at his university needed to change. Specifically, it had to distinguish the importance of qualitative measurement from the more traditional quantitative one used in strategic planning to aid decision-making. Otherwise, as indicated in Professor Y’s quote, immediate confusion emanates from not knowing what is being measured in what way(s); quantitatively or qualitatively.

The fifth relationship of this dissertation study’s core category to the fifth intermediate category was “Measurement.” This participant demonstrated and revealed that communication of significance in the strategic planning process in higher education traditionally relied upon quantitative analysis:

Our budgeting process strictly looks at the expense of an item (i.e., what does it cost me to teach a class). There is absolutely no analysis of benefit. I can make a million dollars teaching that class but if it goes over their estimate of expenses, they could easily cancel that
class. You really can’t do assessment unless you add in cost and profit side of things – the revenue. If revenues are not considered part of the formula, then how are you using anything in a strategic way?

For him, the strategic planning process in higher education did not have any applied measurement method (i.e., “mechanism”) that helped stakeholders identify significant procedural steps. He later elaborated:

“A strategic plan ought to be something where there is that built in direction.” This meant that it was probable that other stakeholders did not understand that most quantitative analyses in strategic planning in higher education occur on the strategy level.

The sixth relationship of this dissertation study’s core category to the sixth intermediate category was “Bureaucratic.” Here, Professor Y demonstrated how the formality of the communication process in strategic planning in higher education was conveyed by, in, and with specific terminology that had different meanings for stakeholders:

It is amazing because we spend a huge amount of time kind of mincing over every word that occurs in a mission statement and trying to define goals and objectives. You say we want to do this, well that is really not a goal; that is an objective. I went to the state for a committee and they used the opposite definition of goals and objectives that we had. You say, well, that is not an objective that is a goal. No it is not, you cannot even agree on what is a goal and an objective. It is hard to see that those are going to really be something that affects some kind of positive impact: We have a vision statement, we have core values, we have mission.
This participant became frustrated by the miscommunication and lack of shared understanding for the same terminology during the strategic planning process at his university. The researcher can only assume that this scenario also impeded progress and might have even been construed as a waste of time by some stakeholders.

The seventh relationship of this dissertation study’s core category to the seventh intermediate category was “Status Quo.” It both demonstrated and revealed that the communication process in strategic planning in higher education had dual meanings:

I think all strategic plans lack a lot of specificity because of fairly nebulous goals. All of these goals, strategies, and everything else were debated. First of all, they were developed in a committee and [then] debated by a committee as a whole and somewhere there has to be documentation I would think. Maybe not. Maybe no one did take notes or anything. But those debates are probably just as interesting as the actual hard copy of what was written down. We had flip charts and brainstorming on the flip charts [and] we dedicated ourselves to the process of development. I am not sure we dedicated ourselves to the process of enactment.”

First, the researcher interpreted Professor Y’s above comments to mean that the strategic planning process in higher education spent too much time on acquiring consensus regarding what goals to implement. Second, they indicated that a lack of clarity and disagreement existed when stakeholders discussed how those goals were to relate to the university mission statement.
Moreover, disagreement must have arisen when the State said that one of those goals must be to increase “access” (Ohio Board of Regents, 2008b, p. 104) to Ohio four-year public universities:

Access is almost a code word for associate degrees and a two-year program. That requires a nuance of what some of these terms and words mean but access is certainly a two-year program. You do not discuss access to a Ph. D. program. When they [politicians] talk about and emphasize access they are certainly talking about a different kind of university than you would expect from an urban research university. Undergraduate probably at the associate level, not undergraduate at the major kind of level – I would think access in a junior college than a research university.

The researcher also interpreted that Professor Y’s last line in his quote evolved from discord: University stakeholders experienced great strife when trying to align institutional goals to its mission statement and the State mandated access goal. Professor Y viewed the increased access afforded to students as a political issue that resulted specifically from the Ohio Ten Year Strategic Plan because, in his opinion, many students needed remediation. How did this relate to communication in the strategic planning process in higher education and Professor Y? The researcher provides supporting context to justify his above interpretation next.

Providing students increased access to public universities has historically been a contentious political issue in American higher education. To illustrate, American higher education had contextually struggled with educating all citizens; one exception being the Morrill Land Grant Act of 1862
which demarked “mass education . . . to develop more people for scientific and technical careers” (Geiger, 2005, p. 116). In 1887, the Hatch Act “funded agricultural experiment stations at land grant colleges” (Thelin, 2004, p. 135). Three years later, a second Morrill Act increased higher education access and stipulated that federal money be withheld from universities “that made distinctions of race in admissions” (West Virginia University, 2007). Might have this been our government’s discreet inception of Affirmative Action? This researcher noticed an historic political pattern that influenced American higher education from Jefferson’s post Civil War idea of “Creating a distinctive modern university for a new nation” (Thelin, 2004, p. 35) to the Morrill Land Grant Act of 1862 to the Hatch Act of 1887 to a second Morrill Land Grant in 1890 to the 1914 Cooperative Extension Program to Secretary Spellings Commission’s report, *A Test of Leadership* (USDOE, 2006).

The Spellings Commission’s report (USDOE, 2006) made reference to U. S. mass education as analogous to an “unfulfilled promise” (p, ix). This created “urgency [because] college [was foreseen as] . . . unattainable” (Spellings as cited in Duboff, 2006, p. 1) and represented the federal government’s call on higher education to help emulate the G. I. Bill’s success.

Comparatively, the earlier implemented Ph. D. programs at this participant’s university were perceived as very positive changes that were initiated by the state of Ohio and its *Strategic Plan*. (See the third
relationship of this dissertation study’s core category to the third intermediate category of “Political Prowess”). In this seventh relationship of this dissertation’s core category to “Status Quo,” however, the researcher deduced that there was initial distrust and fear about the Ohio Ten Year Strategic Plan during its inception. For example, this researcher attributed such fear to the preexisting meaning for specific terminology such as “access:” “Access is almost a code word for associate degrees and a two−year program.” He also understood that the state’s strategic plan for higher education began to eliminate some of the longstanding traditional barriers that have helped preserve a status quo in higher education (see tacit theory).

The eighth relationship of this dissertation study’s core category to the eighth intermediate category was “Communication.” It demonstrated and revealed that the communication process in strategic planning in higher education remained unclear because of differences in terminology used and understood differently:

Communication was identified as a problem as a first strike but communication starts with listening and gathering information. I think to a large extent that old saying “life is a journey and not a destination” [applies where] too many people saw our strategic plan as a destination and not a journey. . . . It is kind of interesting since we are probably going to be going through this again in a year but I think most presidents come in and decide they need a strategic plan because they feel they need one. If it is expected of them, they will do it but you can go through the motions of something without actually understanding the essence of it and I am not sure that they understood the essence of the strategic plan.
This researcher deemed that miscommunication and/or misunderstanding of what was conveyed comprised the crux of strategic planning: little shared understanding and the need for clearer communication of its definition, terminology, and purpose(s).

The ninth relationship of this dissertation study’s core category to the ninth intermediate category, “Capricious,” revealed that the communication process in strategic planning in higher education is vague: “Strategic plans themselves are written vaguely. Mission statements are a part of strategic planning but they are elevated in vagueness by a couple orders of magnitude.”

This researcher interpreted Professor Y’s above responses to indicate that the crux of strategic planning in higher education emanated from three points: First, there is little shared understanding between stakeholders in strategic planning in higher education and those leading the plan. Second, there is a need for clearer communication of the purpose(s) for what strategic planning in higher education is specifically being used for (i.e., measurement and its relation to assessment procedures). Third, it must be made explicit to all stakeholders that strategic planning in higher education cannot be all inclusive of everything and instantly remedy problems and/or immediately achieve goals.
The tenth relationship of this dissertation study’s core category to the tenth intermediate category, “Revolution,” revealed that the communication process in strategic planning in higher education can be obscured with political issues:

Access is almost a code word for associate degrees and a two-year program. That requires a nuance of what some of these terms and words mean but access is certainly a two-year program. You do not discuss access to a Ph. D. program. When they [politicians] talk about and emphasize access they are certainly talking about a different kind of university than you would expect from an urban research university. Undergraduate probably at the associate level, not undergraduate at the major kind of level – I would think access in a junior college than a research university.

The political issue portrayed in the above quote related to Ohio’s Ten Year Strategic Plan and its goal to increase student access. The researcher interpreted that Professor Y perceived his responsibilities as a faculty member to have consistently been the same since he began teaching. However, this researcher also noticed tension placed on the participant from the State goal to increase student access. Why? Providing increased access to students for them to enroll in universities often meant that faculty members had to address the issue of teaching remedial courses for those less prepared. Consequently, Professor Y felt unappreciated or underappreciated when he provided the response above: This participant also allotted time from his primary role of teaching to engage in his university’s strategic planning process.
Professor Y proceeded on to explain how his teaching related to his university’s mission statement:

On a day to day basis my work tends to be the same before we had these visions, core values, and mission. I assume kind of like the WHO song *The Revolution*: revolutions come and go but you still go to work and toil the fields or whatever. Certain things change cosmetically but they do not really change what you do. I would guess that long before we had mission and goals, the basic academic functions remain the same: we teach our classes; we introduce students to research; we try to perfect our courses.

Professor Y expressed his attitude to remain committed to teaching despite changes and increases to his responsibilities from his participation as a stakeholder in his university’s strategic planning. This researcher interpreted that this individual also understood the significance of being able to work with ambiguity during the strategy process in strategic planning in higher education.

What else did the data look like in stage 3? Later in stage 3, the researcher attained intermediate categories. There, major concepts and their definitions advanced category development until axial coding (stage 5) solidified and better represented them. Intermediate categories were formed and further separated into macro (the social context) and micro (the institutional context) (see table 7, columns 3 and 4): The researcher identified and defined these intermediate categories’ relationship to the situational, social, and historical contexts.
Table 7

**Intermediate Categories at the Macro Level Separated further into Concepts from the Micro and Macro Levels**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interview Question #</th>
<th>Professor Y Initial Categories</th>
<th>MICRO Level Concepts</th>
<th>MACRO Level Concepts</th>
<th>Professor Y Intermediate Categories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1Q1</td>
<td>Power Relations</td>
<td>Historical Context</td>
<td>SF Process = Situational Context</td>
<td>PRODUCTION of CAPITAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Understand SPP)</td>
<td>Individual Expertise</td>
<td></td>
<td>CT = &quot;Theory of Power Relations&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Understand SPP)</td>
<td>Political Process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1Q2</td>
<td>Individual Expertise</td>
<td>Historical Context</td>
<td>SF Process = Situational Context</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Understand SPP)</td>
<td>Positivist Paradigm</td>
<td></td>
<td>CT = &quot;Theory of Individual&quot;</td>
<td>HABITUS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1Q3</td>
<td>Measurement</td>
<td>Historical Context</td>
<td>SP Process = Situational Context &amp; Policy = Social Context</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Understand SPP) &amp;</td>
<td>Positivist Paradigm</td>
<td></td>
<td>CT = &quot;Theory of Power Relations&quot;</td>
<td>PRODUCTION of CAPITAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Relationship &amp; Policy)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CT = &quot;Theory of Social Structures&quot;</td>
<td>FIELD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1Q4</td>
<td>Bureaucratic</td>
<td>Historical Context</td>
<td>Policy = Social Context</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Relationship &amp; Policy)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CT = &quot;Theory of Power Relations&quot;</td>
<td>PRODUCTION of CAPITAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CT = &quot;Theory of Individual&quot;</td>
<td>HABITUS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1Q5</td>
<td>Status Quo</td>
<td>Historical Context</td>
<td>Policy = Social Context</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1Q5 CW RQ2)</td>
<td>Communication [IVC]</td>
<td></td>
<td>CT = &quot;Theory of Individual&quot;</td>
<td>HABITUS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1Q6</td>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>Historical Context</td>
<td>Policy = Social Context</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1Q6 CW RQ2)</td>
<td>Capitious [IVC]</td>
<td>ACCESS</td>
<td>CT = &quot;Theory of Power Relations&quot;</td>
<td>PRODUCTION of CAPITAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Relationship &amp; Policy)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CT = &quot;Theory of Individual&quot;</td>
<td>FIELD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>G招牌 [IVC]</td>
<td>ACCESS</td>
<td>CT = &quot;Theory of Social Structures&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1Q7</td>
<td>historical Context</td>
<td>SP Process = Situational Context &amp; Policy = Social Context</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1Q7 CW RQ1 &amp; RQ2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CT = &quot;Theory of Power Relations&quot;</td>
<td>PRODUCTION of CAPITAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Relationship &amp; Policy)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CT = &quot;Theory of Individual&quot;</td>
<td>FIELD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CT = &quot;Theory of Social Structures&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Relationship of the Core Category to Each Macro Level Category

The core category for this dissertation study was “communication” and arose from key responses that Professor Y had to the seven interview
questions posed by this researcher. It was presented earlier when this researcher analyzed the definitions of the core category to each initial category. Here, the researcher analyzes the relationship of this dissertation study’s core category to each category in the macro level (social context). Additionally, four intermediate categories emerged from analysis of macro and micro level concepts that related to the core category: (a) Production of Capital, (b) Habitus, (c) Field, and (d) Access.

