Spring 2012

The Journal of Academic Administration in Higher Education

Volume 8 Issue 1

The Journal of Academic Administration In Higher Education

CONTENTS

Budgeting and Organizational Trust in Canadian Universities
Cynthia V. Simmons 1

Critical Issues Facing America's Community Colleges: A Summary of the Community College Futures Assembly 2011 Mixed Methods/Appreciative Inquiry Research Project
Matthew J. Basham, Dale F. Campbell, Hajara Mahmood, & Kenyatta Martin 13

An Examination of Social Media Policy Usage of South Central United States' Universities
Virginia J. Eaton, Donna W. Luse, & Thomas G. Hodge 33

Leader Derailment in Academe: Does the Training Match the Problems?
Feruzan Irani Williams, Constance Campbell, William McCartney, & Carl Gooding 43

Bullying and Mobbing in Academe: Challenges for Distance Education and Social Media Applications
Jo Ann Oravec 49

Innovative Team-Teaching: Faculty Perceptions and Administrative Policies 59
Lawrence O. Hamer & Robert O'Keefe 59

Volume Eight Issue One
Spring 2012

JOURNAL OF ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATION IN HIGHER EDUCATION

JW PRESS

MARTIN, TENNESSEE

Published by

JW Press

P.O. Box 49

Martin, Tennessee 38237

Printed in the United States of America

Board of Reviewers

Editor

Dr. Edd R. Joyner
Edd@JWPress.com

The JW Press Family of Academic Journals

Journal of Learning in Higher Education (JLHE)

ISSN: 1936-346X (print)

Each university and accrediting body says that teaching is at the forefront of their mission. Yet the attention given to discipline oriented research speaks otherwise. Devoted to establishing a platform for showcasing learning-centered articles, JLHE encourages the submission of manuscripts from all disciplines. The top learning-centered articles presented at ABW conferences each year will be automatically published in the next issue of JLHE. JLHE is listed in Cabell's Directory of Publishing Opportunities in Educational Psychology and Administration, indexed by EBSCO, and under consideration for indexing by Scopus.

Individuals interested in submitting manuscripts directly to JLHE should review information at http://jwpress.com/JLHE/JLHE.htm.

Journal of Academic Administration in Higher Education (JAAHE)

ISSN: 1936-3478 (print)

JAAHE is a journal devoted to establishing a platform for showcasing articles related to academic administration in higher education, JAAHE encourages the submission of manuscripts from all disciplines. The best articles presented at ABW conferences each year, that deal with the subject of administration of academic units, will be automatically published in the next issue of JAAHE. JAAHE is listed in Cabell's Directory of Publishing Opportunities in Educational Psychology and Administration, indexed by EBSCO, and under consideration for indexing by Scopus.

Individuals interested in submitting manuscripts directly to JAAHE should review information on their site at http://jwpress.com/JAAHE/JAAHE.htm.

International Journal of the Academic Business World (IJABW)

ISSN 1942-6089 (print)
ISSN 1942-6097 (online)

IJABW is a new journal devoted to providing a venue for the distribution, discussion, and documentation of the art and science of business. A cornerstone of the philosophy that drives IJABW, is that we all can learn from the research, practices, and techniques found in disciplines other than our own. The Information Systems researcher can share with and learn from a researcher in the Finance Department or even the Psychology Department.

We actively seek the submission of manuscripts pertaining to any of the traditional areas of business (accounting, economics, finance, information systems, management, marketing, etc.) as well as any of the related disciplines. While we eagerly accept submissions in any of these disciplines, we give extra consideration to manuscripts that cross discipline boundaries or document the transfer of research findings from academe to business practice. International Journal of the Academic Business World is listed in Cabell's Directory of Publishing Opportunities in Business, indexed by EBSCO, and under consideration for indexing by Scopus.

Individuals interested in submitting manuscripts directly to IJABW should review information on their site at http://jwpress.com/IJABW/IJABW.htm

Budgeting and Organizational Trust in Canadian Universities

Cynthia V. Simmons
Associate Professor
Accounting Area, Haskayne School of Business
University of Calgary
Calgary, Alberta, Canada

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this research was to investigate the relationship between budget processes and levels of organizational trust in universities. A series of semi-structured interviews were conducted with senior administrative personnel in universities across Canada. A relationship was found to exist between university administrators' level of organizational trust and their views regarding the approach and value of the budgeting process at their institution. The trust levels are influenced by the correspondence between the stated goals and directions of the university with actual resource allocations, the level of influence the individual felt they had on the budget process, and the degree that the budget could be used to predict financial impacts under various scenarios.

This study provides new information on the way budgets can affect the workings and organizational culture of the university. It shows that there is a relationship between budgets and organizational trust and presents evidence that individuals' attitudes toward cost information differ from that of the budget itself. It shows that the usefulness of budgets as a management tool is increased when users recognize that it functions as a broad communications medium - both the manner in which it is developed and the financial information it presents can affect organizational trust

"Nowhere is the competition for funds as brutal or political as in most universities" (Bublitz & Martin, 2007)

This paper presents the findings from a preliminary investigation into the relationship between university administrators' attitude toward the budgeting process at their institution and their level of organizational trust. Budgeting within universities has received increased attention as institutions of higher learning across the globe deal with strains on funding (see the ies National Center for Education Statistics; Blumenstyk, 2010; Goetzmann *et al*., 2010 for information on university funding levels), as well as the application of formula-based costing approaches (Thomas, 2000), and the use of incentive based budgeting systems (Priest *et al*.,2002). In the ideal a budget is an instrument of resource distribution in line with the strategic focus of the organization, and can serve as a basis of evaluation and control. The nature of universities is such though, that their approach to the budget process can emphasize the political. Universities are institutions designed both to educate and to develop new knowledge, the outcomes of which are difficult to quantify, and the relationship between resources expended and these outcomes being fuzzy at best. The result is that in universities the utilization of authority, power, and/or influence, i.e. the political, can have a significant influence on the distribution of resources.

In this politically charged environment the level of organizational trust held by individuals may influence, or be influenced by, the budget process. Trust is seen to provide an advantage to an organization. It leads to more effective communication, increased co-operation, and a diminished resistance to change. Given the unique nature of the university – their knowledge based outcomes and politically charged environment – together with their increased focus on cost structure and control, the relationship between budgeting

practices and organizational trust is worthy of further investigation.

BUDGETS AND TRUST

Accounting textbooks define a budget as a formal, quantitative expression of an organization's strategic plans (see Horngren *et al*., 2007). The budget process translates "qualitative mission statements and corporate strategies into action plans, link(ing) the short term with the long term, bring(ing) together managers from different hierarchical levels and from different functional areas, and at the same time provid(ing) continuity by the sheer regularity of the process" (Umapathy, 1987, pg. xxii). A budget translates an institution's plan into priorities (Whalen, 2002). Complications can arise however from a long list of considerations: when organization goals are not clear or are conflicting; when there is a lack of agreement regarding priorities; when there is inconsistency between stated priorities and subsequent resource allocations; when the methods for achieving outcomes are unclear; when there are limited resources; or when individuals determining resource allocations and/or performance benchmarks have a conflict of interest. In other words, the nature of complex organizations such as universities can result in a budget that is a reflection of these complexities as opposed to strict economic considerations.

The budget, together with the process used to create it, can be seen to be something far different than a rational statement of resource allocation based on agreed upon strategic goals. For example, the budget can be seen to be the product of a negotiation exercise (Wildavsky, 1984). Given a finite level of resources, a commitment of resources to a specific unit or activity within an organization necessitates that other units or activities will do with less. The planning aspect of the budget process can thus be viewed as less a division of resources to achieve an agreed upon result, and more of a political exercise where competing organizational interests vie for recognition and support. Budget projections can also be affected by budget gaming (Jensen, 2003), where resource allocations are set at levels designed to force increased efficiencies (low), or resource needs requested at levels designed to allow for slack (high). In neither case would the budget figure be an amount representing actual need. This "gaming" of the budget is especially problematic when budget values are used as part of an organization's performance evaluation/control system. But perhaps the most limiting view of the budgeting process is when it is considered to be lacking in relevance. Where the process is seen as a time consuming bureaucratic exercise that is either not reflective of company strategies, or flexible enough to allow for changing conditions, or both. (Hope and Fraser, 2003; Libby and Lindsay, 2010).

As institutions of higher learning whose focus is on teaching, research and service, resource distribution decisions within universities can be subject to a high level of political influence. The goals of research and teaching are understood, but the exactness of what is to be learned is not agreed upon nor is the relationship between effort (resources) and outcome determinable. Reputation plays a key role, allowing for the impact of authority, power and influence in the development of goals and the distribution of resources. Social attributes such as the non-profit character of the universities goals (Gross, 1968), strong attachments to traditional academic values (Paterson, 2003; Lapsley and Miller, 2004), and the nature of contemporary academic work as both a public service and creative knowledge work (Deem, 2004), support the unique nature of the university as an organization. It is this that can make the allocation and evaluation of resource usage especially problematic.

Studies have shown resource allocation processes and models to be historically and culturally situated within the context of each university, with the models in use being more a matter of internal fit than of best practice (Goddard and Ooi, 1998; Jarzabkowski, 2002). Empirical findings indicate that the existence of models in universities provided a sense of objectivity, but that the strong collegial culture proved unwilling to accept a strongly centralized organization of the resources allocation processes (Jones, 1994; Scapens *et al*., 1994). And although the use of computer-based models for planning is seen as being more transparent, knowledge of how universities allocate resources appears to be largely restricted to those involved in the process (Angluin and Scapens, 2000). Even formula based approaches

to resource/cost allocation have been found to be influenced by patterns of micro-political activity, the influence of sub-unit power, and the priorities and preferences of key individuals (Thomas, 2000). Clearly political, social and group effects influence the development and utilization of budgets in a university context.

Trust is a social construct that can occur between individuals or between individuals and groups. It is recognized as an important factor in determining organizational success, organizational stability and the well-being of employees (Albrecht and Travaglione, 2003; Cook and Wall, 1980; Shaw, 1997; Kramer and Tyler, 1996). High levels of trust between senior management and employees strengthen an organization's ability to remain competitive (Davis *et al*., 2000). This competitive advantage is assumed to come about from the reduced transactions costs (Cummings and Bromiley, 1996), more effective communication, increased co-operation among organization members and diminished resistance to change (Kramer, 1999) – factors important in a university as well as a business context. In terms of budgeting, it has been argued that trust between the resource allocation process members plays an important role since it facilitates better management of the process and supports structures of accountability between participants (Manochin, 2008).

Researchers have defined trust in a number of ways. Mayer *et al*. (1995) characterized trust as a willingness to be vulnerable. Cook and Wall refer to trust as the extent to which one is willing to ascribe good intentions to and have confidence in the words and actions of other people (1980). Albrecht and Travaglione define trust in senior management as "an employee's willingness to act on the basis of the words, actions, and decisions of senior management under conditions of uncertainty or risk" (2003, pg 78). The definition of trust used in this study is the one articulated by Cummings and Bromiley (1996). Trust being a belief that "another individual or group (a) makes good-faith efforts to behave in accordance with any commitments both explicit or implicit, (b) is honest in whatever negotiations preceded such commitments, and (c) does not take excessive advantage of another even when the opportunity is available" (pg 303). In universities where resource pressures are high; where tradition, micro-political activity, and differential sub-unit power exists, and where there is limited knowledge of resource allocation practices; an understanding of the relationship between an administrator's level of organizational trust and their views and perception of the budget could lead to improved functionality.

METHOD

The researcher undertook a series of interviews with senior university administrative personnel across Canada. Twelve individuals at four universities representing the Western, Central, and Maritime regions of Canada were interviewed. All individuals were actively involved in the budget process at their university and included deans, associate deans, members of the University Budget Committee, as well as non-academic senior financial personnel. Academic areas represented included Business, Economics, Education, and Social Work. None of the academics interviewed had in-depth accounting training, but the senior financial personnel held accounting designations. The research was conducted over a 5 month period.

A semi-structured interview method based on a 42 item questionnaire was used. The questions covered their general understanding of budgets and cost determination; the nature of the budget and the budgeting process at their specific institution; as well as the level of budget participation they felt appropriate and why. They were also asked to provide as overall evaluation of the budget process at their institution considering time spent, overall effectiveness and any dysfunctional behavior it might cause. Associated with the questions on budgeting and the budget process, interviewees discussed the manner in which costs were determined and allocated across the different functional units of their university. As well, issues surrounding the frequency and accuracy of cost and budget reporting and the reports usefulness for future planning and program evaluation were raised.

Included in the 42-item questionnaire was a modified version of the Cummings and Bromiley short-form organizational trust inventory (1996) to aid in determining individual trust levels. The

questions provided a starting point for a broader discussion on the level of organizational trust at their institution. In all cases the individuals related a critical incident surrounding the budgeting process. The interviews provided rich insight into the relationship between the participants perceived level of trust within the organization, their attitude toward the budget and the budgeting process, and their confidence in and desire for more detailed cost information.

FINDINGS

Trust

Eight of the twelve individuals interviewed indicated that they did not trust the governing administration of their university, with four indicating strong levels of trust.

Trusting individuals felt that those involved in the administration of the university were reliable, they kept their word, and negotiated fairly and honestly. In all of these cases the interviewees talked about working closely with central administration. They considered themselves to be a part of the decision making process and believed that their views were considered. When asked about their opinion regarding the need for increased financial controls, one trusting individual became strongly defensive. S/he emphasized how hard those in "Centre" worked and how administration was trying to build the university "in spite of strong resistance to change" (P4)[1]. Another trusting respondent spoke of his/her close working relationship with the president and the need for a stronger "business approach" (P5) to university finances.