The first relationship of this dissertation study’s core category to the first intermediate category at the macro level was “Production of Capital.” It revealed that the communication process in strategic planning in higher education historically had been relegated from the federal level to the state level down to public universities. This meant that, for example, the Spellings Commission’s report, *A Test of Leadership* (USDOE, 2006) influenced strategic planning in higher education. Specifically, the report’s goals were to increase access, affordability, accountability, and quality in higher education public universities which, in turn, would increase the educated work force in this country:

America’s national capacity for excellence, innovation and leadership in higher education will be central to our ability to sustain economic growth and social cohesiveness. Our colleges and universities will be a key source of the human and intellectual capital needed to increase workforce productivity and growth. They must also continue to be the major route for new generations of Americans to achieve social mobility. (USDOE, 2006, p. 7)
Secretary Spellings asked all higher education institutions to help alleviate social *immobility*, a societal problem not confined to community colleges. The Spellings Commission’s report suggested that states continue to develop higher education and historically preserve access to it through making tuition affordable. For this researcher, this goal demonstrated why Spellings emphasized social mobility: Higher education is the vehicle that provides its graduates with the expertise, knowledge, and skills to earn their financial stability, respect, responsibility, and autonomy which also improves the workforce and economy.

This researcher understood Spellings’ accountability goal to focus universities’ efforts on further developing the State’s economic growth: These social institutions would eventually graduate more students who provide a better skilled, educated, efficient, effective, critically-thinking, and problem solving labor force. The historic example provided in this dissertation of this phenomenon was when then Governor Strickland worked with then Chancellor Fingerhut to create Ohio’s statewide higher education system (see chapter 2).

The second relationship of this dissertation study’s core category to the second intermediate category at the macro level was “Habitus.” It exhibited that the communication process in strategic planning in higher education generated confusion that promulgated a political environment. “Habitus is a
more sociological idea referring to the set of internalized (learned and shared) dispositions and tastes that guide perception and action within the structural situations, or fields, that compose society” (Meisenhelder, 2006, p. 63)

The third relationship of this dissertation study’s core category to the third intermediate category at the macro level was “Field.” It demonstrated that the communication process in strategic planning in higher education remained separated by expertise, discipline, and job duties: Field placed faculty against administrators; business managers against employees; and military sergeants against lieutenants, commanders, and soldiers.

The fourth relationship of this dissertation study’s core category to the fourth intermediate category at the macro level, “Access,” revealed that the communication process in strategic planning in higher education ranged from top−down to horizontal to bottom−up.

**Stage four.** In stage 4, Define and Explain, the researcher essentially continued stage 3 but increased and directed his focus on developing greater specificity. It was an intermediate step where he examined how Professor Y partook in his four−year public university’s strategic planning. Here, the researcher wrote “early memos” (Charmaz, 2006, p. 80) and further developed existing and emerging categories. The researcher asked questions about these categories and concepts to make comparisons between them and better understand the participant’s involvement in his university’s strategic
planning. Three possible relationships between and/or among three constructs and several preliminary variables emerged: (a) faculty stakeholder participation in strategic planning in higher education, (b) other aspects of university policies related to its strategic planning, and (c) social issues.

Here, one theme with three subthemes, two metaphors, three propositions, and two social issues emerged throughout all 7 interview questions answered by Professor Y. The researcher analyzed each and explained how they corresponded with this dissertation’s two research questions: It exemplified another area where he applied quantitative rigor to his qualitative grounded theory. These subthemes are first collectively analyzed in stage 4. Their completed analyzed data was afterwards reassembled to finish the analytic storyline for strategic planning in higher education that began in stage 2.

This researcher identified one theme that linked to Professor Y’s understanding of the general strategic planning process at his university: high hopes and very involved. This theme was first identified in stage 2 where Professor Y claimed that the strategic planning process benefitted his university through the involvement of many internal and external stakeholders who used their individual expertise and experience: “We had people from the outside community; we had people representing all areas of
the academic sector, administrators, and some faculty members.”

Stakeholders projected confident expectations for their participation and believed it would positively impact the university, its strategic plan, the community, and students.

Professor Y first understood the strategic planning process at his university to be “very involved” and started out with “high hopes.” This theme emerged in interview question 2 and corresponded with research question 1. Interview question 2 asked the participant what his perceptions of the strategic planning process were at his university. The first research question investigated how faculty members who were involved in their strategic planning at selected Ohio four-year public state universities understood the general strategic planning process at the university level.

This theme also had three subthemes. Here, this researcher identified the first subtheme that related to Professor Y’s understanding of the general strategic planning process at his university: disappointment in the lack of measurement. He claimed that this disappointment arose from strategic planning being misunderstood by many; and that it must be a “dynamic event” rather than a “static” one. This participant equated the general strategic planning process at his university with assessment and not strategic planning. He stated that it followed a three step pattern of process where there was some “original analysis of the situation,” an “idea of how to
improve the situation,” and a “mechanism to affect improvement.” Change would ensue from its continual analysis and ideally be “cyclical.” Also see this participant’s operational definition late in stage 2 to see that stages overlap.

“Disappointment in the lack of measurement” emerged when the participant wove a speculative nuance in his argument regarding how the strategic planning process began at his university: “It followed a pattern where there was a lot of input, experience involved in it, and people had some belief that that was really going to benefit the institution.” Professor Y also declared his disappointment of the general strategic planning process at his university: “I’m very disappointed in the fact that the strategic plan, I don’t think, has ever been followed.” More explicitly, Professor Y believed that his disappointment emanated from eleven issues:

1. Individual expertise was not used,
2. Known assessment process was not used,
3. Lack of measurement on concrete products,
4. Strategic planning was not perceived as a continuous process,
5. Strategic planning structure was not followed,
6. No cyclical nature of implementation and evaluation,
7. Knowledge of assessment not applied to strategic planning,
8. Policy decisions were made without real data,
9. University lacked a business model approach,
10. University lacked cost–benefit (profit) analysis, and
11. Different plans were made by different committees.

Professor Y first understood the strategic planning process at his university to be ladened with “disappointment in the lack of measurement.” This first subtheme emerged in interview question 2 and corresponded with research question 1. Interview question 2 asked the participant what his perceptions of the strategic planning process were at his university. The first research question investigated how faculty members who were involved in their strategic planning at selected Ohio four–year public state universities understood the general strategic planning process at the university level.

This researcher identified a second subtheme that corresponded with Professor Y’s understanding of the general strategic planning process at his university and its relationship to policy: participants were discouraged because of their disappointment in the lack of measurement. It emerged in interview question 4, corresponded with research question 2, and was labeled by this researcher as “theme 2A.” Interview question 4 asked the participant what, if anything, came to mind about what was happening at the state level when they reflected back on their university’s strategic planning process. The second research question investigated how faculty members who were involved in strategic planning at their selected Ohio four–year public state
university described a relationship between the general process of strategic planning in higher education and other aspects of university policies.

This researcher identified a third subtheme that linked to Professor Y’s understanding of the general strategic planning process at his university and its relationship to policy: “same old same old.” This subtheme revealed one possible way universities may inadvertantly help perpetuate the societal status quo by not understanding how strategic planning’s shared context applied to higher education (i.e., tacit theory). Further, it identified the inability of quantitative data to measure strategic planning in higher education and help determine appropriate strategies to implement.

The first subtheme emerged in interview question 4, corresponded with research question 2, and was labeled by this researcher as “theme 2A.” Interview question 4 asked the participant what, if anything, came to mind about what was happening at the state level when he reflected back on his university’s strategic planning process. The second research question investigated how faculty members who were involved in strategic planning at their selected Ohio four-year public state university described a relationship between the general process of strategic planning in higher education and other aspects of university policies.

Summarily, one theme with three subthemes emerged from Professor Y’s transcript where the theme itself and the first subtheme related to the
strategic planning process and occurred in interview question 2. The second two subthemes related to the relationship between policy and strategic planning and occurred in interview question 4.

**One metaphor.** The only significant metaphor identified by this researcher related to how Professor Y understood communication that occurred during the strategic planning process in higher education. He declared:

> I think we certainly have a spectrum of understanding of what the strategic plan means, is, or should do kind of like the Blind People and The Elephant where one said the tail, one said the trunk [etc.] and you get very different interpretations. I do not think that we really had an elephant that was well defined as being an entity.

This metaphor revealed a second possible way how universities may inadvertently help perpetuate the societal status quo by not understanding how strategic planning’s shared context (i.e., communication) applied to higher education (i.e., tacit theory).

**Three propositions.** Three propositions that pertain to the strategic planning process in higher education arose throughout Professor Y’s transcribed and coded interview transcript:

1. “If revenues are not considered part of the formula [budgeting process vs assessment] then, how are you using anything in a strategic way?”
2. If faculty members are “always aware of federal and state priorities,” then, how does strategic planning at the state and federal levels that influences public universities affect them?

3. If faculty members are “always aware of federal and state priorities,” and the Ohio Ten Year Strategic Plan then, why would “access” be a contentious issue?

**Two social issues.** The first social issue that emerged from this participant’s analyzed transcript was the concept of an implicit contract (i.e., charter) made between public universities and society that was reintroduced again later in the social context section. Here, Professor Y claimed that:

Mission says we are going to be good people, we are going to do good things, [and] we are going to progress. I could probably take any mission statement at any institution across the country and they would look very similar. Therefore mission statements by themselves probably tend to be less informative and less something that you could really react to.

The researcher identified a third reason why public universities may inadvertently perpetuate the societal status quo.

The second social issue that emerged from this participant’s analyzed transcript was the concept of open access:

I would think you would be crazy not to make it in accordance with the state plan. I would venture to guess that our strategic plan will look very different next time than it does this time [now]. We will downplay the open access aspects of our institution. You have got to remember we have a community college in whatever form it is that certainly was not here when we did the Centennial plan either. It is not a bricks and mortar junior college, “it is let us use some space at
this technical school and let us use some space at this technical school.” They just had an article in the paper yesterday complaining: How come everybody else gets bricks, mortar, and a building and we get some delocalized kind of situation? I really believe that that open access aspect will really change because we will let the junior college be the open access as it is in most schools. You look at the difference between us and Cleveland State and we have almost exactly the same number of students and yet Cleveland State has something like 60 million dollars a year more in appropriations from the state. That is because all or a good number of their students are juniors, seniors, or graduate students because they let Cuyahoga Community College (Tri C) do the first two years. The first two years are cheaper, the student pays less, and as far as the state is concerned that is a perfect model. We have not been able to do that. We actually in 1970 whatever we proposed a junior college here and we were afraid, we the institution was afraid, that that would really cut into our students. So [people] said “put the junior college inside” and that has been a nightmare because you try and negotiate a labor contract from people that are basically junior college to people that are researchers like Ohio State and it is really hard to come up with a contract and satisfy all of those needs for those people. Maybe our strategic plan can be more tightly defined next time.

Stage five. In stage 5, Axial Coding, the researcher executed axial coding and finalized definitions for categories. Constant comparison of transcript codes to concept codes and definitions of each interview question “refined” (Charmaz, 2006) categories. Analytic memos supplied richer written text from Professor Y’s vivid descriptions. Sometimes analytic memos also highlighted important theoretical questions about themes and propositions and implicitly suggested possible areas that could be examined further by using theoretical sampling (i.e., stages 2 and 7).

This iterative strategy permitted the researcher to identify gaps in the primary data from Professor Y’s transcript: an awareness essential for
theoretical sampling and for determining the need for a possible follow-up interview(s) (stage 7). For example, this researcher identified a gap in the primary data to be how assessment and strategic planning in higher education are linked and/or related. One need for a possible follow-up interview was identified by this researcher to clarify why Professor Y related “tenure” to the process of strategic planning in higher education.

Axial coding also linked the central/core category “communication” in the strategic planning process in higher education “to all subcategories which contribute to it” (Grbich, 2007, p. 79). In a full grounded theory study, those subcategories would first be identified and afterwards be explained. At that point, it should also be probable that the researcher would expound upon the specific relationships within and between variables of a dimension. Each of those specific variables for who, what, where, when, and why strategic planning in higher education occurred for faculty members who are stakeholders in it based on their experiences.

Ideally, each variable’s relationship would delineate strategies used in strategic planning in higher education and help illustrate the significant influence of the local, state, and federal levels upon it (i.e., intervening conditions). Intervening conditions would then identify general situations where strategies occurred (i.e., social, economic, and political) that influenced them (Strauss & Corbin, 1990).
Stage six. In stage 6, Selective Coding, the researcher linked generated categories and propositions from open coding, axial coding, and interview questions. It more accurately depicted earlier organized properties and propositions in chapter 2 and significant social issues in strategic planning in higher education. Here, the “explanatory power” (Glaser, 2002a) of grounded theory emerged: The researcher identified social issues that occurred during strategic planning in higher education from analyzed primary data. Defined categories aided in locating new properties, themes, and patterns for social issues incurred in strategic planning in higher education and represented key elements to further analyze. Some of these key elements were in the form of propositions that identified possible “causal conditions” (Strauss & Corbin, 1990, 1998) and needed to be explored.

His structuring of selective coding occurred in two steps with his original defined categories/concepts (stage 4) that complemented analysis of generated properties and propositions. First, originally defined properties emerged during open coding as “attributes or characteristics pertaining to a category” (Strauss & Corbin, 1990, p. 61). They were located along a possible dimension (e.g., communication) to be analyzed further when generating future substantive and/or formal grounded theory. Second, propositions were directional hypotheses significantly related to categories discovered in the phenomena of this study. They appeared in the form of if/then statements
and helped demonstrate the importance for this dissertation’s research questions to “examine the relationship among variables rather than to compare groups” (Creswell, 2003, p. 111).

Identified causal conditions/relationships were also studied to determine how they related to the researched phenomenon: faculty stakeholder participation in strategic planning in higher education. Grounded theory identified influence through these conditions and emerged from primary data; they were also diagramed and presented in a model to illustrate process. For this dissertation’s situational context, for example, this process was the general military, business, and higher education strategy analysis process for strategic planning (see chapter 2). The researcher explained the relationship of identified influences to the phenomenon and narrated the story of strategic planning in higher education based on analysis afterwards.

Stage seven. Stage 7, Theoretical Sampling, applied conceptualization to generate the power of grounded theory and further refine one’s research to develop theory. It initially “directs you where to go” (Charmaz, 2006, p. 100) and better enables researchers to “obtain data to help explicate categories” (p. 100). Bron and Schemmann (2002) reminded researchers that during this process of conceptualization, the most significant “property” is the one that it is “abstract of time, place, and people” (p. 316).
Here, participant data identified specific issues within the seven posed interview questions and suggested possible need for more study and interviewing (i.e., possible theoretical sampling). The former might involve a second literature review to expound others’ theories that “extends, transcends, or challenges dominant ideas in your field” (Charmaz, 2006, p. 165). For example, this researcher identified a gap in the primary data to be how assessment and strategic planning in higher education are linked and/or related. An additional review of the literature might help close this gap.

The latter would involve additional interviewing and would include a heterogeneous sample or different participants to test validity. It differs from the need for a “possible follow−up interview” identified in stage 2 whose purpose was to close a gap in the primary data. Existing participant interviews are from a purposeful sample of faculty stakeholders in strategic planning in higher education. For example, one need for a possible follow−up interview was identified by this researcher to clarify why Professor Y related “tenure” to the process of strategic planning in higher education. If different participants were posed a question(s) to clarify this gap, validity might increase.

The researcher conducted theoretical coding to achieve theoretical saturation. It was the point where no new information added to the understanding of the fit between the general strategic planning process and
other aspects of university policies as described by faculty members. For this researcher, saturation occurred in stage 7 despite literature that emphasized that saturation primarily results from constant comparison in axial coding (stage 5). Why was saturation attained here in stage 7 rather than with axial coding in Stage 5? This researcher applied “flexible guidelines” (Charmaz, 2006, p. 61) instead of adhering to rigid procedures that might inhibit his work.

An example of a possible gap in primary data for Professor Y emanated from his earlier identification of his “disappointment” in his university’s strategic plan and his institution hiring of a new president:

I’m very disappointed in the fact that the strategic plan, I don’t think, has ever been followed. Obviously, some things in the plan are vague but they were not really the structure of the entire plan. Certainly, there has never been any cyclic nature to it, there has never been . . . how did the plan work? What should we have done differently? How should we improve it?

Imperative for theoretical sampling, this researcher identified the possible need here to conduct another interview with Professor Y to help determine how the communication process for strategic planning in higher education differs, if at all, with a change in leadership.

**Stage eight.** In stage 8, Generate Theory, the researcher explained the most significant relationship within and between properties of a dimension that best fit this dissertation’s study: Faculty stakeholder involvement in
strategic planning in higher education, higher education strategy (i.e., its
general strategic planning process), and other aspects of university policies.
This stage evoked realization of the possibility to attain a substantive and/or
formal theory.

**Stage nine.** In stage 9, the researcher wrote a comprehensive
summative conclusion of this storyline analytically: It permitted him to tell
the narrative for strategic planning in higher education constructed from the
overlapping analyses in his ten stage process model of grounded theory.
This researcher discovered that Professor Y’s understanding of the strategic
planning process in higher education at his university had a definite
beginning, middle, and end.

First, Professor Y understood the strategic planning process at his
university to begin with positive enthusiasm:

The whole process starts out with high hopes and *very involved*. We
had people from the outside community; we had people representing
all areas of the academic sector, administrators, and some faculty
members.

It commenced by collectively using individual stakeholder’s expertise and
experience in what this participant perceived as a Democratic process with
internal and external stakeholders. There were initial and immediate
positive experiences and expectations from this group of competent
individuals sincerely interested in the betterment of their university’s
excellence. Professor Y depicted himself as a faculty member serving with
administrative responsibilities who was familiar with the expectations of the accreditation experts from the Higher Learning Commission. In retrospect, the participant believed the only caveat that this group of stakeholders had was that they “tried to be all things to all people” and what usually results when you try to do that often results in “not be[ing] very good at anything or as good as you would like it to be.”

Second, Professor Y understood clear communication and shared comprehension to be problematic to the strategic planning process at his university during the midway point:

If it [strategic planning is] expected of [all involved], they will do it but you can go through the motions of something without actually understanding the essence of it and I am not sure that they understood the essence of the strategic plan.

This participant believed that, in his opinion, individual expertise was not used. Measurement of the strategic planning process did not include any known process used and resulted in a lack of measurement of concrete products. At this juncture, there were eight negative perceptions by this participant about the strategic planning process at his university:

(a) strategic planning was not perceived as a continuous process, (b) any structure to the process was not followed, (c) there was no cyclical nature of implementation and evaluation, (d) knowledge of assessment was not applied to strategic planning, (e) policy decisions were made without real data, that is, by traditional political beliefs and/or loyalties, (f) his university lacked what
he termed a business model approach, (g) he found his university to avoid using cost–benefit analysis, and (h) different plans were made by different committees.

Third, Professor Y understood the strategic planning process at his university not to be treated as a process. This meant that it was perceived and treated more as a “static event” rather than a “dynamic” one that involved a continual cycle where feedback permitted flexibility to modify decisions. This participant also claimed that Ohio policy controls individual universities’ strategic plan. This researcher interpreted this to mean that the Ohio Ten Year Strategic Plan (state strategic plan) had precedence over some individual aspects of each Ohio four–year public state university’s mission. For example, one of the Ohio Ten Year Strategic Plan’s strategic goals was to increase student access to public universities and offer more affordable tuition rates. Professor Y believed that regardless of that state strategic plan, each new university president brings to the institution his or her own strategic planning ideas with formation of new committees. Such transitions and changes, to this participant, meant the death of the existing and/or prior strategic plan and the inception of a new one (see figure 6).
Figure 6. A portrayal of the storyline for a grounded theory of faculty stakeholder understanding of the strategy process in strategic planning in higher education: Professor Y.

Stage ten. In stage 10, this researcher first organized his findings from analyses regarding discovered relationships between this faculty stakeholder in strategic planning in higher education, other university policies, and social issues. He then placed those discovered relationships in data displays (see tables 8, 9, and 10) to improve readers’ understanding of their significance. Final results for this ten stage process model for conducting qualitative grounded theory analysis led this researcher to develop a preliminary model for “Faculty Involvement for Professor Y” which he places in chapter 5 as a finding. For future studies, these ten stages can
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and should be repeated for all interview questions asked of each additional participant until analysis is complete.

Table 8 illustrates why grounded theory analysis presented in this researcher’s ten stage process model, or figure 5, appears to solely represent a linear process. However, stages of analysis overlap in each analyzed interview question and generate depth and rigor in the evolved codes and data for each as can be seen from this table. For this reason, table ten organizes some specific acquired participant concepts from this dissertation’s one interview. The researcher compares them to the phenomenon and demonstrates how the selected participant’s emerged concepts from fracturing primary data relate to each interview question (IQ) and research question (RQ) of this study. This process helps “locate [the] phenomenon” (Strauss & Corbin, 1990, p. 166).

Analyses by interview questions revealed that the first and second interview questions corresponded with the first research question whose purpose was to acquire primary data to understand the strategic planning process. Interview questions four, five, and six were in accord with the second research question whose gathered data described a relationship
Table 8

**Data of Professor Y for Ten Stage Process Model**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interview Question #</th>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>10 Stage Process Model Applied to Transcript</th>
<th>Resulting Transcript Codes</th>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>10 Stage Process Model Applied to Transcript</th>
<th>Resulting Data from Transcript</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EQ1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Line-By-Line Coding</td>
<td>[SCL(CU)]</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Line-By-Line Coding</td>
<td>[QUALITY]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQ1 CW EQ1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Frustration Data</td>
<td>[DBOP]</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Frustration Data</td>
<td>[COMPETENT]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[NAMFM]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Line-By-Line Coding</td>
<td>[SPPF II &amp; EI]</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Fracture Data</td>
<td>Theme 1A [WPSOW HH&amp;V]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E2 CW EQ1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Frustration Data</td>
<td>[SPPF = I]</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Define &amp; Expalin</td>
<td>Operational Def. 1 [ASSIST]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[SPPF PA]</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Define &amp; Expalin</td>
<td>Theme 1B [SP=STATIC]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[SPPF AWA &amp; NSP]</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Define &amp; Expalin</td>
<td>Proposition 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[SPPF 3 STEPS]</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Selective Coding</td>
<td>Proposition 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[WU, IHH, MFC &amp; EI]</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Selective Coding</td>
<td>Proposition 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Line-By-Line Coding</td>
<td>[SL=RRWA]</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Open Coding</td>
<td>Metaphor 1A [NEI]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4 CW EQ1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Frustration Data</td>
<td>[DFPS]</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Open Coding</td>
<td>Metaphor 2 [UMOC]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[UENSA SP]</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Define &amp; Expalin</td>
<td>Theme 1C [SP=DYNAMIC EVENT]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[FPCG SP&amp;D]</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Define &amp; Expalin</td>
<td>Proposition 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[PU T&amp;P]</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Define &amp; Expalin</td>
<td>Proposition 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[E, L &amp; FOSQ]</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Selective Coding</td>
<td>Proposition #2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Line-By-Line Coding</td>
<td>[CSL[SU]]</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Axial Coding</td>
<td>Pattern 1 [POOR COMMUNICATION]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E6 CW EQ2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Frustration Data</td>
<td>[NCO of SP D&amp;P]</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Selective Coding                          &amp; Theoretical Sampling</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[SPMAREI]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>=IST Link to Tactic Theory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[MOW U]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[SP = LAFIRE = IVC]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Line-By-Line Coding</td>
<td>[FT that [RS]]</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Open Coding</td>
<td>Metaphor 1C [NS TENURE]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E6 CW EQ2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Frustration Data</td>
<td>[WTFTEPS]</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Open Coding</td>
<td>Capricious [VIC I]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[BCO &amp; BSRF = [VIC]</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Open Coding</td>
<td>Metaphor 3 [REVOLUTION]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[EGOB = [TBSI]]</td>
<td>6 and 7</td>
<td>Selective Coding                          &amp; Theoretical Sampling</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[SN CT C FSQ]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Social Issue 2 in SP HEED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[PU T&amp;P]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>=NETWORKING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[P=CDI]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Proposition #5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[PCD]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[CAP = [VC]]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Line-By-Line Coding</td>
<td>[MPSO DO CE]</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Selective Coding</td>
<td>PART of Proposition #3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E7 CW EQ1 &amp; EQ2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Frustration Data</td>
<td>[LS]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[OHIOPIP = IFHPD]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[SN CT C FSQ]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

between strategic planning in higher education and policy. The third and seventh interview questions complemented both research questions (see table 9). Why is this important? This table illustrates the qualitative rigor applied in this dissertation where the researcher’s seven interview questions
are directly related to one or both research questions. Consequently, one interview sufficed for this study because it generated detailed participant responses and an abundance of imperative primary data to analyze.