One interviewee, a dean of a non-business professional faculty (P3), expressed a strong level of trust in academic members of university administration but articulated his/her belief that there was a high level of mistrust throughout the institution. S/he attributed this mistrust to the actions of the union and the non-academic management professionals working in the university. Through their defence of individuals whose actions did not warrant support, the union had "harmed" the institution and made their membership "worse off" through the creation of an us versus them mentality as opposed to that of a single working team. Likewise, the management professionals had harmed the institution through the implementation of an ever changing set of inappropriate controls and procedures. To illustrate this point this dean referenced the implementation of mandatory four year budget projections by senior administration. It was his/her view that the revenue and cost in these four year budget projections were "worthless". Demanding that the deans take actions to assure that their budgets were balanced for the next four years while regularly changing the revenue and cost projections, created a lack of confidence in both the skills of the management professionals making the projections, and the administration who put such a system into place.

This dean felt that the "us versus them" mentality at the university, together with the increased focus on financial controls, had resulted in a high level of mistrust between central administration and regular faculty. Senior administration were seen as viewing faculty members as completely self interested - only concerned with how change was going to affect their individual lives in terms of teaching loads and personal research agendas. They viewed the regular faculty member has having no concern about the greater institution. Individual faculty members, on the other hand, were seen to view senior administration as only looking to the bottom line without respect for the faculty or concern about the quality of research and the education process.

Support for this dean's (P3) perception that there exists a high level of mistrust between central administration and the faculty was found in the responses of the other interviewees. One of the structured interview questions asked if the participants believed that the central administration, the operating units, and the faculties/schools held a common view regarding the purpose and focus of the university. There was unanimous agreement amongst all the academics that a common view was *not* held. There was disagreement as to the reasons for this lack of a common view, ranging from "the faculty members' resistance to change (P4)," to the administration being "out of touch with really happens in the classroom (P11)," to "they (specific individuals in

1 In order to assure confidentiality participants have each been assigned a unique number.

administration) are sucking resources away from the people doing the real work so they can inflate the salaries of their friends" (P7). This proved to be an emotionally charged area for some of the interviewees. Based on these responses one could conclude that the Universities had failed to create, or perhaps maintain, a generally accepted overarching idea of their purpose and how best to pursue it.

Those interviewees who expressed a lack of trust with the governing administration felt that those in central administration failed to keep their word, that they tried to get the upper hand, and that they would take advantage of people who are vulnerable. The interviewees felt distanced from the decision making body at their institution and resentful that their expertise was not recognized or their views considered. They felt that a hierarchical leadership style dominated, as opposed to the more desired collegial governance model, with the increased dominance of the financial within university discourse as evidence of this shift. The view expressed was that the budget was in fact a reflection of the attitude of those governing the institution, but that this attitude did not match the stated goals of the university. Rather, the budgeting process served as evidence of a shift from traditional university ideals towards a more managerialist approach and the creation of a well compensated managerial class.

Those who felt cut out from the decision process looked to the budget to communicate the "real" intention of the governing administration, resource allocation being seen as a stronger indication of objectives than rhetorical statements surrounding the University's goals and purpose. If the resource allocation did not reflect the stated goals of the university mistrust increased. If budgets were not adjusted to reflect faculty input mistrust increased. If technical computations were not clearly explained, were changed, or were inconsistently applied mistrust increased. One non-trusting individual gave a detailed description of the failure of central administration to implement a promised new approach to budgeting and resource allocation at their school.

> We were told that the resources would flow to the four priorities of the University as outlined in our Strategic Plan. We spent hours justifying our resources needs in terms of these priorities, building a strong case for our request. In the end they gave us the same as they did before. They didn't pay any attention to our arguments. In fact there was no acknowledgement at all... They could have said something, 'Hey we recognize and value the case you put forward, but we just don't have the money right now".... But there was just silence. This year at budget time we just upped last year's numbers by X% and submitted that. Why waste your time. (P2)

Another talked about the failure to determine an accurate profit for different executive education programs.

> He (the budget officer) manipulated the information so that the people he liked appeared to do well and the people he didn't like did badly. He didn't like (director of program X) so they received a significant allocation of overhead costs, making it look like they were losing money. But he did like (director of program Y) so he argued that (Y) was a new program and should be given a chance to prove itself without having to cover overhead. It looked like (Y) was making money when really they were losing money hand over fist. Our new budget officer fixed it, but those people in Central never caught on. Proves you can't trust the numbers or the system. (P8)

In summary there were a greater number of interviewees who expressed a sense of mistrust in their institutions than those who expressed a sense of trust. This perception was strongly influenced by the level of participation the interviewee felt they had in the decision making process at their universitsy. For those who felt they were part of the decision making process, trust was expressed for individuals in the central administration. For those who felt set apart from the decision process, a lack of trust was expressed and the internal accounting processes provided evidence for this mistrust.

Budgets

In addition to questions about trust, interviewees were asked their views on the budget and the budgeting process at their institution. Included were their views on university budgeting in general; the nature of the budget and the budget process at their specific institution; as well as the level of budget participation they felt appropriate and why. They were also asked to provide an overall evaluation of the budget process at their institution considering time spent, overall effectiveness, and any dysfunctional behaviour it might cause.

When asked how best to consider the role a budget plays in the operations of a university, all those interviewed indicated that the budget should be thought of as a plan and that this plan should be based on the strategic goals/direction of the university. One Dean expressed it slightly differently, stating that the "real planning takes place when developing the strategic goals and objectives of the faculties" (P3), with the budget being a reflection of this plan. Still, there was unanimity that in the ideal the budget should serve as a reflection of the strategic direction of the university – a plan of action with the relevant resource implications clearly laid out.

Even with this unanimity regarding the planning role of the budget, many of the academics interviewed felt the need to bring up the fact that actual financial results would differ from what was budgeted. One emphasized the inevitability that budget numbers would not match the actual numbers, that "rapidly changing external conditions overwhelm... and there is no way to (determine) an accurate estimate of costs and revenues" (P7). Another discussed the issue of budget estimates differing from the actual figures, and described it as "a truism – just the nature of the beast" (P4). One program director felt that the budget provided a general direction, but that too much detail was costly to produce and could serve as a "straight jacket". In his/her view budget variances were valuable only in that they provided a starting point for discussion (P12). Thus while there was an expressed consensus among those interviewed that operating budgets at universities should function as a plan, or a reflection of a plan, the academics felt the need to call for flexibility when comparing actual results to this plan. This corresponds to their views regarding financial controls discussed later in the paper and points to tensions related to the use of the budget as a control device.

When asked to how the operating budget at their university was treated *in practice* there was disagreement. The trusting responders again indicated that it was in practice treated as a plan. The non-trusting responders gave a more diverse set of responses. The most common response of the non-trusting interviewees was that that the budget was a negotiations tool – it provided a forum by which an astute administrator could obtain (or protect) resources from a limited pool. The next most common response was that it was a bureaucratic exercise without impact. Little time was spent on determining accurate projections of costs (and in some cases revenues), but rather individuals tended to put forth last year's numbers or last year's numbers multiplied by a set percentage. Two described the budget at their institutions as predominately a means to control expenses. Only one non-trusting interviewee indicated that the operating budget at their university was, in practice, treated as a plan.

When asked if the budgeting process should begin at the top of the organization and work down, or at the faculty member level and work up, one interviewee replied:

> "Not either/or (top or bottom), it should be both. To me this is the negotiation. This is the crux of it. Don't know where you start, but it is important to start the discussion." (P3)

Another talked about the "lack of consensus between 'units' versus 'university'" and the need to "talk about what we are as a collective. What we are going to do and, importantly, what we are not going to do." Without a two way discussion, without agreement regarding which activities/programs will be pursued and which will not, s/he worries about the "'atomization' of dollars – the breaking down of the dollars into smaller bits until nobody has enough money to do anything" (P1). Importantly to this individual the difficult decision regarding resource distribution should not be made unilaterally by Central Administration but by discussion, directed by strategy, across functional and hierarchical lines.

All those interviewed expressed interest in having input into the budgeting/resource allocation process at their universities, with their current level of perceived input being strongly associated with organizational trust. This desire for input was the case even though as one individual stated: "it is a very fuzzy thing to people. It is seen as another bureaucratic activity that takes time away from the real job of teaching and research" (P2).

The individuals with higher levels of individual trust believed that their concerns regarding budget distributions were considered and had affected the estimates included in the final budget. Those who indicated low levels of organizational trust felt that they had limited – if any – meaningful input into the budget process. The revenue/cost estimates included in the final budget were "not helpful for planning" and "subject to arbitrary change based on the needs and wants of central". These final figures were determined "based on history and not as a result of consultation or need." Those most negative toward the budgeting process were those who felt that their requested input was mere pseudo-participation. Statements about the process included: "No correspondence between what we submitted and the way the money flows down;" "Nothing I can control affects the outcome;" and "Hell of a lot of work - no impact."

The perceived usefulness of the budget as a tool for determining the financial impact under various scenarios not only affected the user's perceived value of the budget itself, but also influenced their level of organizational trust. One individual talked about how budgeted monthly costs did not reflect the actual utilization of resources across the academic year. Another spoke about the timing of revenue distributions not corresponding to what was budgeted. In both cased the individuals felt this lack of correspondence minimized the value of the budget as a control tool and caused them to question the ability of individuals in the central budget office.

Changes to the budget approach such as an inclusion of multi-year forecasts, or the requirement for a contingency fund were not seen as process improvements but as additional work for "meaningless" results. Those changes to the budget numbers or the budget processes brought up in discussion by the interviewees were, in all cases, communicated as directives from central administration and not as a result of informed debate between interested parties. As such, and since the changes tended to reduce the dollars or the flexibility of the departments/faculties affected, the motivations for the changes were called into question. The discussion then moved to the need for more and better cost information. Cost information was seen to provide real and useful information on the state of the organization as opposed to the biased or inaccurate projections of the budget.

To conclude the discussion on budgeting, the interviewees were asked to provide an overall evaluation of the budget process at their institution. Based on the question developed by Murray and Lindsay (2010), interviewees were asked to assign and overall "grade" of the process taking into account time spent, system effectiveness, and any dysfunctional behaviour it might cause. Trusting respondents ranking the process as falling between a 60, "more helpful that harmful", and 70, "good", with the average being a 65. Non trusting respondents gave a wider range of responses falling between 30, which the respondent labelled as "useless," to 70, or good. The average grade assigned the budget process by the non-trusting respondents was a 52, with a 50 on the scale being labelled as "no value". This scores indicate a relationship between held levels of organizational trust and individuals' views regarding the value and effectiveness of the budget process, and is worthy of further investigation.

Costing

The individuals interviewed expressed a different view towards cost information than that held towards budgets. Whereas budget figures were plans or tools of negotiation, costs were considered to be a real reflection of the true state of things. There was a general desire for more cost information and a belief that a significant contributor to the financial constraints facing universities today was the absence of sufficient accurate financial information. Information that enabled/supported an appropriate response to changing conditions was needed.

When asked if they believed that accurate costing information should be determined for all activities within the university, all but two individuals agreed. The two who disagreed with the statement both expressed low levels of organizational trust and in both cases they focused on the word "activities". Both individuals had worked with activity based costing systems (ABC) in organizations outside of the university. Their views of ABC were negative, believing that the approach was expensive, time intensive, and that it caused the organization to move its focus away from its primary mission.

Participants were asked if they would find *full costing* information – costs including an allocation of all overheads - on student enrolments, course sections, research and various program activities valuable to their decision making. This led to wide ranging discussions on the nature of costs within the universities; the level of expenditures directed towards infrastructure, administrative compensation, student support services and the difficulty of allocating professorial time. Most agreed that they would find full cost information valuable. One dean said

> "we can't get mired in minutiae. I don't want to drown in data, don't want to be data driven, but *I need information*. No one can tell me how much it costs to run a program. I took faculty salary and tried to divide it between teaching and research, then between programs. ... I don't know how much it costs to educate a student. I don't know how much it costs for a function – like research" (P3).

Participants were aware and frustrated by the fact that a high percentage of costs within the University were fixed, limiting their ability to respond to changing conditions. Most wanted the full cost information because they believed it would make more transparent the level of cost directed toward the administration of the schools. The value of the full cost approach was seen to come from a consistent approach to costing across the institution making comparisons meaningful and making transparent the level of expenditures directed towards various cost categories, especially senior administration. Issues surrounding the arbitrary nature of fixed costs allocations were not a concern to most (as in the dean quoted above) and the view was that more information was always better. Two individuals did, however, express the view that that a full cost/student figure would be meaningless given the high percentage of fixed cost in universities. When the individuals were asked if they would find *incremental cost* valuable, there *was* unanimous and strong support for the calculation and distribution of such figures.

Participants were anxious to express their views on the reasons for the financial constraints confronting their institution and/or faculty and in many cases were looking for detailed cost reports to confirm their held beliefs. There was a repeated call for "full disclosure of all university expenditures from the President on down" (P12) and an expressed need for re-evaluation of procedures associated with the financial aspects of running the university. To quote one dean "(The VP) is interested in establishing a transparent but one size fits all method. I am interesting in establishing a transparent but not one size fits all approach. There has to be local relevance" (P3). Reasons for financial difficulties ranged broadly. They included too much money being spent on buildings, a lack of sufficient government support, an increase in the size and compensation levels of senior administration, and faculty members who only cared about protecting their own comfortable lives. Some called for increased decentralization of decision making and others called for increased centralization. All interviewed were looking for increased cost transparency to shed light on the issue.

When asked "if there should be a government policy that mandates a detailed, consistent, and transparent costing approach to all institutions of higher learning in my Province", most voiced agreement. Follow up discussion indicated differing views, however, on the level of direct control that governments and or central administration should exercise over expenditures. One vice president who had moved to academia from industry stated "I thought that as a public institution (X) would have a higher level of fiduciary responsibility, but I've learned that we have very little. A Mom & Pop grocery store has better controls. Maybe because it is *their* money" (P1). S/he felt that in addition to a consistent approach

to costing across and between universities, there was a need for increased monitoring as well.

In general the academics interviewed held a differing view. They viewed increased financial monitoring and control as an impediment to getting the real work done. "There is too much focus on where to put costs, and not enough on the real work of the organization." (P12) Another interviewee complained about how many signatures you needed to hire a graduate student. A third colourfully stated that the financial office of their university needed to "get the hell out of micromanaging" (P3) and focus on outcomes based evaluations. One interviewee, a department head and member of the university budget committee, stated that: "deans should be given carte blanche on developing world class faculty and measured against this directive 5 to 8 years out" (P4). In his/her view deans should be given full discretion on how the money allocated to School/Faculties is spent. Essentially the call was for financial control to come about through results based evaluation as opposed to the monitoring of spending. The outcomes/results measures mentioned included research productivity and reputation, student quality and placement, and institutional rankings.

The academics interviewed wanted increased cost disclosure and outcomes based assessment. Increased cost disclosure would serve to make the general public aware of what was driving costs and "make sure that monies are being directed to activities in line with the wishes of tax payers and funding bodies" (P7). Disclosure would also give those responsible the information they needed to effectively run the centre/activity over which they were responsible. They were willing to be held accountable for the results of their financial decisions but were frustrated by close monitoring and being told no. These individuals wished to be given broad say over the financial resources made available to them and sufficient time for the results of their decisions to manifest. In effect. detailed financial systems and information were desired when it increased the users' knowledge and control, but were viewed negatively if seen to limit their autonomy.

CONCLUSIONS

The information obtained through the interview process indicated that there exists a relationship between university administrators' level of organizational trust and their views regarding the approach and value of the budgeting process at their institution. Both the final resource allocations as specified in the budget and the procedures and processes utilized to determine these allocations, affected the trust levels. This affect comes about through: the correspondence between the stated goals and strategic directions of the university with the actual resource allocations, the level of input and influence the individual felt they had on the process and the final allocations, and the degree that the individual could use the budget to predict the actual financial impacts under various situational alternatives.

The messaging from the top university administration regarding the mission, vision, values, and/or strategic direction of the institution were viewed with a degree of scepticism by those interviewed. Whereas, the resource allocations as outlined in the budget were seen to be a accurate reflection of the true priorities and power politics of the institution. A correspondence between the stated goals and strategic direction of the university with the allocation of resources supported organizational trust, whereas a lack of correspondence decreased trust.

Individuals who felt they had more input into how the resource decisions were made, were more likely to express trust in the governing body of the university. Since budgets were seen to be a reflection of the power politics of the institution, individuals who felt they had meaningful input into the budget process tended to feel they had influence with the administration. This increase in influence was associated with increased levels of trust. The perceived usefulness of the budget as a devise for predicting resource allocation under various situations was also associated with organizational trust. Lack of consistency regarding approaches to budget development, changes in government funding projections, changes in student number projections, or changes in overhead charge rates all resulted in reduced trust in senior administration. Numerous incremental changes over a relatively short period of time caused indi-

viduals to question the competency and/or motives of central administration.

In spite of the utilization of cost information in the development and use of budgets, interviewees expressed differing views with regard to cost information from those expressed about the budget. Budgets were viewed as a reflection of the priorities and politics of the institution composed of estimates and subject to change. Cost data was considered to provide a picture of the true state of things by all those interviewed and to provide valuable information for decision making. Individuals wanted increased disclosure of detailed costing across all levels of the organization. It was felt that seeing this information would help to form a clearer picture of the basis underlying the financial state of the university and their faculty/department. It would provide them with the data they needed to predict the financial impact of different scenarios – such as changing student enrolment, the addition of a program, or a change in organizational structure. The high proportion of university costs that could be described as fixed in nature was clearly understood by those interviewed, but the impact of this cost structure on the meaningfulness of a cost/student number was not clear to those without a financial/ accounting background. With the exception of two individuals who expressed concern, those interviewed felt that having detailed cost information available was worth the additional expenditure required to obtain it.

When asked if there was a need for greater levels of cost control within the organization, non-academic financial personnel agreed. The academics interviewed did not want to see increased financial controls applied to them. They spoke of financial controls as adding an additional impediment to getting the task accomplished and limiting their personal autonomy. Instead the academics preferred having a clear unchanging picture of the resources available to them over an extended period of time in order to accomplish a specific set of objectives. The objectives most often mentioned included research productivity, research reputation, student quality, and institutional reputation/rankings.

DISCUSSION AND LIMITATIONS

It has been stated that university budgeting should help "translate an institution's plan into priorities, allocate resources that reflect those priorities, empower heads of academic and supporting units to use the resources allocated to them to accomplish the objectives assigned to them, and monitor their progress"(Walen, 2002). Too often the resource allocations as specified in the budget are not seen as aligning with the university's espoused goals and objectives. When this lack of alignment occurs trust decreases. Individuals turn to the budget to determine what the true goals are and/or to speculate as to whom and in what manner influence over these decisions was exercised. This preliminary research has found that university administrators possessing a higher level of organizational trust were those who felt their views on the budget were heard and considered, who saw a correspondence between the stated goals of the institution and the subsequent resource allocations, and who had available to them useful financial information. Those who did not witness this approach to university budgeting had low levels of organizational trust.

A university budget is more than a statement of resource allocations by operating area. It functions as a medium for communicating the goals, objectives, and power structures of the institution. A distribution of resources based on favouritism, self-serving wants, capriciousness, or volume of complaint will be recognized as such. Resource allocations that correspond to the stated goals of the institution provide evidence of the legitimacy of these goals and objectives - in effect money talks. It also builds trust in those individuals outlining the goals and determining the resource distributions.

Recognizing that the budget functions as a device for communicating the true priorities and power politics of the institution increases its usefulness as a management tool. The fact that all the university administrators interviewed wanted more and better cost information would indicate that, independent of their level of trust, they wanted to be part of making the university function effectively. The cost information would provide them with a necessary tool for making this happen.

Applying these findings, top university administrators could make their budgeting and financial control systems function more effectively by following some key practices. First, resource allocations should correspond to the stated priorities of the institution. Second all financial information should be accurate and its determination well understood. Allocation methods and overhead charges need to be clear and consistent. Cost data needs to be provided in a timely manner and their variations from budget understood with a format that allows individuals to drill down into the detail should they choose to do so. Lastly, a system should be design that utilizes the minimal level of controls necessary to execute appropriate fiduciary responsibility with a focus on outcomes. A part of the skill set of academics is the development of new and innovative insights and solutions to existing problems. Providing the detailed accurate information needed and focusing on the outcomes required, shows recognition of the skills of the academic members enhancing trust.

The generalizability of the findings of this preliminary research to a broader university environment is limited by the number of individuals interviewed. Expanding the research to include a larger number of individuals and institutions would strengthen our understanding of these relationships. In addition, future research should include other organizations both for profit and those whose primary outcomes are assessed more subjectively and where the relationship between inputs and outcomes less clearly understood. Determination of the presence of a strong relationship between budget processes, within-organization cost disclosure, and organizational trust across various organization types would contribute to our understanding of the attributes necessary for their effective functioning.

REFERENCES

Angluin, D. and Scapens, R. (2000), "Transparency, Accounting Knowledge and Perceived Fairness in UK Universities' Resource Allocation: Results from a Survey of Accounting and Finance", *British Accounting Review*, Vol. 32, pp 1-42.

Albrecht, S. and Travaglione, A. (2003), "Trust in public-sector senior management", *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, Vol.14, No. 1, pp. 76-92.

Blumenstyk, G. (2010), "Public Colleges Turn to Tuition Increases to Offset Budget Squeezes", *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, Aug. 31, 2010.

Bublitz, B. and Martin, S. (2007), "The Incorporation of Managerial Accounting Concepts into Governmental Organizations: The Case of Public Universities", *The Journal of Government Financial Management*, Vol. 56, No. 4, pp 56 -62.

Cook, J. and Wall, T. (1980), "New Work Attitude Measures of Trust, Organizational Commitment and Personal Need Non-Fulfillment", *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, Vol 53, pp 39-52.

Cummings, L. and Bromiley, P. (1996), "The Organizational Trust Inventory (OTI)", in Kramer and Tyler (Eds.), *Trust in Organizations*, Sage Publications.

Davis, J. *et al*. (2000), "The trusted general manager and business unit performance: Empirical evidence of a competitive advantage", *Strategic Management Journal*, Vol. 21, No. 5, pp 563.

Deem, R. (2004), "The knowledge worker, the manager academic and the contemporary UK university: new and old forms of public management?", *Financial Accountability and Management*, Vol 20, No. 2, pp 107-128.

Institute of Education Sciences (ies) National Center for Education Statistics, 2009 tables, Revenues of public degree-granting institutions, by source of revenue and type of institution 2004-05 through 2007-08, United States Department of Education, Washington, DC.

Goddard, A. and Ooi, K. (1998), "Activity based costing and central overhead allocation in universities: A case study", *Public Money and Management*, Jul-Sept. 1998, pp 31-38.

Goetzmann, W. et al. (2010), "Educational Endowments in Crises", *Journal of Portfolio Management, Vol. 26, No. 4, pp 112-125.*

Gross, E. (1968), "Universities as organisations – a research approach", *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 3, No. 4, pp 518-544.

Hope. J. and Fraser, R. (2003), *Beyond Budgeting: How Managers Can Break Free from the Annual Performance Trap*, Harvard Business School Press, Boston.

Horngren, C. *et al*. (2007), *Management Accounting*, 5th ed.; Pearson education, Canada.

Jarzabkowski, P. (2002), "Centralised or Decentralized? Strategic Implications of Resource Allocation Models", *Higher Education Quarterly,* Vol.56, No 1, pp 5-32.

Jensen, M. (2003), "Paying People to Lie: the Truth about the Budgeting Process", *European Financial Management*, Vol. 9, No. 3, pp 379-406.

Jones, S. (1994), "Modeling and Muddling: Resource Allocation in British Universities", in Berry R. H. (Ed.) *Management Accounting in Universities*, CIMA, UK, pp. 37-52.

Kramer, R. (1999), "Trust and Distrust in Organizations: Emerging Perspectives, Enduring Questions", *Annual Review of Psychology*, Vol. 50, pp. 569-598.

Kramer, R. and Tyler, T. (1996), *Trust in Organizations: Frontiers of Theory and Research*, Sage Publications, California.

Lapsley, I. and Miller, P. (2004), "Transforming Universities: the uncertain erratic path", *Financial Accountability and Management*, Vol. 20, No. 2, pp 103-106.

Libby, T. and Lindsay, R.M. (2010), "Beyond Budgeting or budgeting reconsidered? A survey of North-American budgeting practice", *Management Accounting Research*, Vol. 21, pp. 56-75.

Manochin, M. (2008), "The Role of Trust in the Resource Allocation Process of an Old University", *International Journal of Economic Sciences and Applied Research*, Vol. 1, No. 2, pp. 38-52.

Mayer, R., Davis, J., and Schoorman, F. (1995), "An integrative model of organizational trust", *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 20. pp. 709-734.

Paterson, L. (2003), "The survival of the Democratic Intellect: Academic Values in Scotland and England", *Higher Education Quarterly*, Vol. 57, No. 1, pp 67-93.

Priest, D. *et al*. (2002) *Incentive-Based Budgeting Systems in Public Universities*, Edward Elgar Publishing Ltd., Northampton.

Scapens, R. *et al*. (1994), "The development of overhead recovery models at the University of Manchester", in Berry R. H. (Ed.) *Management Accounting in Universities*, CIMA, UK, pp.55-67.

Shaw, R. (1997), *Trust in the Balance: Building Successful Organizations on Results, Integrity and Concern*; Jossey-Bass, San Francisco.

Thomas, H. (2000), "Power in the Resource Allocation Process: The impact of 'rational' systems", *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, Vol. 22, No.2, pp. 127-137.

Umapathy, S. (1987), *Current Budgeting Practices in US Industry*, Quorum Books, New York.

Whalen, E. (2002), "The Case, If Any, For Responsibility Center Budgeting", in Priest, Becker, Hossler and St. John (Eds.), *Incentive-Based Budgeting Systems in Public Universities*, Edward Elgar Publishing Ltd. Northampton.

Wildavsky, A. (1984), *The Politics of the Budgetary Process*; 4th ed., Little, Brown & Company Ltd., Canada.

Critical Issues Facing America's Community Colleges: A Summary of the Community College Futures Assembly 2011 Mixed Methods/Appreciative Inquiry Research Project

Matthew J. Basham, Ph.D., Associate Professor
College of Education and Behavioral Sciences
Western Kentucky University
Bowling Green, Kentucky, USA

Dale F. Campbell, Ph.D., Professor and Interim Director
School of Human Development & Organizational Studies in Education,
University of Florida
College of Education
University of Florida, Gainesville, Florida, USA

Hajara Mahmood, Doctoral Student
College of Education and Behavioral Sciences
Western Kentucky University
Bowling Green, Kentucky, USA

Kenyatta Martin, Doctoral Student
College of Education and Behavioral Sciences,
Western Kentucky University
Bowling Green, Kentucky, USA

ABSTRACT

For almost 20 years the Community College Futures Assembly (CCFA) has met annually in Orlando, Florida to serve as a showcase of best practices in community college administration and to serve as a think-tank for research and policy. Through the years the research methodology has evolved. The 2011 CCFA used a mixed-methods approach: qualitative research was collected in several focus groups to produce quantitative categories for voting in the beginning and end of the conference on those critical issues facing community colleges. Between voting sessions the participants attended the showcases of the best practices as well as a presentation demonstrating the sustainability of the winning programs from the past year. Final voting was intended to determine if a relationship exists between the voting sessions based upon the presentations. The descriptive statistics reveal the participants feel very strongly about some sort of redefinition of "education completion" needing to be developed. Moreover, the findings also show a statistically significant difference on opinions of the critical issues facing community colleges based upon the generation of the subject. The findings, including opportunities and challenges, potential implications for community college administrators, and future research topics are also discussed.

INTRODUCTION

For the past few years' changes, wanted or otherwise, have been occurring both within and without education, especially in the economy and nearly every industry around the world. In the face of so much gloom and doom it can be very easy just to turn over and let nature "take it course." However, as educational administrators we must continue to persevere in the best interests of our students and our communities. In doing so it is important for us to focus upon best practices and "what works best" for all of us. Ap-

preciative Inquiry (AI) is a research technique, which allows us to investigate the very best processes of organizational management in this difficult time. This paper will present an AI-mixed methods research project investigating the best practices in community college administration.