Table 9

*The Relationship between This Dissertation’s Interview Questions and Research Questions – the Specific Conditional Matrix of Phenomenon*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specific Concepts</th>
<th>Strategic Planning in Higher Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Qualified, Competent, Political</td>
<td>Understand How Participant Defined the Strategic Planning Process  [IQ 1 and RQ 1]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others’ Responsibility, Quantitative, Causal, Analytic, Predictable</td>
<td>Understand the Strategic Planning Process  [IQ 2 and RQ 1]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualitative, Non Scientific, Non Empirical, Causal</td>
<td>Understand the Relationship between the Strategic Planning Process, Strategic Planning, and Policy  [IQ 3 and RQ 2]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Consuming, Dedicated, Going Through the Motions</td>
<td>Understand the Relationship between the Strategic Planning Process, Strategic Planning, and Policy  [IQ 4 and RQ 2]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repetitive, Redundant, Traditional, Uninformative, Disagreement</td>
<td>Understand the Relationship between the Strategic Planning Process, Strategic Planning, and Policy  [IQ 5 and RQ 2]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confusion, Expect Immediate Results, Façade, Reality</td>
<td>Understand the Relationship between the Strategic Planning Process, Strategic Planning, and Policy  [IQ 6 and RQ 2]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intentionally Broad, Strive for Perfection, Strive for Exactness, Detailed</td>
<td>Understand the Relationship between the Strategic Planning Process, Strategic Planning, and Policy  [IQ 7 and RQ 1 + RQ 2]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lastly, table 10 better illustrates how specific analyses that occurred in each stage overlapped in this researcher’s ten stage process model without the generated codes for the data that emerged. Here, the researcher also
provides a key that explicitly outlines the sophistication of his model’s analysis that generates qualitative rigor.

Table 10

**Analysis that Occurred at Each Stage**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STAGE 1</th>
<th>STAGE 2</th>
<th>STAGE 3</th>
<th>STAGE 4</th>
<th>STAGE 5</th>
<th>STAGE 6</th>
<th>STAGE 7</th>
<th>STAGE 8</th>
<th>STAGE 9</th>
<th>STAGE 10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L-B-LC</td>
<td>L-B-LC</td>
<td>L-B-LC</td>
<td>OCC</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>TS</td>
<td>GT</td>
<td>WA-GSA</td>
<td>DD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECTXTZTN</td>
<td>RECTXTZTN</td>
<td>OCB</td>
<td>D&amp;E</td>
<td>FNLZ DEFS</td>
<td>ID GAPS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GKW</td>
<td>RECTXTZTN</td>
<td>ABSTRACTN</td>
<td>I&amp;E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FDB</td>
<td>INITIAL CATS</td>
<td>DC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CCE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*AMW</td>
<td>*AMW</td>
<td>*AMW</td>
<td>*AMW</td>
<td>*AMW</td>
<td>*AMW</td>
<td>*AMW</td>
<td>*AMW</td>
<td>*AMW</td>
<td>*AMW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*CC</td>
<td>*CC</td>
<td>*CC</td>
<td>*CC</td>
<td>*CC</td>
<td>*CC</td>
<td>*CC</td>
<td>*CC</td>
<td>*CC</td>
<td>*CC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**KEY for TABLE 10**

- **ABSTRACTN**: Abstraction was applied
- **AC**: Axial Coding
- ***AMW**: Analytic Memo Writing can, sometimes does, and ideally should occur at each Stage 1–9
- ***CC**: Constant Comparison also can, sometimes does, and ideally should occur at each Stage 1–9
- **CCE**: Core Category Established
- **DC**: Define Concepts using the participant’s key words supported with analytic memos
- **DD**: Data Display
- **D&E**: Define key concepts/participant’s words & Explain – abstract concepts and apply analytic memos
- **FDB**: Fracturing Data begins
- **FNLZ DEFS**: Finalize Definitions for categories
- **GKW**: Generate Key Words from participant’s transcript
- **GT**: Generate Theory (i.e., substantive and/or formal)
- **ID GAPS**: Identify Gaps in primary data and determine need for further interviewing or research
- **I&E**: Identify & Explain emerged themes, subthemes, metaphors, propositions, and social issues
- **INITIAL CATS**: Initial Categories are formed
- **LBL C**: Line–by–Line Coding
- **OCB**: Open Coding Begins
- **OCC**: Open Coding Continued
- **RECTXTZTN**: Recontextualization
- **SC**: Selective Coding
- **TS**: Theoretical Sampling
- **WA-GSA**: Write Analysis by Generating your Storyline Analytically
Analysis of Situational, Social, and Historical Contexts

The researcher analyzes and discusses the situational, social, and historical contexts from the literature review (secondary data) in this second section. Further, he explains how each context section relates to this dissertation’s research questions. This establishes a guide for future comparative analysis of findings from primary data to the existing literature (i.e., from significant contexts in the primary data).

Situational context analysis. All strategic planning derived from the concept of strategy. Shared context for strategy formed a construct where military, business, and higher education strategy apply SWOT analysis relative to their environment when planning. Business and higher education specifically executed SWOT in their strategic planning models’ core process (see chapter 2). Strategy’s shared context also produced the thread for chapter 2 where SWOT analysis remained woven through many business and higher education strategic planning models. It remained the core process to many business and strategic planning in higher education models with how it is communicated between managers (vertically) and internal stakeholders (horizontally). The type of communication structure in both fields determined the pattern of strategy development (i.e., top-down or bottom-up).
Military strategy in the first section of chapter 2 introduced how it formed a shared context with strategy in business and higher education. Shared context for strategy formed a construct where all three (military, business, and higher education strategy) applied SWOT analysis relative to their environment when planning: business and higher education specifically in their strategic planning models’ core process (see chapter 2 figures 2, 3, and 4). Strategy’s shared context also produced the thread for chapter two where SWOT analysis remained woven through many business and higher education strategic planning models. More specifically, SWOT analysis remained the core process to many business and postsecondary strategic planning models with how it was communicated between managers (vertically) and internal stakeholders (horizontally). Top-down, horizontal, and bottom-up communication applied in each of these disciplines determined the pattern of strategy development.

Secondary data revealed the origin of SWOT analysis as a construct in military strategy, and its development as a core strategic planning process in business and higher education strategy. All three fields maximized strengths, minimized weaknesses, maximized opportunities, and exploited threats in their strategic planning. Discussion of strategy continues next with its shared context derived from its applications in military, business, and higher education.
This researcher discovered that three properties (i.e., process, communication, and purpose) further explained the strategic planning strategy processes as a dimension. There, quantitative measured military, business, and higher education variables were deemed significant. Military strategy categorized properties’ attributes into political, economic, ideological, and social (PEIS) quantitative variables to analyze significance. “[T]he concept of strategy went beyond the use of armed violence to cover the whole arsenal of means of policy, including the political, economic, ideological, and techno–scientific” (Lider, 1983, p. 192). However, business strategy (see Welch as cited in Ocasio & Joseph, 2008) and higher education strategy (see Dolence & Norris, 1994) categorized properties’ attributes formed a joint construct: an idea for a possible theory. Their political, economic, social, and technological (PEST) quantitative variables were used in the same environment and paralleled each other’s strategy development and strategic planning: Businesses and higher education institutions executed strategy to build support for and promote their mission statements in strategic planning, justify monetary expenditures (i.e., accountability), and help the community (i.e., fulfill social responsibility).

Military, business, and higher education SWOT analysis variable categorizations denoted numeric quantities of specific internal and external environmental attributes that fell within an exact classification. The
military grouped ideological empirical variables (I in PEIS) whereas business and higher education instead included a group for technological ones (T in PEST).

More explicitly, this strategy process in all three fields was comprised of elements and properties along the strategy process dimension. Here, military PEIS and business and higher education PEST variables for evaluation were further arranged into quantitative categories before analysis determined their predictive importance: Distinct interval and ratio variables were integrated into SWOT analysis and determined quantitative significance, strength, and predictive power. Significant for this scholarly thesis, strategic planning circumstances (i.e., strategy properties and their attributes) that modified or influenced strategic planning were demonstrated and portrayed in the literature review. They consisted of the situational, social, and historical contexts in this chapter and helped establish qualitative validity and significance. Here, contexts further organized a more complete understanding of the research topic and clarified the relationship between it, the study’s objective, research questions, and analysis of primary data.

Both properties within and between this strategy process dimension presented “new pieces to the research puzzle” (Charmaz, 2006, p. 14) uncovered in axial codes (i.e., categories and subcategories). During axial coding, tactics and strategy provided a means to compare, contrast, and
explain specific differences within military planning and strategic planning in business higher education. Collectively they identified “the form and nature” of “polarities” (Huberman & Miles, 2002, p. 322) in strategic planning and enabled their relationship with specific codes to be further explained in further research (i.e., a full-fledged grounded theory). Alternatively, the extreme characteristics of properties demonstrated the difference of tactics and strategy as an element within and between the strategy process dimension.

**Social context analysis.** Historical importance for analysis of the social context emanated from the patterned federal influence on higher education strategic planning. This federal influence continued to impel change in universities mission statements’ to include their access, accountability, affordability, and quality goals. This researcher traced this fact to how both the 1944 G. I. Bill and President Truman’s 1947 Commission on Higher Education further influenced universities to fulfill social responsibility. The former prompted colleges and universities to open their admission, retrain returning veterans, help with their transition back into society as employees, and “made access to higher education a national priority” (USDOE, 2006, p. ix). The latter accomplished three goals: First, it proposed “massive expansion of access to college” (Perkins, 2006, p. 1). Second, it ended “racial and religious discrimination” (p. 1). Third, it “defin[ed] the responsibilities of
[American] colleges and universities . . . in the light of the social role [they] play” (Truman Commission, Electronic Citation, 2009).

This same federal influence on higher education strategic planning also had negative implications for universities’ fulfillment of social responsibility. A negative result of higher education’s industrial approach to university education arose after the Industrial Age and revealed itself in former Secretary Spellings Commission’s (2006) description of American higher education as a “decentralized system that has no comprehensive strategy . . . to provide either adequate internal accountability or effective public information [Italics Added]” (USDOE, 2006, p. 14). Where American higher education has been asked to help alleviate social immobility perpetuated by such an industrial approach (i.e., Spellings Commission), Sullivan (2004) identified U. S. social immobility as representing higher education’s inability to “educate the masses” and “institutions are viewed as dispensers of degrees” (Zemsky, 2003, p. B8).

Further, Secretary Spellings Commission’s (2006) described American higher education as a “decentralized system that has no comprehensive strategy . . . to provide either adequate internal accountability systems or effective public information” (USDOE, 2006, p. 14). Where American higher education had been asked to help alleviate social immobility perpetuated by such an industrial approach (e.g., Spellings Commission), Sullivan (2004)
identified U. S. social \textit{immobility} as representing higher education’s inability to “educate the masses . . . institutions are viewed as dispensers of degrees” (p. B8). He juxtaposed Duderstadt’s (1999) above finding of an American higher education industrial approach’s benefit and applies insightful reality to a problematic higher education systemic weakness stemming from it: American higher education’s continued transformation to a learning organization. Defined as universities that “embrace continual transformation [and] unlearn old and outdated practices in a constructive way [to implement] new ideas and ways of working rather than reinventing a variation of the status quo” (Baker, 2007, p. 133), these organizations met and exceeded lifelong learners’ needs. Change from an industrial society to an information society led to a selected few privileged students attending universities to many students now being treated as customers (lifelong learners) and receiving the opportunity to acquire their college education.

\textbf{Historical context analysis.} The United States Department of Education and its Commissions’ studies have historically influenced strategic planning and impacted policy in American higher education. For example, the 1967 California \textit{Master Plan} (California State Department of Education, 1960) and the Spellings Commission’s report, \textit{A Test of Leadership} (USDOE, 2006) responded to public demand in America for state universities to provide increased access to students. Historically, the 1967 California \textit{Master Plan}
essentially created and developed a state system for California whereby graduated students from its community colleges fed into the state’s public universities. However, they both coincided with the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education’s “fourth purpose” to provide “universal access” (Mayhew, 1973, p. 116). Both also sought to improve accountability standards and helped shape strategic planning in higher education.

The Ohio Ten Year Strategic Plan for Higher Education strategic plan exemplifies a somewhat more recent example. Its four “access, quality, affordability/efficiency, economic leadership” and “accountability measures” (Ohio Board of Regents, 2008b, pp. 103–104) parallel the Spellings Commission’s report, A Test of Leadership (USDOE, 2006) access, accountability, and affordability goals. The interaction of increased public demand for greater access to universities with the goal of improving the economy through an educated workforce in 2006 led to policy change (see chapter 2). This change was also partly effectuated through the U. S. Department of Education’s (2006) strategic plan to increase “human and intellectual capital” (p. 7) (see chapter 5).
Chapter 5

Conclusions, Discussions, and Recommendations for Future Study

Chapter 5 presents this researcher’s conclusions, dissuasions, and recommendations for future study. He concluded from this study’s findings (chapter 4) that the four areas of potential significance identified in chapter one were attained. First, this dissertation study served as a foundation to generate formal theory: The researcher developed his ten stage process model in chapter 4 for conducting qualitative grounded theory analysis. There, he depicted, described, and explained how he evaluated his participant’s responses and provided specific examples of analyzed primary data. His model served as a foundation for other researchers to follow and execute grounded theory analysis strategies when they develop their substantive and/or formal theory.