LITERATURE REVIEWED

For the purposes of this research, Appreciative Inquiry was selected as the foundational research methodology. As such, a brief overview of the inception of Appreciative Inquiry is presented. After which an overview of the history of the Community College Futures Assembly will provide the reader with an understanding of the constructs of the conference and the formative basis for the research project. Together, these discussions will lead into the research portion of this paper.

Appreciative Inquiry

In the mid-1980's qualitative researchers were generally in agreement with the seeming futility and direction of action research. In response a refinement of Action Research called "Appreciative Inquiry (AI)" was suggested as the "next generation of Action Research" by David L. Cooperrider and Suresh Srivastva (1987). Their newer brand of action research was based upon a "socio-rationalist" view of social research. They built an argument for this newer method upon the comments of Kurt Lewin, Abraham Maslov, Aristotle, and others to point out that action research was created to link science to practice. However, they felt the passion behind the structure and reasoning was severely linking. Appreciative Inquiry was developed to put that passion into the research linking science to practice. "Human beings have the capacity for symbolic interaction and, through language, they have the ability to collaborate in the investigation of their own world. Because of our human capacity for symbolic interaction, the introduction of new knowledge concerning aspects of our world carries with it the strong likelihood of changing that world itself" (Cooperrider & Srivastva, 1987, p. 15). In brief, the foundation of Appreciative Inquiry maintains the will of the group and the passion for the most critical issues will surface within a group. It is that passion which can guide teams to create change for the common good of an organization. Inevitably, the vision for a group can be set through that passion, grounded with integrity, cohesiveness and focus, of the collective group.

Thus, Appreciative Inquiry research seeks out the passion of the group to determine its future directions by identifying the "array of concrete problems an organization faces" (Cooperrider & Srivastva, 1987, p. 18). The process is simple and straight-forward. First, start with an Action-Research framework:

> Action-Research begins with an identified problem. Data are then gathered in a way that allows a diagnosis which can produce a tentative solution, which is then implemented with the assumption that it is likely to cause new or unforeseen problems that will, in turn, need to be evaluated, diagnosed, and so forth. This action-research method assumes a constantly evolving interplay between solutions, results, and new solution...this model is a general one applicable to solving any kind of problem in an ongoing organization (Cooperrider & Srivastva, 1987, 148 citing Cohen, Fink, et al., 1984, 359-360).

During that process the moderator should be trying to help the group identify "stressful situations" or those situations, which may be disrupting the organization or the people in the organization.

> Typical questions in [action-research] data gathering or "problem sensing" would include: What problems do you see in your group, including problems between people that are interfering with getting the job done the way you would like to see it done? And what problems do you see in the broader organization? (Cooperrider & Srivasta, 1987, 148, citing French, 1969, pp. 183-185).

Cooperrider and Srivastva (1987) also cite the University of Michigan's Social Institute in Social Research's factors as a way to help deduce a process for creating change by incorporating questions, which may evoke passion in the group:

> Three factors need to be taken into account in an organization development action-research effort: The behaviors that are problematic, the conditions that create those behaviors, and the interventions or activities that will correct the conditions creating the problems. What is it that people are doing or not doing, that is a problem? Why are they doing or not doing these particular things? Which of a large number of possible interventions or activities would be most likely to solve the problems by focusing on why problems exist?" (Cooper & Srivasta, 1987, citing Hausser, Pecorella, & Wissler, 1977, p. 2).

Thus, AI uses this framework to identify the "broken" elements for consideration for change in the organization. Once diagnosis has been made then the resolutions can be put forth. This is where Appreciative Inquiry adds systematically to Action Research. However, Cooperrider and Srivastva (1987) caution the researcher can dramatically alter the flow and direction of the answers and must be careful how they influence the group, since the group should command this action. Other researchers agree with this tenet as well (Whitney, 1998).

From here, the Appreciative Inquiry framework has been refined and revised to be a four-step process: discover, dream, design, and delivery (Lehner & Hight, 2006; Michael, 2005; Elleven, 2004; Alewine, 2003; Whitney, 1998). Delivery is sometimes called "destiny" also (Atkin & Lawson, 2006). The discovery phase inquires about processes or issues, which may need to be changed in an organization. The dream phase allows the passion to come forth, to allow the participants to dream on how to overcome those obstacles in a perfect world. In short, this allows them to "think out of the box." The design phase allows the participants to create plans for the organization in a collaborative process. Finally, the delivery phase allows the participants to create an action plan based upon the elements identified.

Participants have reported optimistic feedback with the AI process "it is easy to be negative, being positive makes you want to work" (Johnson and Leavitt, 2001, p. 131).

In the context of this foundational framework there have been many applications of Appreciative Inquiry since the 1980's in a variety of disciplines and fields such as marketing research (Whitney, 1998), tourism (Koster & Lemelin, 2009; Raymond & Hall, 2008), nursing and healthcare (Deason, Adhikari, Clopton, Oches, & Jensen, 2010; Chapman & Giles, 2009; Richer, M.C., Ritchie, J. & Marchionni, C., 2009; Maclean, 2007; Atkin & Lawson, 2006; Whitney, 1998), manufacturing (Reed, Jones & Irvine, 2005; Whitney, 1998), libraries (Sullivan, 2004; Alewine, 2003) organizational management (Langer & Thorup, 2006; Van Oosten, 2006), community planning (Boyd & Bright, 2007; Browne, 2004; Mathie & Cunningham, 2003; Whitney, 1998), human resources (Whitney, 1998) and education (San Martin & Calabrese, 2011; Calabrese, Hester, Frieson & Burkhalter, 2010; Kozik, Cooney, Vinciguerra, Gradel, & Black, 2009; Calabrese, Roberts, McLeod, Niles, Christopherson, Singh, & Berry, 2008; Doveston & Keenaghan, 2006; Lehner & Hight, 2006; Carnell, 2005; del la Ossa, 2005; Kemp, 2001). Therefore, the soundness of the methodology, as demonstrated for almost 30 years, logically appears to the researchers to be a sound framework from which to conduct this research herein. Moreover, this research method has been used before in community college organization research (Yoder, 2005). Before we progress to the research methods used in this project, a discussion of the environment in which the AI framework will be implemented is warranted first.

History of the Community College Futures Assembly

The Community College Futures Assembly (CCFA) has been held annually in Orlando, Florida since 1995 and has been hosted by the University of Florida, College of Education. Hundreds of community colleges have sent in applications for the national conference representing almost every state in the United States. Its purpose is to serve as an independent policy think tank, to educe the critical issues facing community college administration, and to serve as a showcase for best practices in community college administration (Morris & Campbell, 2008). Every year a different theme is chosen in

which the research will be designed. The Bellwether criteria are developed based upon current events directly affecting community college administration. As with other conferences there are sometimes some pre-seminar sessions to assist in professional development.

The keynote speech opens the conference on Saturday night. The keynote speaker is selected most often from a discipline outside of education to provide context for policy discussion. There have been a number of very popular themes and keynote speakers at the CCFA. For example, the 2010 conference theme showcased Michael Fullan and his latest book on "Turnaround Leadership" (Campbell & Basham, 2010) the 2009 keynote speaker was Jacqui Banaszynski, the Knight Chair in Editing at the Missouri School of Journalism who discussed "how technology should have been a wake up call to journalists" (Basham, Campbell & Garcia, 2010; (Mendoza, Basham, Campbell, O'Daniels, Malcolm, Felton, Lebesch, & Douma, 2009, November), and the 2008 keynote speaker was Alan Deutschman and his book "Change or Die" (Morris & Campbell, 2008).

Sunday sessions are intended to serve as the formative basis of policy research at CCFA. The details of those sessions are included in the research design phase. From these sessions policy papers are written and shared at several other conferences and key community college advocate groups including the American Association of Community Colleges (AACC), National Council of State Directors of Community Colleges, the Academic Chairs Conference International, the Association of Community College Trustees (ACCT), and the National Council of Instructional Administration (NCIA), the National Council on Continuing Education and Training (NCCET) and others.

On Monday the 30 finalists selected are given an hour to present their best practices project to the attendees. The presentations are arranged according to their category in Instructional Programming and Services (IPS), Planning, Governance, and Finance (PGF), and Workforce Development (WD).

Those best practices are also invited to set up displays to showcase their practices for more personalized conversations on Tuesday morning. During that time the three winning programs from the previous year also present updates from their programs. A focus is placed upon sustainability of projects. Finally at the closing luncheon on Tuesday, final voting in the research project is accomplished before the winning programs are announced.

As an addendum, unlike other conferences there are no sponsors or advertisers at the conference. The intent of the conference is to provide a comfortable environment in which to allow creativity to flourish at the highest level without the pressure of salespersons co-mingling.

Thus far this paper has presented the literature reviewed on Appreciative Inquiry and the history of the Community College Futures Assembly as a basis for designing the research for this project. In the next section, the qualitative research methodology will be presented.

QUALITATIVE RESEARCH DESIGN

On Sunday, January 30, 2011 several focus groups were held at the annual Community College Futures Assembly (http://www.coe.ufl.edu/futures/). The focus group members consisted of Board of Trustee members, Community College Presidents, central administrators and faculty members. The 75 participants were divided as equally as possibly into four focus groups. The focus group participants were then asked to reflect on the comments from the keynote speaker, Jeanne Meister, and her research on the 2020 Workforce with respect to leadership challenges for community college administrators (Meister, 2011). The onus of her speech included skills for tomorrow's leaders: to be able to work in a multicultural environment, to be able to work in more flattened hierarchical organizational structures, to be more skilled with efficient use of technology, and to be able to work more efficiently with multigenerational colleagues, supervisors, and subordinates (Meister & Willyerd, 2010).

For the qualitative research design we selected Appreciative Inquiry to serve as our foundational research framework. This framework was selected over other more traditional qualitative research methods since AI seems to be more robust than content analysis, grounded research,

ethnography or any other qualitative research method. Moreover, AI is especially well suited for leadership inquiry and analysis (Walker & Carr-Stewart, 2004; Carr-Stewart & Walker, 2003). Historically, AI has proven to yield very insightful research for the audience at CCFA (Basham, Campbell, & Garcia, 2010; Campbell & Basham, 2010a; Campbell & Basham, 2010b; Mendoza, Basham, Campbell, O'Daniels, Malcolm, Felton, Lebesch, & Douma, 2009; Basham, Campbell, & Mendoza, 2008; Campbell, D.F. & Basham, 2007). Thus, it was determined that AI should be the research framework for the qualitative research portion of the mixed methods research used at CCFA.

Each group was to brainstorm as many ideas as possible, based upon the question being asked. The tasks:

Step 1 Consider the current state of your institution and identify current gaps in your institution based upon the presentations from yesterday on case studies and/or the keynote speech. Your task is to brainstorm as many ideas as possible.

Step 2 Consider the current state of your institution and identify PROJECT-ED gaps in your institution in 2020 based upon the presentations from yesterday on case studies and/or the keynote speech. Your task is to brainstorm as many ideas as possible.

Step 3 What actions do you need to take now to ensure that your college will be prepared to meet the needs of students to succeed in the 2020 workplace? Your task again is to brainstorm as many ideas as possible.

Step 4 What actions do you need to take now to ensure that your college will be prepared to meet the needs of the community to succeed in the 2020 workplace? Your task again is to brainstorm as many ideas as possible.

Each of the four groups then posted the brainstormed list around the conference room by question number. Throughout the day attendees were allowed to peruse all of the items and vote for their #1 choice in each of the four questions as to what they thought was the most critical issue facing community colleges in America. The top 5-7 items would then be used to construct the items for voting. The focus group participants voted that afternoon on what the top critical issue should be for America's community colleges. After viewing the Bellwether finalist presentations on Monday and hearing feedback from the 2010 Bellwether winning presentations, the entire assembly would have the opportunity to vote upon the top critical issues facing America's community colleges during Tuesday's sessions. The final voting aggregate data was gathered using Turning Point Personal Response Systems (also known as "clickers").

Qualitative Research Findings

The groups brainstormed a variety of answers for each of the four questions presented. The collective responses are available by request from the authors. Throughout the day the participants were allowed to vote for their top selection in each of the four tasks. The top 5-7 answers for each task are presented in Table 1. In this section we will briefly present the context of the discussions for each of those top selections.

#1 What are your *current* institutional gaps?

The first task asked the group to brainstorm and identify the current institutional gaps. In no particular order, there was a lengthy discussion with respect to faculty-administration communication problems. This is not without historical support from previous CCFA research sessions. Moreover, from the industrial-organizational research conducted by the authors on many educational administrative groups in nearly all groups "communication" is the one attribute rating which historically is the lowest of the leadership competencies (Basham & Mathur, 2010; Basham, Stader, & Bishop, 2009; Basham, 2008). Professional development for all is also a recurring issue. Defining a "new vision of education" in the USA essentially encompassed the discussion on identifying or revising "completion" in the community college setting. Some discussion ensued on adopting the vocational model, linking occupational completion points at certain milestones throughout a students educational program. Therefore successes will be more easily

Table 1
Community College Futures Assembly 2011
Aggregate Voting Descriptive Data

Question Answer	Sunday Voting		Tuesday Voting	
	n	%	n	%
#1 What are your current institutional gaps?	(N = 47)		(N = 81)	
Faculty-administration communication problems	10	22%	6	7%
Professional development for all	8	15%	13	16%
Defining a "new vision of education" in the USA	18	39%	36	44%
Creating/maintaining internal/external partnerships	7	15%	14	17%
Creating/maintaining global partnership	4	9%	12	15%
#2 What are your projected institutional gaps?	(N = 46)		(N = 76)	
Employee selection	2	4%	9	12%
Connections with WFD/Industry	12	26%	19	26%
Leadership/HR	15	33%	12	16%
Teaching "to fit the needs"	11	24%	27	35%
Technology	6	13%	9	12%
#3 Actions on behalf of students?	(N = 48)		(N = 76)	
E-learning infrastructure development	4	8%	9	12%
Becoming more multicultural	2	4%	4	4%
Creating stronger community relations	5	10%	3	4%
Breaking those "silos" between departments	12	23%	13	16%
Employability skill training	8	19%	21	29%
Critical thinking skill training	17	35%	26	35%
#4 Actions on behalf of the community?	(N = 48)		(N = 76)	
Maintaining a continuous dialog with the community	3	8%	3	4%
Maintaining/developing regional partnerships	6	10%	9	12%
Telling the "CC/Economic development" story	8	17%	14	18%
Globalization	3	6%	11	14%
Understanding the role on economic development	13	23%	15	18%
Collaboration with business partners	15	33%	26	35%

measured by employability and not necessarily in the "arbitrary" educational model of obtaining a "degree" per se. Also included in the top were categories of creating, maintaining, and sustaining internal and external partnerships and creating, maintaining and sustaining global partnerships. These also have been discussed in previous CCFA research projects.

#2 What are your *projected* institutional gaps?

Again, in no particular order employee selection was identified as one of the top projected institutional gaps by the research group attendees. This category encompasses succession planning and all issues related to employee selection. This is not to be confused with the leadership/HR issue, which is more interested with being able to find leaders when the time arises. This is more relevant to "finding talent" rather than "selecting talent." Creating, maintaining and sustaining

connections with workforce development and industry were also identified. There was considerable discussion to collapse several items into one broad category called teaching to "fit the needs." The majority felt this projected gap mainly covers "how to teach programs for occupations which do not exist today" and "addressing workforce needs." Examples from the onset of nanotechnology and green jobs were presented. The final category also encompasses several: technology. This is to include adapting new technology, integrating technology, but also using technology effectively.

#3 What are actions you need to take now on *behalf of the students?*

Somewhat related to the technology category in #2, one category identified here is development and refinement of the E-learning infrastructure. There were discussions on the evolvement of E-learning into stand-alone departments and not necessarily those dominated by IT personnel, but those integrating learning management systems, enterprise systems, and learning platforms. The groups as a whole echoed the sentiments expressed by the keynote speaker in taking actions to become more multi-culturally engrained on campus. This includes professional development activities to provide multicultural training. Also in this category was integrating community relations into the curriculum, including community relations or service-based learning projects. Breaking down those silos between the departments was also identified as a critical issue on behalf of the students. Too many times faculty members do not stray out of their department to engage others (students and faculty alike) in different departments. The last two categories involve training to be incorporated in the curriculum: employability skills and critical thinking skills.

#4 What are actions you need to take now on *behalf of the community*?

In our final question, again in no particular order, maintaining a continuous dialog was identified as one of the top critical issues for acting on behalf of the community. Several group members strongly voiced this as a concern, however, they also conceded that with shrinking staff and resources maintaining those dialogs are quickly disappearing from the priority lists, and they should not be. Similarly, maintaining and developing regional partnerships was also identified as a priority. As with years past, globalization has been identified as a critical issue. This will encompass including more global projects in the curriculum as well as with global service learning projects. The final three categories were the source of several discussions as to whether they should be combined into one category. The group members instead felt three categories would best represent the intent of the project. Group members felt very strongly about including telling the economic development-community college connection story to the community. They felt with all of the economic changes and retirements there are new people in the community who may not be aware of the roles and relationships of the community college with the local businesses and industries. In short, the community college administrators do not want to be "left out" of collaborations in the future from a lack of knowledge. The other two categories, similar to the telling of the story, were "understanding the role on economic development" and "collaboration with business partners."

The other portion of the qualitative research included the presentations from all 30 finalists. In the interest of preserving space only the three winning programs are briefly described next. A complete list is available from the authors.

Bellwether Winning Programs

More than 200 community colleges submitted proposals for consideration in the 2011 Community College Futures Assembly. There are three categories: (1) Instructional Programs and Services, (2) Planning, Governance and Finance, and (3) Workforce Development. The judging for this year's award was based upon flexible deliver methods, international partnerships, innovation and collaboration to develop resources, understanding social and global dynamics, partnerships and programs aiding the completion agenda. Peers in each of the three areas conducted the judging. In the Instructional Programs and Services (IPS) category, which are programs that have been designed and successfully implemented to foster or support teaching and learning in the community

college, senior leaders from the National Council for Instructional Administrators served as judges. In the Planning, Governance and Finance (PGF) category, which are programs that have been designed and successfully implemented to improve efficiency and effectiveness in the community college, senior leaders from the Council for Resource Development (CRD) served as judges. Finally in the Workforce Development (WD) category, which are public and/or private strategic alliances and partnerships that promote community and economic development, senior leaders from the National Council on Continuing Education and Training served as judges. Ten finalists in each category were invited to present and compete for the Bellwether Award.

The 2011 Bellwether Award in the Instructional, Programming and Services category was awarded to Sinclair Community College (SCC), in Dayton, Ohio, for their program "*Pioneering Online Science Labs.*" The presentation by SCC described the successful development of an online science curriculum delivered using lab simulations. The strategies and technologies SCC used to develop and deliver online labs ensure that online students meet the same learning outcomes as traditional students. SCC has experienced great impact and student learning outcomes through their online science lab. Learn more about SCC's science programs at http://www.sinclair.edu/online/. (Community College Futures Assembly, 2011).

The 2011 Bellwether Award in the Planning, Governance, and Finance category was awarded to Prince George Community College (PGCC), Largo, Maryland, for their program "*Engaging Students and Empowering a Community: A Campus-Based Community Organization.*" The presentation by PGCC's discussed PGCC's Community Financial Center support for economic improvement of Prince George's County residents through its Finance 411 education program, year-round free Volunteer Income Tax Assistance (VITA) program, and financial information network. Through involvement of students, faculty, and community volunteers, PGCC provides needed financial resources and education, residential support and assistance by partnering with existing organizations. For more information, visit the college Web site at www.pgcc.edu (Community College Futures Assembly, 2011).

The 2011 Bellwether Award winner in the Workforce Development category was awarded to Houston Community College (HCC), Houston, Texas, for their program "*Exporting Houston Community College.*" The HCC presentation detailed the development of a fully American accredited associate degree programs offered in Vietnam, a pioneering consortium partnership in Brazil, and multiple accomplishments in the Middle East. Through international partnerships, HCC has reassessed and redefined its service community to educate adaptable and resilient students prepared for the global economy. To learn more about HCC's attempts to "think local and act global" visit their website, http://www.hccs.edu/portal/site/hccs (Community College Futures Assembly, 2011).

Each of the attendees at the conference had the opportunity to listen to up to 6 of the concurrent finalist sessions in between the voting sessions. The voting sessions comprised the quantitative portion of the mixed methods design and will be discussed next.

QUANTITATIVE RESEARCH DESIGN

Those top issues identified in the qualitative research formed the foundation for the quantitative research portion of this mixed methods research study. In what we feel is an unusual departure from traditional Appreciative Inquiry (AI) research we are also including quantitative research based upon the AI findings. In this section the research variables, research questions, research hypotheses, and findings are presented.

Research Variables

In this study there are four main dependent variables and four main independent variables. Each of the variables was treated as nominal, numeric variables. Current institutional gaps, projected institutional gaps, actions on behalf of students, and actions on behalf of the community served as the dependent variables while gender, generation, region, title, and day of the week served as the independent variables.

Research Questions

In contrast to years past, several research questions framed the research methodology described. The quantitative research questions guiding this quasi-experimental design project are:

- RQ1 What is the relationship on the critical issues of the participants between Sunday and Tuesday, when presentations (treatment) are shown between testing increments when controlling for socioeconomic status variables?
- RQ2 What is the relationship on the critical issues of the participants when controlling for generational differences?

In order to test for support of the second research question there are five null hypotheses:

- HØ1: There is no difference in the critical issues identified by the sample based upon generational categories.
- HØ2: There is no difference in the critical issues identified for current institutional gaps (Q1) based upon generational categories.
- HØ3: There is no difference in the critical issues identified for projected institutional gaps (Q2) based upon generational categories.
- HØ4: There is no difference in the critical issues identified on behalf of students (Q3) based upon generational categories.
- HØ5: There is no difference in the critical issues identified on behalf of the community (Q4) based upon generational categories.

These data collected to test support for these questions were analyzed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (v. 18). The significance for this study will be set at the a = Ø.Ø5 level. During the analysis missing data will be excluded from statistical procedures, therefore some sample numbers and population numbers will vary from item to item. The overall population for this study is *N = 81.*

Quantitative Findings

The quantitative findings will be discussed in two sections: the descriptive statistics and the inferential statistics.

Descriptive Statistics

Since the variables were nominal we counted the responses and calculated the percentages for each answer (see Table 1). The first question identified the current critical issues within the organization. The most selected answer was defining a "new vision of education" or "completion" in the USA on Sunday (n = 18, 39%) and Tuesday (n = 36, 44%). The second most selected answer on Sunday (n = 1Ø, 22%) was faculty-administration communication problems, which slipped down a bit (n = 7, 7%) on Tuesday while creating and maintaining internal and external relationships inched up a bit (from n = 7, 15% to n = 14, 17%).

The most selected answer identifying the projected gaps within an institution on Sunday was leadership/human relations (n = 15, 33%), which dropped down on Tuesday (n = 12, 16%) to third place. On Tuesday the most selected answer became teaching to fit the needs of workforce or industry (n = 27, 35%), which on Sunday only received (n = 11) 24% of the votes (third).

For the actions taken on behalf of students the most selected answer did not change from Sunday (n = 17, 35%) to Tuesday (n = 26, 35%): critical thinking skills. However, the second most selected answer on Sunday was breaking down those silos between departments (n = 12, 23%), which dropped to (n = 13) 16% on Tuesday (third). On the other hand, employability skills increased on Sunday (n = 8, 19%) to Tuesday (n = 21, 29%).

In the final dependent variable question we asked the assembly to vote upon those actions to be taken on behalf of the community. The most selected answer did not change from Sunday (n = 15, 33%) to Tuesday (n = 26, 33%): collaboration with business partners. The second most selected answer however, did change somewhat. The understanding of the community college's role on economic development dropped between Sunday (n = 13, 23%) and Tuesday (n = 15, 18%), while telling the community college/economic devel-

opment story increased between Sunday (n = 8, 17%) to Tuesday (n = 14, 18%).

The socioeconomic status variables show some discrepancies and not too much even distribution (see Table 2). The gender represents the composition of the student body in community colleges with about 60% female and 40% males. The clear majority of participants in the sample are from the Baby Boomer generation (n = 44, 61%), with the Generation X (n = 18, 25%) ranking second. Most of the participants in the sample work either in the North Central (n = 22, 31%) or in the Southern, or Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS) region (n = 21, 30%). This demographic is heavily dependent upon the finalist presentations. Finally the largest percentage of participants is "other administration" (n = 23, 33%) with senior administrators not too far behind (n = 21, 29%).

Inferential Statistics

A variety of inferential statistics were calculated to provide a more complete picture of the aggregate data. In most cases non-parametric procedures were used to compensate for small cell sizes in the samples. In this section the inferential statistics are presented. Thereafter the discussion and implications for practitioners will ensue.

Table 2

Community College Futures Assembly 2011
Aggregate Socioeconomic Status (SES) Descriptive Data

Question Answer	Sunday Voting		Tuesday Voting	
	n	%	n	%
#5 Gender	(N = 48)		(N = 73)	
Male	21	44%	35	48%
Female	26	56%	38	52%
#6 What is your generation?	(N = 51)		(N = 72)	
Traditional (pre-1946)	4	8%	5	7%
Baby boomer (1947-1964)	25	51%	44	61%
Generation X (1965-1977)	14	25%	18	25%
Millennials (1978-1997)	8	16%	5	7%
Workforce 2020 (1998+)	0	0%	0	0%
#7 From which accreditation region are you employed?	(N = 50)		(N = 71)	
Middle states	11	22%	14	20%
New England	0	0%	1	1%
North Central	8	16%	22	31%
North West	8	16%	9	13%
Southern	21	42%	21	30%
Western	2	4%	4	6%
#8 What is your closest title?	(N = 51)		(N = 71)	
Board member	1	2%	2	3%
President	8	16%	7	10%
Senior administration	14	27%	21	29%
Other administration	16	31%	23	33%
Faculty	7	14%	8	11%
Other	5	10%	10	14%

The first analysis used the non-parametric Pearson's Chi-Square/cross-tabulation procedures to educe support, or lack thereof, for the research questions and null hypotheses presented earlier in this paper.

Since we are using nominal data cross-tabulations were selected as the inferential statistical technique to discern if any differences existed globally on the four main dependent variables between the responses on Sunday and Tuesday. This data will be used to answer research question 1. In general no statistically significant support was found in the cross-tabulations (asymptotic 2-sided test) between the dependent variable from Sunday to Tuesday (see Table 3). However, to be more precise the researchers then repeated the cross-tabulations procedure and controlled for the socioeconomic status independent variables. When controlling for gender, there were no appreciable statistically significant differences (see Table 4). However, it should be noted statistical significance at the a = 0.10 level for projected institution gaps for females (X^2 = 10.052, p = 0.074) between Sunday and Tuesday, and for actions on behalf of students (X^2 = 10.571, p < 0.061) for gender as a whole between Sunday and Tuesday. These may just be spurious findings, but are still worth noting all the same. The cross-tabulations, when controlling for generation, found a statistically significant finding (X^2 = 11.564, p < 0.041) for actions on behalf of students (see Table 5). There indicates some effect of the socioeconomic status independent variable "generation" upon the four broad questions. What this indicates to us is while deriving a plan of action based upon these critical issues identified here, we should also be careful to create a "plan B" or some alternate plan in case there are massive retirements or movements of upper generational administrators.