Second, this dissertation study helped close the gap between higher education research and practice: It implemented progress towards a new qualitative paradigm that the researcher explains in the following paragraphs. This advancement exemplified what Lincoln (2010) discussed in her article: “What a long, strange trip it’s been . . . : Twenty−five years of qualitative and new paradigm research.” Lincoln’s article revealed that her purpose was “to talk about the past 20 years of qualitative research: Where had we been? Where were we now? Where were we going?” (p. 3). This
researcher understood the significance of this article’s claim for him, his dissertation, and its study to emphasize the imperative need to develop and/or generate future theory that applies a new qualitative paradigm.

To illustrate, Lincoln (2010) declared that the Scientific Method was the traditional research method that produced reliability, generalizability, replicability, and validity. It is obvious to qualitative researchers that all of the elements above are not attainable using qualitative methodology; particularly generalizability. However, based on this dissertation study’s findings, neither should the inability for qualitative research to generalize preclude those researchers from striving ever closer to attaining a new paradigm. Nor should the predominance of the existing quantitative methodology detract from their further development and presentation of qualitative rigor essential to increase its validity and reliability:

Cumulation of knowledge in the positivist paradigm is fairly straightforward. As the format for propositional knowledge is virtually always theory (or a set of testable hypotheses) and the object of knowledge seeking and knowledge generation in theory development, additions to the knowledge base are accessible and assessable, and the terminus of the intellectual project is frequently theory that provides for both prediction and control. (p. 5)

This researcher agrees with Lincoln’s (2010) statement above regarding the positivist paradigm. However, he also understands the need for qualitative researchers to advance development of qualitative rigor in response to the positivist paradigm. Why? His dissertation study implemented qualitative grounded theory methodology that applied and
honored the rigor of quantitative analyses and the power of conceptualization.
Consequently, he better explained the strategic planning process in higher education and helped close the gap between its research and applied practice.

Third, this study aided possible development of new higher education policy because it demonstrated the power of qualitative research to reveal problems in complex, sometimes tumultuous, social issues. How does this apply to policy development in higher education? Historically, higher education institutions have presented a valuable and opportunistic environment for students to increase their exposure to and acquire greater understanding of cultural diversity. Universities, especially public ones, also provided students with the ability to participate in future assimilation to increase their social mobility, status, and personal earning power. Public universities that afford students increased access directly and indirectly modified how class structures either maintain the societal status quo or improve social mobility of them through graduation of students. The above context portrays significance for policy development in higher education.

Fourth, this study contributed new knowledge to the literature. The researcher discovered that higher education tends to over rely on quantitative analysis to determine power. The Scientific Method, for example, is a process where an experiment is tested, observed, and measured to determine its reliability, replicability, and validity. Collectively, these
elements determine predictability of hypotheses, control for and/or eliminate bias, identify significant variables, and generate numeric values to interpret.

However, determining importance for a qualitative phenomenon such as strategic planning in higher education is problematic. Strategic planning in higher education is a social science. Its interval and ratio variables have traditionally been measured quantitatively to aid final decision-making. For example, cost–benefit analysis represents one specific common strategy or method applied in strategic planning that calculates exact profit/loss dollar amounts. It is often used by researchers and others to conduct “what-if” analysis to help determine the point where one achieves the maximum return on investment (i.e., profit) before losses are incurred. Alternatively stated, cost–benefit analysis enables researchers and others to identify the juncture where the law of diminishing returns commences: more losses are incurred than any profit generated. Herein exists where the paradox of measurement for strategic planning in higher education resides and the researcher made a contribution to new knowledge in the higher education literature. Specifically, this dissertation study contributed new knowledge to the literature because this researcher developed a model for how to apply greater qualitative rigor to empirical studies and increase their reliability and validity.
The Analytic Onus Experienced by this Researcher

Here, the researcher communicates in first person to demonstrate ownership of his ethical principles, his scholarly opinion, and his disciplinary expertise. I, as a qualitative grounded theory researcher, disagree with Glaser (1992) that Strauss’s (1990; 1998) method is “totally unnecessary, laborious, and is a waste of time” (Glaser, 1992, p. 43). For me, Strauss’s method enabled my more profound understanding and ownership of my research. I found that executing constant comparison for the sake of implementing it did not permit me to apply quantitative rigor to qualitative grounded theory analysis that Lincoln (2010) discussed as being vitally imperative to advance the grounded theory/qualitative research paradigm. I also disagree with Glaser (1992) that constant comparison should be applied because it “gets the analyst to the desired conceptual power quickly, with ease and joy” (p. 43). That is an oxymoron! Grounded theory entails arduous work, attention to meticulous detail, and constant comparison: researchers ought not to promote the value of their method because of the “ease” that it affords over sacrificing rigor. It is precisely that qualitative rigor that yields more valid results, better data integrity, and improves its successful interdisciplinary practice!

Further, qualitative researchers should be competent enough to place methodological debates and/or arguments aside. They must have the requisite discipline, patience, fortitude, and conceptual and writing skills to
thoroughly project clarity, develop fluidity, and generate valuable new
knowledge. Qualitative researchers’ ability to achieve this, to simultaneously
be aware of the evolving product, and to adroitly partake in how these skills
help close a gap in a discipline or disciplines becomes the joy of research!

**Discussion of Strategy Analysis in Strategic Planning in Higher Education**

Military SWOT analysis incited a core framework for business and
higher education strategy and strategic planning through evaluation of its
political, environmental, ideological, and social (PEIS) empirical variables. It
initially grouped variables into PEIS categories often derived from specific
battlefield internal and external environmental attributes. Business and
higher education, however, organized variables into political, economic,
social, and technological (PEST) categories derived from specific market
internal and external environmental attributes. PEIS and PEST
categorizations could then be separated according to quantitative nominal,
ordinal, interval, and ratio variables and scales. But only their interval and
ratio numerical measurable amounts/values were applied to statistical
formulas to determine their quantitative predictive power. This analysis was
further modified by business (see Mintzberg, 1990a, 1990b, 1994; Mintzberg,
et al., 1998) and higher education (see Dolence & Norris, 1994; Sevier, 2000).
It became the analytical process applied in most strategic planning models.

The above discussion of strategy analysis, the literature review, and
this researcher’s deduced argument from it provide a significant base for the
development of future formal grounded theory. There, emerged codes from transcripts that related to the within and between properties shared by and among specific categories of an exact phenomenon (i.e., communication in planning) will determine the theory.

**Discussion of the Higher Education Fit to this Study**

The Spellings Commission communicated its assessment of American public higher education. Social and critical theories provided a foundation to critique the Commission’s report on higher education accreditation and accountability. American public higher education tended to academically exude rich traditions through theoretical discourse albeit more frequently within the context of students’ specialization. Social theory is broader than critical theory and it provided valuable context to the latter’s importance as a specific methodology. More explicitly, social theory enabled researchers to study higher education and determine more appropriate modifications so these institutions could better fulfill their social responsibility (Fay, 1987; Morrow & Brown, 1994).

Dewey’s contributions to education theory and discussion of the environment’s influence on molding individuals’ behavior into “external habits of action” (1916, p. 14) helped justify critical theory’s emancipatory action against the status quo and oppression. He identified students’ personal struggle as a conflict between limitations of their social status and pressure to conform to industrialism. He also believed that students’
classroom conduct was motivated by their personal desire to acquire competency (Dewey, 1924, p. 119). His education theory complemented critical theorists’ perspectives (e.g. − Gramsci’s Hegemony; Freire’s Popular Education and Conscientization; Bourdieu’s Cultural Capital of Consumption) and provided more credibility to the Spellings Commission’s report, *A Test of Leadership* (USDOE, 2006).

**Further Assumptions for Future Study**

This researcher identified five assumptions for the application of his ten stage process model for conducting qualitative grounded theory. First, this model has significance for development of future substantive and/or formal qualitative theory. Second, this model’s process is pertinent to understand so that qualitative grounded theory can be more successfully conducted. For this dissertation, this process has already proven beneficial to better understand strategic planning in higher education and other policies that occur during its implementation. Such awareness is essential to more efficiently determine the relationship between strategic planning in higher education and policy development in higher education. Third, this model will only work if all 10 stages are followed, executed, and completed in their entirety. If future researchers selectively choose which stages that they want and/or are going to apply, the result will be haphazardly conducted qualitative analysis with low rigor. Fourth, although this model was depicted as a linear process, grounded theory analysis is recursive and overlapping in
each and/or differing stages. Fifth, this model generates clarity for each topic that is subjected to its rigor: strategic planning in higher education and faculty stakeholder involvement for this dissertation.

**Conclusion to Dissertation**

The conclusion to this dissertation has two sections: First, the researcher includes two poems that he wrote during his analysis of the literature review for strategic planning in higher education and critical theory. These poems served as a guide to the overall portrayal of the strategy process in all strategic planning and signaled change in the qualitative paradigm. This meant that the researcher veered from strict adherence to application of one sole qualitative genre and included a portion of others in this work to provide greater rigor. Afterwards, this researcher presents his last section for this dissertation where he provides his recommendations for future and further study.
Strategic Planning in Higher Education and the Literature

So frequently in strategic planning in higher education
The university president often leads
Promoting his institutional vision
Acquiescent discontent visibly seen

Strategic planning evolved from military strategy and planning
Where quantitative analyses became doctrinal tenet
And proverbial internal/external environmental scanning
Grouped strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats

Military strategy analysis determined significance
Where process incited strategic planning’s shared context
With measured variables that determined relevance
And resolved the plan to execute using which tactics

Business strategy analysis compelled decisions to win
Where plans were developed to achieve company goals
With top–down communication: vertical management
To generate maximum profit and maintain control

Higher education strategy analysis examined to inform
Where plans conveyed military and business terminology
With steadfast endeavor to accurately perform
Are scientifically limited and undeveloped qualitatively

Each execute strategy unique to their discipline
Where it develops specific applications for their specialties
It befits different field professionals and experts within
And remains inter–disciplinarily disconnected, theoretically

Military science, management science, and philosophical logic
Three disciplines that each practice their own strategic management
To achieve certain goals, they sometimes apply tactics
But they all provide other frameworks with organized precepts

Confusion derives from borrowed military terminology:
The military “deploys” forces deemed appropriate
Businesses engage in “frontal attack” marketing strategy
And higher education “speedily surprises” its market to differentiate
Specialization compounds the problem indefinitely:
  Military science exercises tactics and speed
Management science calculates process probability
While philosophical logic preaches Aristotelian Creed

All three disciplines’ stakeholder groups proclaim
  To correctly describe an attribute of this beast
  But it remains poorly defined and explained
  And results in isolated disparate beliefs

Military stakeholders quarrel over forecasts
  They claim to know how to plan strategically:
  Military strategy renders the enemy aghast
  And predicts future gains and victory

Business stakeholders disagree over process
  They also claim to know what strategic planning means:
  Business strategy generates quantitative analyses
  And battles for increased revenues to be gleaned

Higher education stakeholders argue over control
  They too profess to know what strategic planning means:
  Higher education strategy achieves long term goals
  And philosophizes over policy, politics, and autonomies

The strategic planning in higher education pachyderm
  Perceived differently in its environment
  Roams freely where academicians discern
  If it is more like a rhino, hippo, or an elephant
  Currently understood by its generated ambiance
  With a shared meaning that exudes continuous reticence

— Ludy Glenn Aponte (2010)

“So oft in [strategic planning] wars,
  The disputants, I ween,
  Rail on in utter ignorance
  Of what each other mean[s]
  And prate about an elephant
  Not one of them has seen!”