Table 3
Cross-Tabulation Results for Q1-Q4 by Day (Sunday-Tuesday)

Crosstab	Pearson X^2	*df*	Asy. *p* (2-sided)	N Sun.	N Tues.
Q1	6.684	5	0.245	55	101
Q2	8.401	5	0.135	55	101
Q3	8.107	5	0.230	55	101
Q4	5.335	6	0.502	55	101

Table 4
Cross-Tabulation Results for Q1-Q4 by Day (Sunday-Tuesday) by Gender

Crosstab Var 1	Crosstab Var 2	Pearson X^2	*df*	Asy. *p* (2-sided)	N Sun.	N Tues.
Q1	Gender	3.771	4	0.438	47	73
	Male	3.157	5	0.676	21	35
	Female	7.155	5	0.209	26	38
Q2	Gender	2.192	5	0.822	47	73
	Male	1.977	5	0.852	21	35
	Female	10.052	5	0.074	26	38
Q3	Gender	10.571	5	0.061	47	73
	Male	5.673	6	0.461	21	35
	Female	7.040	6	0.317	26	38
Q4	Gender	4.792	6	0.571	47	73
	Male	7.116	6	0.310	21	35
	Female	4.732	6	0.579	26	38

When controlling by region (see Table 6), we find marginally statistically significant findings for current institutional gaps in general (X2 = 10.776, p < 0.056) and for the answers between Sunday and Tuesday in the Southern region (X^2 = 12.673, p < 0.027).

There is some effect of the socioeconomic status independent variable "region" upon the four broad questions. This is indicative of the region from which an employee resides and the potential or willingness to change. For example, those employed in the Southern region have a statistically significant difference when comparing their votes between Sunday and Tuesday. This may infer the presentation provided had an effect upon changing their opinion of what truly is critical for community colleges. This may also mean the other regions are better at decision making with which to begin.

There is some effect of the socioeconomic status independent variable "title" upon the four broad

Table 5
Cross-Tabulation Results for Q1-Q4 by Day (Sunday-Tuesday) by Generation

Crosstab		Pearson	*df*	Asy. *p*	N	N
Var 1	Var 2	X^2			Sunday	Tuesday
Q1	Generation	2.337	5	0.801	50	72
	Traditional	3.938	4	0.415	4	5
	Baby Boomer	8.428	5	0.134	24	44
	Gen X	4.049	5	0.542	14	18
	Millenial	2.790	4	0.594	8	5
	WF2020	n/a	n/a	n/a	0	
Q2	Generation	4.307	5	0.506	51	72
	Traditional	3.600	4	0.463	4	5
	Baby Boomer	7.762	5	0.170	25	44
	Gen X	1.940	4	0.747	14	18
	Millenial	2.297	3	0.513	8	5
	WF2020	n/a	n/a	n/a	0	0
Q3	Generation	11.564	5	0.041	51	72
	Traditional	3.938	4	0.415	4	5
	Baby Boomer	7.978	6	0.240	25	44
	Gen X	7.547	5	0.183	14	18
	Millenial	3.142	5	0.678	8	5
	WF2020	n/a	n/a	n/a	0	0
Q4	Generation	9.942	5	0.77	51	72
	Traditional	4.140	4	0.387	4	5
	Baby Boomer	7.957	6	0.241	25	44
	Gen X	10.405	6	0.109	14	18
	Millenial	6.541	5	0.265	8	5
	WF2020	n/a	n/a	n/a	0	0

questions. We have found that junior administrators (X2 = 13.644, p < 0.08), like those personnel from the Southern region, may either be more amenable to change, or may not be as decisive as those with other titles (see Table 7).

To further investigate the null hypotheses we used only the data from Tuesday to determine if there was no relationship between generations and the answers of the dependent variables (see Table 8). Each of the five null hypotheses was found to be significant using non-parametric one sample Chi-square testing. The individual counts for Baby Boomer responses and Generation X responses were tabulated (see Table 9). We removed the responses from the Traditionalists and Millennials since each of those groups had very low numbers. No statistically significant differences were found between the responses. Interestingly the highest counts for each group occurred for the same critical issue identified. We hypothesized creating an overall "plan of attack" based upon the assembly votes and then creating a "Plan B" to reflect any retirements, change of leadership, etc. We, however, are not able to do so in this instance.

It is also interesting to note there are changes, which have taken place when controlling for generations (see Table 9). Almost 57% of Baby Boomers selected "defining a new vision of education in the USA" as the top institutional gap whereas only 37.5% of Generation Xer's selected that item. On the other hand, creating, maintaining, and sustaining internal and external partnerships was selected 31.3% of the time by Generation Xer's but only 13.5% of the time by Baby Boomers. Does this reflect more time for

Table 6
Cross-Tabulation Results for Q1-Q4 by Day (Sunday-Tuesday) by Region

Crosstab		Pearson	*df*	Asy. *p*	N	N
Var 1	Var 2	X^2			Sunday	Tuesday
Q1	Region	10.776	5	0.056	50	71
	Middle	6.809	5	0.235	11	14
	New England	n/a	n/a	n/a	0	1
	North Central	5.186	5	0.394	8	22
	North West	4.032	3	0.258	8	9
	Southern	12.673	5	0.027	21	21
	Western	3.000	2	0.223	2	4
Q2	Region	2.760	5	0.737	50	71
	Middle	2.205	5	0.820	11	14
	New England	n/a	n/a	n/a	0	1
	North Central	9.261	5	0.099	8	22
	North West	4.122	4	0.390	8	9
	Southern	4.500	5	0.480	21	21
	Western	0.000	1	1.000	2	4
Q3	Region	4.041	6	0.671	50	71
	Middle	3.650	5	0.601	11	14
	New England	n/a	n/a	n/a	0	1
	North Central	7.094	5	0.214	8	22
	North West	3.907	4	0.419	8	9
	Southern	3.086	6	0.798	21	21
	Western	1.500	1	0.221	2	4
Q4	Region	9.917	5	0.078	50	71
	Middle	2.318	4	0.678	11	14
	New England	n/a	n/a	n/a	0	1
	North Central	9.850	6	0.131	8	22
	North West	3.260	5	0.605	8	9
	Southern	5.933	6	0.431	21	21
	Western	1.500	2	0.472	2	4

"abstract" thinking? Does this reflect the daily work routines of the generational administrator? This argument could go either way. As such, we will leave it to you to decide.

For those projected institutional gaps and controlling for generations we also find some gaps to consider for our discussion (see Table 9). Of the Baby Boomers 18.9% chose employee selection whereas none of the Generation Xer's did. Likewise 25% of the Generation Xer's selected "technology" but only 10.8% of the Baby Boomers did. Does this reflect the intergenerational differences regarding technology use? Does this reflect differences in "broader" institutional thinking regarding succession planning? Again, this sets the stage for more discussions to be had at a future time.

For those actions taken on behalf of the students we find some gaps between the generations as well (see Table 9). While the Baby Boomers selected "creating stronger community relations" 20.9% of the time only 5.56% of the Generation Xer's did. This may point to a cognizance issue as

Table 7
Cross-Tabulation Results for Q1-Q4 by Day (Sunday-Tuesday) by Title

Crosstab		Pearson X^2	*df*	Asy. *p*	N Sunday	N Tuesday
Var 1	**Var 2**					
Q1	Title	7.581	4	0.108	51	71
	Board Mem.	3.000	2	0.223	1	2
	President	0.938	2	0.626	8	7
	Sr. Admin.	7.344	5	0.196	14	21
	Other Adm.	13.644	5	0.018	16	23
	Faculty	2.946	4	0.567	7	8
	Other	4.350	4	0.361	5	10
Q2	Title	4.106	5	0.534	51	71
	Board Mem.	0.750	1	0.386	1	2
	President	4.420	5	0.491	8	7
	Sr. Admin.	6.771	5	0.238	14	21
	Other Adm.	4.628	5	0.463	16	23
	Faculty	10.179	5	0.070	7	8
	Other	3.750	4	0.441	5	10
Q3	Title	5.008	5	0.415	51	71
	Board Mem.	3.000	2	0.223	1	2
	President	5.960	5	0.310	8	7
	Sr. Admin.	3.056	6	0.802	14	21
	Other Adm.	4.278	6	0.639	16	23
	Faculty	2.143	4	0.710	7	8
	Other	7.125	4	0.129	5	10
Q4	Title	10.146	5	0.071	51	71
	Board Mem.	3.000	2	0.223	1	2
	President	4.286	5	0.509	8	7
	Sr. Admin.	4.514	5	0.478	14	21
	Other Adm.	3.067	6	0.800	16	23
	Faculty	6.071	4	0.194	7	8
	Other	5.100	5	0.404	5	10

well, reflective of the daily routines of those administrators and faculty.

Finally we find some puzzling data on those actions taken on behalf of the community. On the one hand we find Baby Boomers selecting maintaining and developing community relations 17.9% and understanding the role on economic development 20.5% of the time over Generation Xer's 0% for both. On the other hand we find telling the economic development-community college story 27.8% of the time for Generation Xer's to 17.9% of the time for Baby Boomers. However, we feel this mirrors the earlier arguments within the groups to collapse these into one item or leave them as three.

Thus, we have concluded with our inferential statistics that we have found something, but really cannot be certain without further testing. The significance of the inferential findings alone warrants replication and scaling up to larger samples and different populations.

Table 8
Non-Parametric One-Sample Chi-Square Test Results for Q1-Q4 from Tuesday only by Generation

Null Hypothesis		X^2	*df*	*p*	Decision
H01:	Generation categories occur with equal probabilities	56.333	3	0.000	Reject null hypothesis
H02:	The categories of #1 occur with equal probabilities	32.642	4	0.000	Reject null hypothesis
H03:	The categories of #2 occur with equal probabilities	15.842	4	0.003	Reject null hypothesis
H04:	The categories of #3 occur with equal probabilities	33.895	5	0.000	Reject null hypothesis
H05:	The categories of #4 occur with equal probabilities	22.615	5	0.000	Reject null hypothesis

Table 9
Counts from voting by Baby Boomers and Generation X attendees

Question	Baby Boomer		Generation X	
	n	%	n	%
#1 What are your current institutional gaps?	(*N* = **37**)		(*N* = **16**)	
Faculty-administration communication problems	0	0.00	1	6.25
Professional development for all	7	18.9	2	12.5
Defining a "new vision of education" in the USA	21	56.8	6	37.5
Creating/maintaining internal/external partnerships	5	13.5	5	31.3
Creating/maintaining global partnership	4	10.8	2	12.5
#2 What are your projected institutional gaps?	(*N* = **37**)		(*N* = **16**)	
Employee selection	7	18.9	0	0.00
Connections with WFD/Industry	10	27.0	3	18.8
Leadership/HR	4	10.8	2	12.5
Teaching "to fit the needs"	12	32.4	6	37.5
Technology	4	10.8	4	25.0
#3 Actions on behalf of *students?*	(*N* = **39**)		(*N* = **18**)	
E-learning infrastructure development	3	7.69	2	11.1
Becoming more multicultural	2	5.13	0	0.00
Creating stronger community relations	8	20.5	1	5.56
Breaking those "silos" between departments	0	0.00	1	5.56
Employability skill training	10	25.6	7	38.9
Critical thinking skill training	16	41.0	7	38.9
#4 Actions on behalf of *the community?*	(*N* = **39**)		(*N* = **18**)	
Maintaining a continuous dialog with the community	1	2.57	2	11.1
Maintaining/developing regional partnerships	7	17.9	0	0.00
Telling the "CC/Economic development" story	7	17.9	5	27.8
Globalization	4	10.3	4	22.2
Understanding the role on economic development	8	20.5	0	0.00
Collaboration with business partners	12	30.8	7	38.9

DISCUSSION

To bring this research to a conclusion we will first discuss some of the limitations of this research before introducing our thoughts as to the broader implications of this research for both practitioners and researchers alike.

Limitations of Research

Unfortunately, as with most research, there are a number of limitations. In the future, the researchers could record individual personal response system numbers by respondent in order to conduct the research using pair-wise analysis. This should increase the insight into the data.

The sample size could be expanded. This would enhance the strength of the statistics procedures. Using non-parametric procedures yields some significance, but not particularly strong results. A larger sample size would help, however, the sample size is reflected and largely dictated by the number of participants at the conference. Over the years, as budgets tighten at community colleges, attendees are being more selective as to the conferences they will attend. The CCFA has seen its numbers shrink from over 200 down to around 100 or so in the past five years.

Since the keynote speech and speaker vary from year to year there is only weak or causal analysis, which can be inferred from longitudinal analysis of the data. We do not see this changing any time soon, however this is a limitation.

Of course, replicating this study with this group over time would also overcome some limitations of this study. However, this too, will probably not be done.

Finally, using only nominal variables creates some limitations for the study. It would be interesting to use some Likert scales to gauge intensity of categorical variables for each of the questions.

Implications for Practitioners

The implications for practitioners are interesting. On the one hand we see some responses, which seem to mirror daily activities and routines. On the other hand when we control by generations we can see a "shift" in thought processes. We have seen that practitioners wish to be very involved with maintaining relationships with business, industry, and the community in both a local and global sense. However, we also have heard concerns about the longer hours involved in serving as a community college administrator. And those longer hours leave little time for creating, maintaining or sustaining those relationships.

We definitely see a very heavy focus on workforce development. The explosion of nanotechnology and green jobs over the past few years has served community college administrators as a "wake up call" to be prepared to create workforce programs "on the fly" for occupations tomorrow which do not exist today. The advent of working from home, as mentioned by Meister, should serve as a catalyst for further discussions to investigate "future jobs" for researchers and practitioners alike.

It will be interesting to see some discussions evolving on the role of the community college in the new century. There are many external forces shaping the role of the "new century" community college, including E-learning, "for-profit" colleges (such as Kaplan, the University of Phoenix, and others), and baccalaureate granting community colleges. In many respects these forces all combine to create a very tenuous set of circumstances for community colleges. Defining that "new vision of education" certainly will take center stage in discussions for a few years.

Implications for Researchers

There is one glaring implication for researchers that would be remiss in our duties if we did not mention here. We selected Appreciative Inquiry to be the research framework for this study, however we cannot help but make parallels to the rise of AI with the rise of social media. There are numerous similarities, which bear further research. For example, Brogan (2010) says, "you can either speak *at* people or you can speak *with* people" (p. 1). Effective social media allows people to talk with other people. This too, is the hallmark of AI research: empowering the participants to create synergy and change. We feel more research comparing and contrasting AI and social media may yield further positive changes in AI as a research methodology (see also, Calabrese, et al., 2008).

Also, we have yet found a mixed methods study incorporating Appreciative Inquiry as the foun-

dational framework. This could be good or bad. It will be interesting to see if other researchers follow suit and attempt mixed methods projects using AI.

Implications for Leadership Programs

There are some implications for leadership programs found within this study. We have found several instances of communications problems in the categories. For example, we saw one item on "telling the economic development-community college story." This would be a good project to include in a leadership program. As we mentioned, communication skills almost always seems to rank near the bottom of the leadership competencies in our past studies. This alone should serve as a call for more inclusion in leadership programs. Our findings here echo that sentiment from past studies.

Moreover, we have seen suggestions for inclusion of service-based learning type items within curriculum. Leadership over curriculum has been gaining momentum in leadership programs over the years in both K-12 and higher education. We see no reason for this to slow anytime soon. The data also points to employability and critical thinking skills. These too, have been sources of conversations for more than a decade. What we have experienced in those curriculum discussions has been fairly consistent: "To include those items, something else needs to go...but everything else is crucial..." In many respects this is analogous to the "chicken and egg" debate. We feel educators should empower students to complete assignments or readings above and beyond the base curriculum whether as extra credit or for personal growth and development.

CONCLUSION

As the years go by and the research methodologies improve we are finding ourselves with deeper understanding of the data from the research and policy sessions. In the 2011 Community College Futures Assembly we have noted the strong presence of workforce development attributes in all areas of the research. This is certainly understandable given the current economic climate and emphasis on securing external funding. We see no reason why workforce development will not continue to be part of the discussion in the years to come. This is not to underestimate the importance of other factors in community college administration such as instructional programs, services, governance, planning and finance. As a final note we wish to include one conversation from the policy focus groups: what will our finances be like in 2015 when the enrollments drop because the economy recovers?

We wish to thank all of the assembly participants from the past and give special thanks to the focus group participants for the generous donation of their precious time in helping to move forward by identifying critical issues, provide vision and strategic planning for community college administrators. We look forward to the 2012 Community College Futures Assembly where critical issues will once again be discussed with respect to themes identified from a current book with community college administration implications.

REFERENCES

Alewine, M. (2003, November/December). School library media specialists: Essentially administrators. *Knowledge Quest, 32*(2), 25-29.

Atkin, H., & Lawson, S. (2006, March). Participative service redesign using **appreciative inquiry.** *International Journal of Therapy & Rehabilitation, 13(*3), 102-102.

Basham, M. J., Campbell, D. F., Mahmood, H., & Martin, K. (2011, May). *Critical issues facing America's community colleges: A summary of the Community College Futures Assembly 2011 mixed methods/Appreciative Inquiry research project. Paper presented at the International Conference on Learning and Administration in Higher Education, Nashville, Tennessee.*

Basham, M. J., & Campbell, D. F. (2011). A comparative analysis between researchers, innovative practitioners, and department chairs of critical issues for turnaround leadership in community college instructional programs and services 2010 and beyond. Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 35(1-2), 50-60.

Basham, M. J., & Campbell, D. F. (2010, Fall). Change is good...you go first: A Summary of the 2010 Community College Futures Assembly. Leadership, 16(3), 22-30.

Basham, M. J., Campbell, D. F., & Garcia, E. (2010). Stop the presses! Using the journalism field as a case study to help community college administrators today. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 34(1-2), 175-179.*

Basham, M. J., Campbell, D. F., & Mendoza, P. (2008, November). Critical issues facing America's community colleges: A summary of the Community College Futures Assembly 2008. Community College Journal of Research & Practice, 32(11), 857-870.

Basham, M. J., & Mathur, R. P. (2010, Spring). Dynamic leadership development in community college administration: Theories, applications, and implications. *New Directions for Community Colleges, 149, 25-32.*

Basham, M. J., Stader, D. L., & Bishop, H. N. (2009, March/April). How pathetic is your hiring process? An application of the Lessig "Pathetic Dot" model to educational hiring practices. *Community College Journal of Research & Practice, 33(3/4), 363-385.*

Basham, M. J. (2008, Winter). A quantitative study examining entrepreneurialism of NCCET members. Catalyst, 37(3) 3-7.

Boyd, N. M., & Bright, D. S. (2007, November). Appreciative Inquiry as a mode of Action Research for community psychology. Journal of Community Psychology, 35 (8), 1019-1036.

Brogan, C. (2010). *Social media 101: Tactics and tips to develop your online business.* Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.

Browne, B. W. (2004, September/October). Imagine Chicago: a methodology for cultivating community. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology, 14*(5), 394-405.

Calabrese, R. L., Hester, M., Frieson, S., & Burkhalter, K. (2010. Using Appreciative Inquiry to create a sustainable rural school district and community. *International Journal of Educational Management, 24*(3), 250-265.

Calabrese, R. L., Roberts, B. E., McLeod, S., Niles, R. Christopherson, K., Singh, P., & Berry, M. (2008). Emerging technologies in global communication: Using Appreciative Inquiry to improve the preparation of school administrators. *International Journal of Educational Management, 22*(7), 696-709.

Calabrese, R. L. (2006). Building social capital through the use of An Appreciative Inquiry theoretical perspective in a school and university partnership. *International Journal of Education Management, 20*(3), 173-182.

Campbell, D. F., & Basham, M. J. (2007). Critical issues facing America's community colleges: A summary of the Community College Futures Assembly 2006. *Community College Journal of Research & Practice, 31, 541-545.*

Carnell, E. (2005, September). Boys and their reading: Conceptions of young people about the success of the full on magazine. *Curriculum Journal, 16*(3), 363-389.

Carr-Stewart, S., & Walker, K. (2003). Learning leadership through **Appreciative Inquiry.** *Management in Education, 17*(2), 9-14.

Chapman, L., & Giles, D. (2009, November). Using Appreciative Inquiry to explore the professional practice of a midwife lecturer. *Studies in Continuing Education, 31*(3), 297-305.

Community College Futures Assembly 2011 conference booklet.

Cooperrider, D.L., & Srivastva, S. (1987). Appreciative Inquiry in organizational life. *Research in Organizational Change and Development, 1*, 129-169.

Deason, L. M., Adhikari, S. B., Clopton, T. M., Oches, B., & Jensen, C. (2010, April). The Ohio Cross-Cultural Tobacco Control Alliance: Understanding and eliminating tobacco-related disparities through the integration of science, Practice, and Policy. *American Journal of Public Health, 100*(S1), S240-S245.

de la Ossa, P. (2005, Fall). "Hear my voice:" Alternative High School students perceptions and implications for school change. *American Secondary Education, 34*(1), 24-39.

Doveston, M., & Keenaghan, M. (2006, February). Improving classroom dynamics to support students' learning and social inclusion: a collaborative approach. *Support for Learning, 21*(1), 5-11.

Elleven, R. K. (2007, Summer). Appreciative Inquiry: A model for organizational development and performance improvement in student affairs. *Education, 127*(4), 451-455.

Johnson, G., & Leavitt, W. (2001, Spring). Building on Success: Transforming organizations through an **Appreciative Inquiry.** *Public Personnel Management, 30*(1), 129.

Kemp, M. (2001, October). Fictioning identities: a course on narrative and fictional approaches to educational practice. *Reflective Practice, 2(*3), 345-355.

Koster, R. L. P., & Lemelin, R. H. (2009, May). Appreciative Inquiry and rural tourism: A case study from Canada. *Tourism Geographies, 11*(2), 256-269.

Kozik, P., Cooney, B., Vinciguerra, S., Gradel, K., & Black, J. (2009, Fall). Promoting inclusion in secondary schools through Appreciative Inquiry. *American Secondary Education, 38*(1), 77-91.

Langer, R., & Thorup, S. (2006). Building trust in times of crisis: Storytelling and change communication in an airline company. *Corporate Communications, 11*(4), 371-390.

Lehner, R., & Hight, D. L. (2006, Spring). Appreciative Inquiry and student affairs: A positive approach to change. *College Student Affairs Journal, 25*(2), 141-151.

MacLean, G. D. (2007, November). Appreciative Inquiry: Reducing Maternal and Neonatal morbidity and mortality. *British Journal of Midwifery, 15* (11), 702-706.

Mathie, A., & Cunningham, G. (2003, November). From clients to citizens: Asset-based Community Development as a strategy for community-driven development. *Development in Practice, 13*(5), 474-486.

McAdam, E., & Mirza, K. A. H. (2009, May). Drugs, hopes and dreams: Appreciative Inquiry with marginalized young people using drugs and alcohol. *Journal of Family Therapy, 31*(2), 175-193.

Meister, J. C. (2011, January). Keynote speech: The 2020 workplace. Presented at the annual meeting of the Community College Futures Assembly, Orlando, Florida.

Meister, J. C., & Willyerd, K. (2010). The 2020 workplace: How innovative companies attract, develop and keep tomorrow's employees today. New York: Harper Collins.

Mendoza, P., Basham, M. J., Campbell, D. F., O'Daniels, T. M., Malcolm, Z., Felton, S., Lebesch, A., & Douma, D. (2009, November). Missions, values, and "flying monkeys:" Critical issues for community colleges today and in 2019. Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 33(11), 866-882.

Michael, S. (2005, April). The promise of Appreciative Inquiry as an interview tool for field research. Development in Practice, 15(2), 222-230.

Morris, P. A., & Campbell, D. F. (2008). 2008 Community College Futures Assembly Focus: Change or die—keys to enacting change in the community college. Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 32, 839-842.

Raymond, E. M. & Hall, C. M. (2008). The development of cross-cultural (mis)understanding through volunteer tourism. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism, 16*(5), 530-543.

Reed, J., Jones, D., & Irvine, J. (2005, June). Appreciating impact: Evaluating small voluntary organizations in the United Kingdom. *Voluntas: International Journal of Voluntary & Nonprofit Organizations, 16*(2), 123-141.

Richer, M. C., Ritchie, J., & Marchionni, C. (2009, December). "If we can't do more, let's do it differently!' Using Appreciative Inquiry to promote innovative ideas for better health care work environments. *Journal of Nursing Management, 17*(8), 947-955.

San Martin, T. L., & Calabrese, R. L. (2011). Empowering at-risk students through **appreciative inquiry.** *International Journal of Educational Management, 25(*2), 110-123.

Sullivan, M. (2004, Summer). The promise of **Appreciative Inquiry** in library organizations. *Library Trends, 53(*1), 218-229.

Van Oosten, E. B. (2006, January 8). Intentional change theory at the organizational level: a case study. *Journal of Management Development, 25*(7), 707-717.

Walker, K., & Carr-Stewart, S. (2004). Learning leadership through **Appreciative Inquiry.** *International Studies in Educational Administration, 32(*1), 72-85.

Whitney, D. (1998). Let's change the subject and change our organization: An appreciative inquiry approach to organization change. *The Career Development International, 3*(7), 314-319.

Yoder, D. M. (2005, January). Organizational Climate and Emotional Intelligence: An Appreciative Inquiry into a "Leaderful" Community College. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 29*(1), 45-62.

An Examination of Social Media Policy Usage of South Central United States' Universities

Virginia J. Eaton
Professor of Computer Science
College of Business Administration
University of Louisiana at Monroe
Monroe, Louisiana

Donna W. Luse
Associate Dean and Graduate Coordinator
Professor of Business Communications
College of Business Administration
University of Louisiana at Monroe
Monroe, Louisiana

Thomas G. Hodge
Associate Professor of Accounting
College of Business Administration
University of Louisiana at Monroe
Monroe, Louisiana

ABSTRACT

Since the use of social media tools by universities has expanded exponentially, a university can easily find itself in a precarious situation in a moment's notice because social media tools have been used inadvertently. This study investigated the social media policies of AACSB-International accredited schools in the SREB South Central Region of the United States as posted on university web sites. Results from this study showed that although the majority of these universities have links to social media tools on their university web sites, a minimal number of universities have social media policies posted. Given the popularity of social media tools and the results of this study, it is evident that more universities need to develop and/or publish their policies on their web sites.

INTRODUCTION AND PURPOSE

As an administrator at a mid-sized regional university, imagine waking up one morning and learning that your university is in the national news because one of your students posted a racist video on Facebook. Would your university have a contingency plan for this type of unforeseen incident? Would your university have a social media policy to fall back on to help "control" such a situation?

The above scenario is exactly what happened to university administrators at the University of Louisiana at Monroe (ULM) in October 2007. ULM made national news when a current student posted on her Facebook page a video of several white students reenacting the beating of a white male by black students known as the Jena 6 (CNN, 2007). The video was quickly reposted on The Smoking Gun (The Smoking Gun, 2007) and YouTube (YouTube, 2007). The national news coverage of this incident was extremely embarrassing not only to the student but also to the university. Because ULM in October of 2007 did not have a social media policy in place, university administrators grappled with the immediacy of handling the situation to prevent ongoing national exposure and ridicule.

With technology use expanding exponentially, from easy access of publishing information on a web site to distributing information via nu-

merous social media tools, a university can easily find itself in a similar embarrassing and precarious situation in a moment's notice. For this reason, many university sports departments are beginning to realize that social media can create problems for them and their high profile college athletes. A recent news story about University of Washington basketball player Isaiah Thomas underscores this point. Prior to a game with Washington State University (WSU), Thomas tweeted that Pullman was a ghost town (Burnett, 2011). This inconspicuous "tweet" got out, and by game time, WSU students were fired up and heckled Thomas throughout the game; many of them sent tweets to Thomas after WSU won the game so he would remember the "ghost town." Questionable postings by university athletes on Twitter and other social media web sites have caused some university athletic departments to hire Udiligence to monitor social media usage of their athletes (Udiligence, 2011) . Udiligence notifies the university and the athlete if questionable material appears in a social media posting or tweet.