— Saxe, 1873
(Ludy Glenn Aponte, 2010)
Critical Theory Critique of the Strategic Planning Pachyderm

So frequently in higher education strategic planning
Communication remains top down
And three “agreed upon patterns of interpretation” (Habermas, 1990, p. 135)
Of time, space, and status quo abound

*Time* is the first pattern – old as the sun
That weathers what is discussed and learned
Where all questions disintegrate, into a trite *one*
And disagreement, like fog, is never heard

*Space* is the second pattern – a black hole which looms
That portrays “relations of identity and difference” (Bourdieu, 1988, p. 2)
Where portentous power abandons some, leaves others consumed
And programs subconscious commands for deference

*Status quo* is the third pattern – incessant maintained tradition
That perpetrates infinite pursuits to oppress
Where intellect stagnates from imposed sedition
And inhibits emancipatory redress

The higher education strategic planning pachyderm
Meets where the “commons” for planning resides
And its committee members struggle to discern
Which messages to “process, filter, and synthesize” (Habermas, 1996, p. 360)

This beast’s bureaucratic communication
And misunderstood shared context bestow
Wasted time and confusion in discussion
No matter whether an elephant, hippo, or rhino

Three theories – habitus, field, and capital embody its core
That provide higher education philosophical insight
On planning dilemmas that cannot be ignored
And offer possible relief to strategic planning strife

Why should professors augment their power of *habitus*?
When “only the measurable achievement counts and is paid for”
(Bernfeld, 1973, p. 14)
And educational theory, as a science, remains dubious
Besieged by its perceived value in the academic sector
Why should universities help cultivate the *social structure/field*? To lessen problems with access, accountability, and affordability When unremitted contention remains with business administration A discipline that, by itself, tends to promulgate superiority

Why should higher education partake in the *production of capital*? When it has its own struggle with top down managerial control Where faculty and administrators differently define professional And each avoids the other’s work and oversight by the Yeshiva Patrol

The higher education strategic planning pachyderm Meets where the “commons” for planning resides And its committee members struggle to discern Which messages to “process, filter, and synthesize” (Habermas, 1996, p. 360)

This beast’s bureaucratic communication And misunderstood shared context bestow Wasted time and confusion in discussion No matter whether an elephant, hippo, or rhino

Three stakeholder groups participate in its democratic culture: The *military*, some *businesses*, and *higher education institutions* Where forecasts, processes, and managerial practices endure Which *treat* “the mathematical malady” (Bourdieu, 1992, p. 45) through quantitative examinations

The first stakeholder group helps *extirpate social disparities* And claims to ameliorate combative upheaval – Apply military strategy to render an enemy helpless quickly To regenerate and restore a healthy government by the people

The second stakeholder group *eradicates competition* And claims to help ameliorate public accountability – Apply business strategy to promote maximum profit generation To help strengthen and nourish a weak economy

The third stakeholder group *extricates necrotic philosophy* And deliberates over policy, priority, and autonomies – Apply higher education strategy and help emancipate society To alleviate static access, affordability, and accountability
The higher education strategic planning pachyderm
Meets where the “commons” for planning resides
And its committee members struggle to discern
Which messages to “process, filter, and synthesize” (Habermas, 1996, p. 360)

This beast’s bureaucratic communication
And misunderstood shared context bestow
Wasted time and confusion in discussion
No matter whether an elephant, hippo, or rhino

Three meanings ensue from its course journey
Where university strategic planning emulates the struggle of Sisyphus
When it results in a comedy, drama, or tragedy
And communication promulgates intellectual abyss

The first meaning envelops strategic planning as comedy
Where struggle to obtain strategy consensus emanates
When administrators disseminate specialized terminology
And naïveté amongst stakeholders ruminates

The second meaning composes strategic planning as drama
Where struggle to understand shared purpose is symbolic
When planning efforts to collaborate create dilemmas
And expressed concerns by stakeholders are histrionic

The third meaning generates strategic planning as tragedy
Where struggle to obtain unison collective effort resides
When stakeholders debate over myriads of policy
And, after abundant time, money, and effort: the plan dies

The higher education strategic planning pachyderm
Meets where the “commons” for planning resides
And its committee members struggle to discern
Which messages to “process, filter, and synthesize” (Habermas, 1996, p. 360)

This beast’s bureaucratic communication
And misunderstood shared context bestow
Wasted time and confusion in discussion
No matter whether an elephant, hippo, or rhino
Opinions differ over “notorious operational definition” (Bourdieu, 1992, p. 43)
Oh, how disgruntled pachyderms argue, complain, and disagree
Where meaning is found in struggle – critical thinking attrition
And attitudes promote attainment of the societal status quo degree

Multifarious, pluralistic, and multicultural
That higher education strategic planning pachyderm
Where many times it adversely is portrayed as political
And solely understood through conveyed specialized terms

Today’s beast exhibits an aura of “reflexivity” (Habermas, 1994)
That casts doubt on empiricism’s dichotomous practice
Where those with “self-conscious insight” (Foster, 2005, p. 105) roam free
Avoiding deceptive, cyclical, poaching analysis

Restrained by the desired scientific quantitative epistemology
That has been tested in laboratory experiments
Where variables are placed in predictive category
Analyzed to determine if replicable and significant

The higher education strategic planning pachyderm currently perceived:
From its arduous struggle that cultivates esteemed intuition
Wise: but stubborn with its endured, imposed traditional limitations indeed
Where strategic planning success has yet to revel in fruition
Recognized as a wall, spear, snake, rope, fan, or tree – originally
Which corresponded to its body, tusk, trunk, tail, ear, or leg – respectively

–Ludy Glenn Aponte (2009)

“So oft in wars,
The disputants, I ween,
Rail on in utter ignorance
Of what each other mean[s]
And prate about an elephant
Not one of them has seen!”
(Saxe, 1873)

Note: Elephant illustration (C) Jason Hunt: www.Naturalchild.org/jason
This Researcher’s Recommendations for Future and Further Study

This researcher has five recommendations for future and further study. First, the shared dimension between strategy and strategic planning in the military, business, and higher education and developed codes/categories must be studied further to determine their significance to larger social issues. Second, themes identified in chapter 4 should be comparatively analyzed to those derived from other qualitative studies’ primary data that share contexts. This would reveal even greater power of grounded theory abstraction from conceptualization and place researchers closer to developing and/or generating formal theory. Third, the propositions in Chapter 1 need to be applied to future studies whose propositions from their interviews’ primary data can be compared to, analyzed with, and described together. Both would increase validity, significance, and further development of theory that can be successfully applied to current practice(s). Fourth, this researcher deems it very likely that other topics such as assessment, curriculum development, and total quality management have a significant relationship to strategic planning in higher education. Those relationships must be qualitatively studied. Fifth, this researcher recommends further study on his initial portrayal of Professor Y’s faculty involvement in strategic planning in higher education: It has the potential for a second, and very specific, qualitative study that would most probably lead to a definite theory.
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Appendix A

Definitions of Terminology

**Academic Freedom.** Academic freedom refers to professors having protection of their teaching rights in “discussing their subject without introducing controversial matters [that] have no relation to their subject” (American Association of University Professors, 2006, p. 3).

**Aligning.** Aligning is the act of “recognizing and exploiting knowledge about an institution’s strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats to achieve congruity between the institution and the environment” (Rowley et al., 1997, p. 14) through strategic planning in higher education.

**Assessment.** Assessment is “the gathering of information (measurement) and the utilization of that measurement for institutional and individual improvement (evaluation)” (Astin, 1993a, p. 2).

**Axial Coding (A).** Axial coding is a step in the coding process [that] follows open coding. The researcher takes the open coding categories, identifies one as the central phenomenon, and returns to the database to identify: (a) what caused this phenomenon to occur, (b) what strategies and/or actions actors employed in response to it, (c) what (specific) context and interviewing conditions (broad context) influenced the strategies, and (d) what consequences resulted from these strategies; the overall process is one of relating categories of information to the central phenomenon category. (Strauss & Corbin as cited in Creswell, 1998, p. 57)

**Axial Coding (B).** Axial coding “involves taking one category which has emerged in [grounded theory’s] open coding and linking it to all the subcategories which contribute to it” appearing as a stem and leaf diagram (Grbich, 2007, p. 79).
Bracketing (A). Bracketing is “the means by which researchers endeavor not to allow their assumptions to shape the data collection process and the persistent effort not to impose their own understanding and constructions on the data are known as bracketing” (Crotty as cited in Ahern, 1999, p. 407).

Bracketing (B). Bracketing is an iterative, reflexive journey that entails preparation, action, evaluation, and systematic feedback about the effectiveness of the process. The advantage of this process is that the researcher’s energies are spent more productively in trying to understand the effects of one’s experiences rather than engaging in futile attempts to eliminate them. (Porter as cited in Ahern, 1999, p. 408)

Causal Conditions. Causal conditions occur “in axial coding” and “are the categories of conditions [identified] that influence the central phenomenon” (Creswell, 1998, p. 57).

Central Phenomenon. A central phenomenon is an aspect of axial coding and the formation of the visual theory, model, or paradigm. Open coding entails that the researcher choose a central category around which to develop the theory. The central category is chosen by examining open coding categories and selecting one that holds the most conceptual interest, is most frequently discussed by study participants, and is most ‘saturated’ with information; it is then placed at the center of the grounded theory model and labeled ‘central phenomenon.’ (Creswell, 1998, pp. 150–151)

Charter. Charter is also known as universities’ article of incorporation that specifies their rights and privileges between themselves and the public: “the concept of charter suggests that higher education and society are always negotiating an appropriate relationship . . . an international idea” (Brubacher & Rudy, 1997 as cited in Kezar, 2004, p. 431).

Collegium. Collegium is “the complex network of assumptions, traditions, protocols, relations, and structures within the university which permit the professoriate to control and conduct the academic affairs of the institution” (Downey, 1995, p. 6).
Concurrent Validity. Concurrent validity “is one type of criterion validity which compares the instrument under evaluation to some already existing criterion, such as the results of another measuring device” (Monette, Sullivan, & DeJong, 2008, p. 112).

Conditional Matrix. A conditional matrix comprises a diagram typically drawn late in a grounded theory study that presents conditions and consequences related to the phenomenon under study. It enables the researcher to distinguish and link levels of conditions and consequences specified in the axial coding model (Strauss & Corbin, 1990); a step that is seldom seen in data analysis of grounded theory studies (Creswell, 1998, p. 57).

Consequences. Consequences “are the strategic outcomes in axial coding taken by study participants; these outcomes may be positive, negative, or neutral” (Strauss & Corbin, 1990).

Constant Comparative Approach. The constant comparative approach “generate[s] successively more abstract concepts and theories through inductive processes of comparing data with data, data with category, category with category, and category with concept” (Charmaz, 2006, p. 187).

Construct. Constructs are “attributes or characteristics expressed in an abstract, general way, whereas a variable is an attribute or characteristic stated in a specific, applied way” (Creswell, 2005, p. 590).

Construct Validity. Construct validity “is the most complex type of validity [that] involves relating an instrument to an overall theoretical framework to determine whether the instrument is correlated with all the concepts and propositions that comprise the theory (Cronbach and Meel as cited in Monette et al., 2008, p. 113).

Content & Sampling Validity. Content and sampling validity determine whether a measuring device covers the full range of meanings or forms that are included in a variable to measure; VALID measuring devices provide an adequate, representative sample of all content or elements / instances of the phenomena being measured. (Monette et al., 2008, p. 111)
**Context.** Context refers to a construct’s related concepts, attributes, and/or variables that help “shape strategy by providing a lens through which leaders and staff interpret and assign value to various institution development alternatives” (Alfred, 2006, p. 127).

**Conventional Planning.** Conventional planning is a planning strategy that “identifies specific items such as budget lines that planners expect the organization [university] to hit within a specific time frame” (Rowley et al., 1997, p. 36).

**Core Values.**

Core values are enduring beliefs that your institution and the people who inhabit it hold in common and endeavor to put it into action; [they] guide your institution’s faculty, staff, administrators, and to some degree students in performing their work . . . [and] lead individuals within organizations to believe that some goals or ends are more legitimate or correct [while] others . . . are wrong. (Sevier, 2000, p. 84)

**Corporate Social Responsibility.**

Corporate social responsibility is the obligation of the firm to use its resources in ways to benefit society, through committed participation as a member of society, taking into account the society at large, and improving welfare of society at large independently of direct gains of the company. (Kok, van der Wiele, McKenna & Brown as cited in Hill, 2004, p. 89)

**Corporation.** Corporation is

a creation of society whose purpose is the production of needed goods and services, to the profit of society and itself; as an institution of society, a corporation must reflect that society’s shared values – social, moral, political, and legal, as well as economic. (Wilson, R., 2000, p. 37)
**Corporate Social Charter.** A corporate social charter is “an evolving phenomenon [that] reflects the changing conditions of society and the economy and the changing values of consumers and the public . . . ‘partly written in the form of legislation, regulations, and policy declarations’” (Wilson, R., 2000, p. 33).

**Critical Theory.**

Critical theory briefly defined [means] ‘emancipatory imperative directed towards the abolition of social injustice and . . . [the focus] principally on a critique of ideology, showing how repressive interests underlie the ostensibly neutral formulations of science, politics, economics, education, history, literary criticism, psychology, political science, sociology, and theology.’ (Underwood as cited in Willis, 2007, p. 48)

Critical theory is a research program ultimately linked to a critical emancipatory knowledge interest, is distinguished clearly by a distinctive approach to methodology as a set of metatheoretical assumptions and privileged research design strategies, a core set of substantive commitments related to the analysis of crisis tendencies in advanced capitalism, an explicit approach to normative theory and its relation to critique of ideologies. (Morrow & Brown, 1994, p. 242)

**Criterion Validity.** Criterion validity “establishes validity by showing a correlation between a measurement device and some other criterion or standard that we know or believe accurately measures the variable under consideration” (Monette, Sullivan, & DeJong, 2008, p. 112).

**Cross Impact Analysis.** Cross impact analysis is “a technique for harvesting the collective judgment of the group and for focusing group discussion and supporting analysis” (Rowley et al., 1997, p. 116).

**Culture.** Culture is “the coherent, learned, shared view of a group of people about life’s concerns that ranks what is important, furnishes attitudes about what things are appropriate, and dictates behavior” (Varner & Beamer, 2005, p. 5).
**Deductive.** Deductive refers to a process of thinking that “entails looking first to established theory – the big picture – to provide the definitions and hypotheses from which predictions can be derived and tested” (Schram, 2005, p. 21).

**Differentiation (A).** Differentiation occurs “by market, product, [or] service [and] is achieved through more than mere “communicating values, ideals, and purposes – it is achieved by creating value added” (Alfred, 2006, pp. 140-141).

**Differentiation (B).** Differentiation has “the purpose [of] building customer loyalty through an image of excellence regarding the organization and its products and services” (Rowley & Sherman, 2001, pp. 89–90).

**Discriminant Sampling.** Discriminate sampling is:

a form of sampling that occurs late in a grounded theory project after the researcher has developed a model. At this point, the focus question becomes: How would the model hold if more information is gathered from people similar to those initially interviewed? Thus, in verifying the model, the researcher chooses sites, persons, and/or documents that ‘will maximize opportunities for verifying the story line, relationships between categories, and for filling in poorly developed categories. (Strauss & Corbin, 1990, p. 187)

**Empowerment.**

Empowerment is the freedom to control [one’s] contribution within the organization. . . . This means [stakeholders] are given the authority and responsibility to complete tasks and attain targets without the direct intervention of management (Sutherland & Canwell, 2004 as cited in Baker, 2007, p. 74).

**Fit.** Fit, a grounded theory term, is the first “criteria in evaluating substantive/formal [critical] theory [that provides] the link between the theory and the arena where it will be used to provide insight [which] needs to be clear” (Grbich, 2007, p. 81).
Flexibility. Flexibility is defined as “the extent to which new and alternative decisions are generated and considered in strategic planning, allowing a positive organizational change and adaptation to environmental turbulence” (Combe & Greenley, 2004; Evans, 1991; Fiegenbaum & Karnani, 1991; Grewal & Tansuhaj, 2001). It is “through flexibility organizations are better prepared to cope with environmental turbulence, enhancing the influence of their strategic planning on performance” (Rudd, Greenley, Beatson, & Lings, 2008, p. 99).

Frame. Frame is “a concept or construct that identifies what type of advantage the institution is trying to achieve; it can take the form of a measurable concept such as cost” (Alfred, 2006, p. 82).

Goals. Goals are “generally the major milestones that have a 3 to 5 year, or even longer, horizon” (Rowley et al., 1997, p. 106).

Governance.

Governance encompasses relationships among academic divisions within the institution as well as linkages between the internal community and the larger worlds of government, business, and the community. (Marginson & Considine as cited in Burke, 2005, p. 56)

Grounded Theory Study. A grounded theory study is a qualitative study where the researcher generates an abstract analytical schema of a phenomenon that explains some action, interaction, or process: this is accomplished in higher education through collecting interview data, making multiple visits to the field (theoretical sampling), attempting to develop and interrelate categories (constant comparison) of information, and writing a substantive or context-specific theory. (Strauss & Corbin, 1990)

Inclusion.

The notion of inclusion refers to social values which are commonly accepted and are not only concerned with disabled people. . . . [T]he notion of inclusion concerns the recognition of the right of all individuals to full participation in social life as full . . . actors. (Armstrong & Barton, 2000, p. 62)
**Inductive Approach.** An inductive approach in grounded theory permits the researcher to “go from specific experiences and pieces of data to a more general explanation of an idea” (Schram, 2005, p. 21).

**Interval Scale.** An interval scale is one where one unit on this scale is the same size anywhere along the scale so values can be treated mathematically (i.e., averaged) but zero on the scale does not indicate a total absence of the variable being measured (i.e., IQ scores). (Cohen & Lea, 2004, p. 5)

**In Vivo Codes.** In vivo codes are “codes or categories in grounded theory research where the investigator uses exact words of the interviewee to form names or category codes: they are ‘catchy’ and immediately draw readers’ attention” (Strauss & Corbin, 1990, p. 69).

**In Vivo Coding.** In vivo codes serve as symbolic markers of participants’ speech and meanings. . . . [They] do not stand on their own in a robust grounded theory: these codes need to be integrated into the theory. Three kinds of in vivo codes prove to be useful: [1] those general terms everyone knows that flag condensed but significant meanings, [2] a participant’s innovative term that captures meaning or experience, and [3] insider shorthand terms specific to a particular group that reflect their perspective. (Charmaz, 2006, p. 55)

**Intervening Conditions.** Intervening conditions within a grounded theory “are the broader conditions found in axial coding (broader than the context) within which strategies occur: they might be social, economic, and political forces that influence the strategies in response to the central phenomenon” (Strauss & Corbin, 1990).

**Key Performance Indicator.** A key performance indicator is “a measure of an essential outcome of a particular organizational performance activity or an important indicator of a precise health condition of an organization” (Rowley et al., 1997, p. 108).
Line–by–Line Coding.

Line–by–line coding involves naming each line of your written data (Glaser, 1978 In Charmaz, 2006, p. 50) . . . to [provide] you insights about what kinds of data to collect next [permitting you to] distill data and direct further inquiry early in the data collection. (Charmaz, 2006, pp. 53–54)

Memo Writing.

Memo writing leads directly to theoretical sampling: [it is] strategic, specific, and systematic. Conducting theoretical sampling depends on having already identified a category(ies) because you intend to use it elaborate and refine your theoretical categories. This pivotal grounded theory strategy helps you to delineate and develop the properties of your category and its range of variation. (Charmaz, 2006, p. 103)

Memoing.

a process in grounded theory research where the researcher writes down ideas about the evolving theory; it could be in the form of hypotheses, ideas about emerging categories, or some aspects of the connection to categories in axial coding – the written records of analysis that help with theory formulation. (Strauss & Corbin, 1990)

Military Strategy. Military strategy “represents the political aim of war as reflected in the strategic aims, and the shape of strategy has been under the direct influence of policy” (Lider, 1983, p. 205).

Mission Statement.

is a relatively short, clear statement of the primary purpose(s) of the organization [university]. It might include the reason for being, what the organization does, how it does it, and how the organization is different from its competitors. The mission should reflect the values or the basic beliefs to which the organization [university] and its stakeholders have agreed. (Baker, 2007, p. 151)
**Mission Statement Differentiation.** Mission statement differentiation “is achieved through more than mere communicating values, ideals, and purposes – it is achieved by creating value added” (Alfred, 2006, pp. 140-141). This means that universities establish themselves, their programs, or other provided services as values unique to their institution. It is precisely these values that separate them from universities competing for recruiting the same students and even faculty. For this reason, students and faculty choose to attend or teach at one university over another.

**Objectives (Business).** Objectives are “specific targets to be achieved at various points within the planning period with an indication of the target and the means by which it will be achieved; they can be organized into a hierarchy of primary and secondary objectives” (Baker, 2007, p. 151).

**Objectives (Higher Education).** Objectives are generally outcomes of no more than one year; they tend to be time bound (due date assigned) and are measurable activities (meaning that their achievement can be unambiguously determined) that keep the organization or unit heading towards its strategies and goals. (Rowley et al., 1997, p. 106)

**Open Coding.** Open coding “is the first step in data analysis process for grounded theorist involving taking data (e. g. – interview transcriptions) and segmenting them into categories” (Strauss & Corbin, 1990).

**Ordinal Scale.** An ordinal scale marks “values [that] have an order that can be represented by numbers, but the numbers cannot be used mathematically because the intervals may not be equal (i.e., assigning ranks according to the ability of gymnasts on a team)” (Cohen & Lea, 2004, p. 5).

**Pattern Theory.** Pattern theory contains an interconnected set of concepts and relationships, but does not require causal statements. Instead, pattern theory uses metaphor or analogies so that relationship makes sense. Pattern theories are systems of ideas that inform; concepts and relations within them form a mutually reinforcing, closed system; specifying a sequence of phases or link parts to a whole. (Neuman as cited in Creswell, 2003, p. 133)
**Phenomenon.** A phenomenon is “the central concept being examined by the phenomenologist; it is the concept being experienced by subjects in a study, psychological concepts such as grief, anger, or love” (Moustakas, 1994).

**Policies.** Policies are “rules or guidelines that express the limits within which action should occur” (Mintzberg & Quinn, 1991, p. 5).

**Political Process.** Political process and decision making:

Tend to focus on the role of interest groups, political leaders, policy makers, agendas, and decisions in producing public policy change. . . . The agenda–building approach suggests that periods of abrupt change can be explained by the process in which issues get raised and placed high in the government’s agenda. This process entails some sort of trigger event – a catastrophic accident, a depression, war, etc. – which raises the visibility of an issue, precipitates public awareness of a situation, or dramatizes a problem. Policy initiators exploit this event and define the situation as a problem requiring government action. (Wilson, C. A., 2000, p. 248)

**Process.** Process is ‘the sequence of steps, relationship transformations, and interpersonal and intellectual transactions needed to reach an end state or outcome’ (Quinn as cited in J. Moore, 1992, p. 257)

**Programs.** Programs “specify the step by step sequence of actions necessary to achieve major objectives. They express how objectives will be achieved within the limits set by policy” (Mintzberg & Quinn, 1991, p. 5).

**Properties.**

other units of information that are analyzed in grounded theory research; each grounded theory category can be subdivided into properties that provide broad dimensions for the category. Strauss & Corbin (1990) refer to them as ‘attributes or characteristics pertaining to a category’ appearing in ‘open coding’ analysis. (p. 61)

**Purposeful Sampling.** Purposeful sampling is theoretical sampling “according to categories one develops from one’s analysis and these categories are not based on quotas; they are based on theoretical concerns” (Charmaz, 2006, p. 101).

**Reflexivity.** Reflexivity is the “way in which our portrayals of social realities simultaneously describe and constitute [those] realities” (Silverman, 2004, p. 36).

**Resistance.** Resistance is defined as a multifaceted phenomenon where

Procrastination and delays in triggering the process of change; unforeseen implementation delays and inefficiencies slow down the change and make it cost more than originally anticipated; [and] efforts within the organization to sabotage the change or absorb in a welter of other priorities [occur]. (Ansoff, 1988, p. 207)

**Selective Coding.**

Selective coding takes place later on in the research process, when the researcher has already developed the categories and specified their connections. In selective coding, the researcher adopts the most important category (‘a core category) and tries to orient the study around this core category by specifying and validating the relationships between it and other categories. (Lonkila, “Grounded Theory as an Emerging Paradigm for Computer-assisted Qualitative Data Analysis,” as cited in Denzin & Lincoln, 2001 a, p. 248)

**Selective Coding (C).** Selective coding occurs

where relationships are validated between a nominated central core category by the drawing together of additional categories of contexts, conditions, actions, interactions, and outcomes together with the focusing of memos and the generation of theory regarding this category (Grbich, 2007, p. 79).

**Social Mobility.**

According to the Spellings Commission, social mobility is ‘Increased human capital production; the generation of more college and university graduates’ (USDOE, 2006 a, p. 1). Social mobility has an alternative connotation: one of individuals’ adeptness to verbally communicate clearly with a range of diverse people. (Marshall, G.,)
**Stakeholders.** Stakeholders are “individuals or a group who either have some input into decision-making about a social problem or are affected by policy decisions on that problem (policy perspective)” (Majchrzak, 1984, p. 104).

**Strategic Business Unit (Business).** A strategic business unit is “an operating unit or a focal point for planning that provides a distinct set of products or services to a distinct group of customers and competes within an identifiable group; it is the point at which business-level strategy is focused and developed” (Hax & Majluf, 1984, p. 294).

**Strategic Business Unit (Higher Education).** A strategic business unit is a group of university department chairs/deans who partake in “a coordinating role between the corporation and the segment managers to help facilitate vertical and horizontal communications” (Ensign & Adler, 1985, p. 113).

**Strategic Decisions.** Strategic decisions are “those that determine the overall direction of an enterprise and its ultimate viability in light of the predictable, the unpredictable, and the unknowable changes that may occur in its most important surrounding environments” (Mintzberg & Quinn, 1991, p. 5).

**Strategic Generation.** Strategic generation is “one that, given a condition or set of objectively favorable circumstances, can create a potent generational consciousness or ideology of political change that is sufficient to bring about potent social change” (Edmunds & Turner, 2002, p. 16).

**Strategic Management (Business).** Strategic management is ‘a continuous process that involves attempts to match or fit the organization with its changing environment in the most advantageous way possible. It clearly includes adapting the organization itself (by internal changes) to fit the external environment’ (Digman as cited in J. Moore, 1992, p. 200); it is analogous to strategic planning.

**Strategic Management (Higher Education).** Strategic management is “the assurance of the institution’s attention and focus applied to maintain an optimal alignment with the environment” (Rowley et al., 1998, p. 15).

**Strategic Planning (Business).** Strategic planning is “a rational approach to assessing and redefining linkages of the firm with both its business and societal environments” (Ansoff, 1987 as cited in J. Moore, 1992, p. 23).
Strategic Planning (Higher Education).

a process of relating an organization and its people to their changing environment and the opportunities and threats in the marketplace; it is a process in which purposes, objectives, and action programs are developed, implemented, monitored, evaluated, and reviewed. . . . It is particularly concerned with anticipating and responding to environmental factors, taking responsibility for change, and for providing unity and direction to an organization’s activities; a tool for ordering one’s perceptions about future environments in which one’s decisions may be played out. (Corrall as cited in Baker, 2007, p. 17)

Strategies (Qualitative). Strategies “are the specific actions or interactions in axial coding that occur as a result of the central phenomenon” (Strauss & Corbin, 1990).

Strategy. Strategy is

the pattern or plan that integrates an organization’s major goals, policies, and action sequences into a cohesive whole . . . it helps to marshal and allocate an organization’s resources into a unique and viable posture based on its relative internal competences and shortcomings, anticipated changes in the environment, and contingent moves by intelligent opponents. (Quinn as cited in J. Moore, 1992, p. 256)

Structure. Structure is

the design of organization through which the enterprise is administered. The design . . . has two aspects. It includes, first, the lines of authority and communication between the different administrative offices; and, second, the information and data that flow through these lines of authority and communication.” (Chandler, 1965 as cited in J. Moore, 1992, p. 38)
Subjectivity.

requires that we delve more deeply into the desires resonating within the locations of the other (evil); it is the move beyond acknowledgement of voice within experience to that of actual engagement. . . . Subjectivity is formed through a range of discursive practices – economic, social, aesthetic, and political – and meanings are sites of creation and struggle, subjectivity linked to performance (Madison, 2005, p. 174)

Substantive Theory. Substantive theory is “a low-level theory applicable to immediate situations; the theory evolves from study of a phenomenon situated in ‘one particular situational context’ (Strauss & Corbin, 1990, p. 174). Researcher differentiation of this theory is made from greater abstraction and applicability theories, midlevel, grand, and formal theories.

Surveying the Environment. Surveying the environment is “the process of inventorying internal and external forces calculating their effects on the direction of the institution (i.e., through quantitative analysis)” (Rowley et al., 1997, p. 140).

System. A system is “a collection of public institutions of higher education with a governing board and a central staff . . . systems . . . functioning depends ultimately on how faculty members choose to conduct themselves” (Chafee, 1989, pp. 3–4).

System Strategic Planning.

The critical difference [between system and institutional strategic planning] is in the context which the process is conducted, and the tension between the institutional and system contexts is the dynamic variable in system versus institutional strategic planning. . . . In most systems, strategic priorities arise through consultation with the institutional / campus chief executives, and in some the consultative process is even broader, with representative campus and statewide committees involved in system level planning. (Szutz, 1999, p. 90)

Tacit Theory. Tacit theory is “one’s personal understanding” (Marshall & Rossman, 2006, p. 31).
Tactics (Business). Tactics are “the operational methods that form the building blocks used to implement the strategy” (Rowley et al., 1997, p. 106).

Tactics (Military). Tactics are “the ordered arrangement and maneuver of units in relation to each other and/or to the enemy in order to use their full potentialities” (Keane, 2005, p. 198).

As opposed to strategy, tactics are concerned with the application of military power, not the ultimate objective such power is expected to obtain. As such, tactics typically fall within the purview of military commanders, as opposed to political leaders. The word is derived from the Greek taktika meaning 'order of arrangement.' (Keane, 2005, p. 198–199)

Theoretical Sampling. Theoretical sampling “seeks pertinent data to develop your emerging theory. The main purpose of theoretical sampling is to elaborate and refine categories constituting your theory. You conduct theoretical sampling by sampling to develop the properties of your categories until no new properties emerge (Charmaz, 2006, p. 96).

Theoretical Validity. Theoretical validity “is obtained to the degree that a theory or theoretical explanation developed from a research study fits the data and is therefore credible and defensible” (Johnson, 2006, p. 282).

Theoretical Understanding. Theoretical understanding “refers to an account’s function as an explanation, as well as a description or interpretation, of the phenomena” (Huberman & Miles, 2002, p. 51).

Theater Strategy. Theater strategy “deal[s] with the political goals, available military resources in the given region, and the interplay of the forces deployed . . . [it is the] intermediate between grand strategy and tactics” (Lider, 1983, p. 205).
**Triangulation.** Triangulation applies

[and] involves the use of multiple and different methods, investigators, sources, and theories to obtain corroborating evidence (Glesne & Peshkin, 1992; Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Merriam, 1988; Miles & Huberman, 1984, 1994; Patton, 1990). Triangulation reduces the possibility of chance by associations, as well as of systemic biases prevailing due to a specific method being utilized, thereby allowing greater confidence in any interpretations made (Fielding & Fielding, 1986; Maxwell, 1992, pp. 239–240)

**Validity.** Validity “refers to the accuracy of the measure” (Monette, Sullivan, & DeJong, 2008, p. 111).
Appendix B

Letter of Permission

<Month, Date, Year>

<All Inside Address Information>

Dear Dr. _____:

I am a doctoral candidate writing my dissertation. For my study, faculty members collectively are stakeholders who not only have direct and frequent contact with universities’ main customers (students) but who also comprise higher education teaching, research, and service variables – higher education’s “means of production” (Birnbaum, 1991). My study proposes to help close the gap between higher education research and practice by generating a substantive theory on faculty members’ description of the fit between the higher education general strategic planning process and how it conceptually relates to other aspects of university policies as described by faculty members.

Potential significance exists for higher education research, practice, and policy: my study will (1) augment existing strategic planning in higher education literature by contributing to scholarly higher education research; (2) help inform higher education administrators, policy makers, and board members of how higher education research might be applied to help close the gap between higher education research and practice (i.e., improve its strategic planning practices); and (3) have immediate application for stakeholders’ and policymakers’ awareness to possibly improve strategic planning in higher education practice and influence development of new education policy.

The purpose of this letter is to ask for your help in obtaining all necessary and appropriate permissions for me to ascertain _____ as one of my sites where I can interview three faculty members with no administrative job functions but who have worked with Faculty Senate. Your willingness to help me ascertain permission to interview three faculty members at ____ University has the potential to impact future higher education policy. Any questions or concerns can be conveyed to me by e-mail at __________________ or my dissertation advisor, Dr. _____ at (__) _____-_____. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Ludy Glenn Aponte
Ph. D. Candidate
Appendix C

Letter of Faculty Interest

<Month, Date, Year>

<All Inside Address Information>

Dear Dr. _____:

I am writing to you and your colleagues who have been involved, according to _____ in your university’s strategic planning. I am a Higher Education doctoral candidate at The University of Toledo writing my dissertation entitled: A Grounded Theory of the Fit between the General Strategic Planning Process and other aspects of university Policies as Described by Faculty Members. For my dissertation study, I describe faculty members who collectively fulfill higher education’s teaching, research, and service variables as stakeholders in university strategic planning.

This study’s purpose is to generate a substantive theory of the fit between the general strategic planning process and how it conceptually relates to other aspects of university policies as described by faculty members. Potential significance exists for higher education research, practice, and policy: (1) it will augment existing strategic planning in higher education literature, contributing to scholarly higher education research and will (2) have immediate application for stakeholders’ and policymakers’ awareness to possibly improve strategic planning in higher education practice and influence development of new education policy.

I would like to interview you about your experiences with strategic planning at the university level. This audio recorded interview would last approximately one hour and would be held at a time and place convenient to you (on university campus). Your willingness to help me will highlight the importance of faculty involvement in university strategic planning. If you would like additional information or to schedule an interview, please email me at: __________. Otherwise, I will be contacting you by email or phone. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Ludy Glenn Aponte
Ph. D. Candidate
Appendix D

Consent Letter

ADULT RESEARCH SUBJECT - INFORMED CONSENT FORM

A Grounded Theory of the Fit between the General Strategic Planning Process and Other Aspects of University Policies as Described by Faculty Members

Principal Investigator: Dr. Lynne Hamer (faculty), Associate Professor, (__) (__) ; Ludy Glenn Aponte, Doctoral Candidate, (__) (__) 

Purpose: You are invited to participate in the research project entitled, A Grounded Theory of the Fit between the General Strategic Planning Process and other aspects of university Policies as Described by Faculty Members which is being conducted at the University of Toledo under the direction of Dr. Lynne Hamer (faculty), Associate Professor, (__) (__) ; Ludy Glenn Aponte, Doctoral Candidate, (__) (__) .

This dissertation study’s primary purpose is to generate a substantive theory of the fit between the general strategic planning process and how it conceptually relates to other aspects of university policies as described by faculty members. Its secondary purpose is to communicate the general process common to most strategic planning models with the hope that it becomes better understood and practically applied in higher education.

Description of Procedures: I would like to meet for a one-hour interview with you (selected participant) to learn about your understanding of the general strategic planning process. An interview protocol will be provided at least two weeks prior to the interview. Your willingness to help me acquire a better understanding of an involved faculty member’s perceptions on strategic planning in higher education will enable me to acquire primary data for analysis of my dissertation topic.

Permission to record: Will you permit the researcher to audio record during this research procedure?

YES ☐ NO ☐

Initial Here ☐
Potential Risks: There are minimal risks to participation in this study, including loss of confidentiality. All risks to subjects are minimal; no minors will be interviewed and the researcher will maintain subjects' confidentiality. Pseudonyms will be used for all universities and interviewees. Harm and/or discomfort will be none to minimal; the researcher is of sound mental health, competent in qualitative research and ethics, and is an exceptional listener.

Potential Benefits: The benefits I see for your participating in this research are: having a doctoral candidate actively listen to you, receiving valuable feedback, and having an opportunity to impact future higher education policy.

Confidentiality: The researchers (primary investigator and student investigator) will make every effort to prevent anyone from knowing that you provided this information. The consent forms with signatures will be kept separate from responses which will not include names. Although we will make every effort to protect your confidentiality, there is a low risk that this might be breached. Confidentiality will be maintained but complete anonymity cannot be guaranteed: field notes, transcriptions, and document collections are only discussed with the qualitative dissertation co chair. All personal identifiers (i.e., telephone/fax/social security numbers, email addresses, zip codes) will be removed; tapes are kept securely locked.

Voluntary Participation: Your refusal to participate in this study will involve no penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled and will not affect your relationship with The University of Toledo. In addition, you may discontinue participation at any time without any penalty or loss of benefits.

Contact Information: Before you decide to accept this invitation to take part in this study, you may ask any questions that you might have. If you have any questions at any time before, during or after your participation you should contact a member of the research team Dr. Lynne Hamer (faculty), Associate Professor, (__) ____-____; Lady Glenn Aponte, Doctoral Candidate, (__) ____-____. If you have questions beyond those answered by the research team or your rights as a research subject or research-related injuries, please feel free to contact the Chairperson of the SBE Institutional Review Board, Dr. ____________, in the Office of Research on the main campus at (__) ____-____.

Before you sign this form, please ask any questions on any aspect of this study that is unclear to you. You may take as much time as necessary to think it over.
SIGNATURE SECTION – Please read carefully

You are making a decision whether or not to participate in this research study. Your signature indicates that you have read the information provided above, you have had all your questions answered, and you have decided to take part in this research.

The date you sign this document to enroll in this study, that is, today's date must fall between the dates indicated at the bottom of the page.

Name of Subject (please print)  Signature  Date

Name of Person Obtaining Consent  Signature  Date

THE UNIVERSITY OF TOLEDO
SOCIAL, BEHAVIORAL & EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD

The research project described in this consent form and the form itself have been reviewed and approved by the University of Toledo Social, Behavioral & Educational Review Board (SBE IRB) for the period of time specified below.

SBE IRB #:  Approved Number of Subjects:  
Project Start Date:  Project Expiration Date:  
                        Date:  
______________________________  Chair

UT Social Behavioral & Educational IRB