One may wonder, however, if monitoring is enough? What are the consequences, if any, if an athlete posts questionable material? What about social media use by students who are not athletes? What about social media use by faculty and staff? Without a social media policy in place at a university, these questions are difficult, if not impossible, to answer. Thus, the pervasive question arises as to whether or not universities are prepared to address such incidents as mentioned above. At ULM, the publicity surrounding the web site and lawsuit as well as the student video was extremely embarrassing, but university administrators learned from these situations and developed and implemented a social media policy. However, ULM is one of a few universities in Louisiana that has a published social media policy on its web page. One may ask why more universities do not have social media policies posted. This deficiency is probably because other universities have not experienced similar embarrassing incidents. However, as more and more students, faculty, and staff embrace social media, it behooves administrators at any university to develop and implement an effective social media policy and educate their constituents about the policy.

The purpose of this paper, therefore, is to consider the technology-based policies as posted on the web sites of AACSB-International accredited universities in the United States' South Central Region, which includes Louisiana, Arkansas, Mississippi, Alabama, and Tennessee; to discuss the elements that should be included in an effective social media policy; and to examine the contents of social media policies as posted on these universities' web sites.

METHODOLOGY

To investigate posted social media policies on university web sites, the researchers first conducted a literature review to examine those elements that should be included in a social media policy. From this review, a checklist of recommended items to include in policies was prepared. In February of 2011, the web sites of AACSB-International accredited schools in the SREB South Central Region of the United States, consisting of Alabama, Arkansas, Louisiana, Mississippi, and Tennessee, were reviewed to ascertain whether policies pertaining to the use of computers, internet, and social media were posted. Additionally, links to social media tools, such as Facebook, Twitter, Linkedin, Youtube, Flickr, that were posted on a university's main web site were documented. The social media policies posted on university web sites in South Central United States as of the first week of March 2011 were then examined, and the elements included in these policies were analyzed.

The AACSB-International accredited schools in the SREB South Central Region consists of 48 schools in Alabama, Arkansas, Louisiana, Mississippi, and Tennessee as shown in Table 1.

TECHNOLOGY-BASED POLICY POSTINGS

Prior to examining the depth and breadth of university social media policies, the technology-based policies, including policies on the use of computers, internet, and/or social media, as posted on the web site of AACSB-International accredited universities in the United States' South Central Region were reviewed. Of the 48 university web sites examined in this study, nine universities (18.8%) had no policies posted on their

Table 1
SREB South Central Region
AACSB
International Accredited Universities

State	N	Percentage
Alabama	11	22.9
Arkansas	8	16.7
Louisiana	14	29.2
Mississippi	5	10.4
Tennessee	10	20.8
Total	48	100.0

web sites. The remaining 39 schools had policies posted addressing the use of computers, internet, and/or social media, with more schools (68.8%) posting policies on computer use (see Table 2). However, only 7 of the 48 schools investigated in this study (14.6%) had social media policies posted. Although only seven universities posted social media policies, 42 of the 48 universities (87.5%) posted a link to a social media tool, such as Facebook, Twitter, Linkedin, YouTube, Flickr, MySpace, iTunes, or some other social media tool, on the main university web site.

The seven universities with posted social media policies include two universities from Alabama, two universities from Arkansas, and three universities from Louisiana (see Table 3).

Table 3
SREB South Central Region
AACSB
International Accredited Universities
With Posted Social Media Policies

State	School	URL
Alabama	Auburn University Montgomery	www.aum.edu
Arkansas	Arkansas Tech University	www.atu.edu
Louisiana	Loyola University New Orleans	www.loyno.edu
Louisiana	Tulane University	tulane.edu
Alabama	University of Alabama	www.ua.edu
Arkansas	University of Central Arkansas	www.uca.edu
Louisiana	University of Louisiana Monroe	www.ulm.edu

SOCIAL MEDIA POLICY ELEMENTS

To determine elements to include in an effective social media policy, one can readily find numerous articles presenting various "do's" and "don'ts" as to what should or should not be

Table 2
Technology-Based Policies Posted on
SREB South Central Region AACSB – International Accredited Universities

School	No Posted Usage Policies		Computer Usage Policy		Internet Usage Policy		Social Media Usage Policy	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Alabama	4	44.4	6	18.2	5	17.9	2	28.6
Arkansas	1	11.1	6	18.2	3	10.7	2	28.6
Louisiana	2	22.2	12	36.4	8	28.6	3	42.9
Mississippi	0	0.0	2	6.1	4	14.3	0	0.0
Tennessee	2	22.2	7	21.2	8	28.6	0	0.0
Total	9	100.0	33	100.0	28	100.0	7	100.0
Total Based on 48 Schools Examined	9	18.8	33	68.8	28	58.3	7	14.6

included in a social media policy. A good starting point for anyone wanting to learn more about social media policies is the web site http://socialmediagovernance.com/, created by Chris Boudreaux (Boudreaux, Analysis of Social Media Policies: Lessons and Best Practicies, 2009). This site provides a database of almost 200 social media policies, a database of almost 200 research reports related to social media, and a policy report resulting from Mr. Boudreaux's analysis of 49 social media policies. According to his "Analysis of Social Media Policies: Lessons and Best Practices," organizations should create two policies: one for those who work in social media as part of their job and one for all employees that addresses both business and personal use of social media. His blog often addresses issues related to social media policy.

In the article "10 Things You Should Cover in Your Social Networking Policy," Shinder indicates an organization's social media policy should include the following: (1) a clear philosophy about social media; (2) a definition of social media; (3) whether employees can identify the organization for which they work; (4) whether employees can write recommendation or referrals for friends; (5) whether employees can refer to clients, customers, or partners; (6) the kinds of information that should be kept confidential; (7) compliance with the terms of service of the social media sites that employees use; (8) compliance with laws about copyrights, plagiarism, [and FTC rules about endorsements], (9) interference with primary job responsibilities, and (10) the consequences of violations (Shinder, 2009).

Like Shinder, Mah argues in "How to Build a Social Networking Policy" that the policy should include a definition of social media and user guidelines. In addition, he emphasizes the need for (1) coordinating with existing policies, (2) educating users on the policy, and (3) monitoring and follow-up (Mah, 2010).

While a little older and focused mainly on blogging, the list of best practices developed by the Society for New Communications Research is worthy of consideration and provides additional insight on elements to include (Best Practices for Developing a Social Media Policy, 2007). Factors noted as influencing the successful development and implementation of a social media policy include fostering a culture of openness, trusting employees to use good judgment, and training employees about the policy and legal issues related to it.

Another useful web site is http://www.socialmedia.biz/, which includes a large number of social media policies and a variety of other resources (Social Media Policies, n.d.). The resources include a social media policy template (as does Mr. Boudreaux's web site) for any organization wishing to develop a social media policy.

While focused on franchising, Bauer's article emphasizes the need for organizations to ensure that their social media policies protect confidential information and protect against improper endorsements by their employees (Bauer, 2010). The author emphasizes the importance of including wording about avoiding controversial topics and requiring disclaimers for content and opinions.

Although numerous articles are readily available to help one develop an effective social media policy, Jonathan Hyman, a partner in the law firm Kohrman Jackson & Krantz, best sums up these articles when he stated, "Employees need to know the ground rules on what's appropriate and what's not" (Aguilar, 2009). Hyman further states, "a social media policy boils down to two words: Be professional."

From the various articles mentioned above in addition to other sources listed in the Bibliography, the researchers developed a checklist of desired elements to include in a social media policy. The elements on the checklist used in examining university social media policies can be organized into four main categories as follows: (1) Policy Introduction/ Background/ Overview, (2) Policy Expectation/Usage Clarity, (3) Policy Education, and (4) Enforcement Clarity.

SOCIAL MEDIA POLICY POSTINGS

The social media policies of the seven universities in the South Central United States with posted policies were examined to determine what elements were included. As presented above, the following main categories of elements were examined: (1) Policy Introduction/ Background/ Overview, (2) Policy Expectation/Usage Clarity,

(3) Policy Education, and (4) Enforcement Clarity.

Policy Overview

In reviewing the introductory section of posted social media policies, the researchers first examined what elements were provided wherein an overview of the policy was addressed. All seven of the social media policies from the above-mentioned universities with posted policies included a definition of social media. In the general overview, all of the policies, with the exception of Loyola, included a discussion of Facebook, Twitter, and YouTube in their definitions (see Table 4). Four universities, including Loyola, specifically discussed blogs.

As shown in Table 5, all of the policies are administered by units responsible for communicating with the public and maintaining goodwill. Additionally, all of the policies discussed the usage and terms of agreement of social media tools at the university, and all of the policies mentioned to some extent the coordination of this policy with other existing policies. Two policies

Table 4
Social Media Tools Included and Defined in University Social Media Policies

School	Facebook	Twitter	YouTube	Other
Auburn	yes	yes	yes	Mentions similar sites
Arkansas Tech	yes	yes	yes	Mentions a variety of social media apps
Loyola	no	no	no	Blogs
Tulane	yes	yes	no	Blogs
U. Alabama	yes	yes	yes	no
U. C. Arkansas	yes	yes	yes	Blogs, Wiki's, LinkedIn, and Flickr
U. L. Monroe	yes	yes	yes	Blogs, MySpace, and other social media apps

Table 5
General Overview Policy Elements Included in University Social Media Policies

School	Responsible for Oversight	School Policy Usage/Terms of Agreement	Coordination with Existing Policies	Building and Maintaining Goodwill	Date of Last Update
Auburn	Univ. Relations	yes	yes	yes	3/1/2011
Arkansas Tech	Univ. Relations	yes	yes	yes	11/2010
Loyola	Office of Web Communications	yes	yes	yes	n.d.
Tulane	Univ. Communications & Marketing	yes	yes	yes	n.d.
U. Alabama	Univ. Relations	yes	yes	yes	2010
U. C. Arkansas	Director of Web Development	yes	yes	yes	3/1/2011
U. L. Monroe	Univ. Relations	yes	yes	yes	8/4/2009

did not give the date of the last update, and two have been updated recently.

Policy Expectation/Usage Clarity

In reviewing information on the expectations for and clarity about the use of social media tools, all of the policies at the seven universities focused on the institutional use of social media and made a point of differentiating between institutional use and personal use. Only two policies mentioned the impact of social media tools on productivity, and only two policies mentioned compliance with the social media site's user agreement (see Table 6).

In reviewing various legal and ethical elements that could be included in social media policies, all of the policies addressed legal issues (see Table 7). Furthermore, all of the schools except the University of Louisiana Monroe discussed the need for honesty and accuracy, to avoid controversy, and to protect confidential information in their policies. The majority of the university policies emphasized the need to publish a disclaimer that the views expressed did not represent the school as a whole and to avoid the appearance of making endorsements on behalf of the institution. The majority of the policies also discussed the need to use school logos and colors with care and to follow appropriate naming guidelines. Approximately one-half of the policies mentioned the need to obey copyright laws.

Table 6
Expectations and Usage Clarity Information Included in University Social Media Policies

School	Institutional	Personal	Productivity	Social Media Terms of Agreement
Auburn	yes	no	no	yes
Arkansas Tech	yes	yes	yes	no
Loyola	yes	yes	no	no
Tulane	yes	yes	no	yes
U. Alabama	yes	no	no	no
U. C. Arkansas	yes	yes	yes	no
U. L. Monroe	yes	yes	no	no

Table 7
Legal and Ethical Information Included in University Social Media Policies

School	Honesty/ Accuracy	Controversy	Confidentiality/ Privacy	Disclaimers	Logos	Naming	Copyright
Auburn	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	no	yes
Arkansas Tech	yes	yes	yes	no	yes	yes	no
Loyola	yes	yes	yes	no	yes	no	yes
Tulane	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
U. Alabama	yes	yes	yes	yes	no	no	no
U. C. Arkansas	yes	yes	yes	yes	no	no	yes
U. L. Monroe	no	no	no	yes	yes	yes	no

Policy Education and Enforcement Clarity

In reviewing both the education of constituencies relative to the social media policies and the clarification of enforcement, none of the schools provide any training relative to their social media policies (see Table 8). And although not explicitly discussed, three of the reviewed university policies hinted at possible disciplinary actions if the policy is violated. However, violations would be detected only if complaints were made because only three schools mentioned any type of employee monitoring. Furthermore, two of these universities indicate that monitoring would not be performed routinely. As mentioned in their policies, only three schools require approval of social media sites, and only two indicated the school reserves the right to remove content.

Table 8
Policy Education and Enforcement Clarification Information Included in University Social Media Policies

School	Training	Security /Risk Mgmt	Approval	Monitoring	Removal of Content	Disciplinary Actions
Auburn	no	yes	yes	yes	no	yes
Arkansas Tech	no	no	no	no	yes	no
Loyola	no	no	no	yes	no	yes
Tulane	no	no	no	no	no	no
U. Alabama	no	no	no	yes	yes	yes
U. C. Arkansas	no	yes	yes	no	no	no
U. L. Monroe	no	no	yes	no	no	no

SUMMARY

In examining the social media policies of the 48 AACSB-accredited schools in the SREB South Central United States, the researchers found that only seven universities (14.6%) had social media policies posted on their web sites. Although 86.4% of the universities did not have a social media policy posted, 42 of the 48 universities (87.5%) had links to social media tools on their main university web sites.

In general, the posted social media policies addressed Facebook, Twitter, YouTube, and Blogs. The policies focused on institutional use of social media rather than personal use of it; however, only two addressed the issue of social media tools' impact on productivity and the need to comply with the social media site's user agreement. All of the seven posted policies reviewed in this study addressed various legal and ethical issues, with the majority of the policies addressing honesty/accuracy, confidentiality/privacy, controversy avoidance, disclaimers, logo usage, and naming guidelines. Although the majority of the policies went into great detail about content that was allowed and not allowed, little time was spent on the issue of noncompliance, a plan to monitor policy compliance routinely, and penalties for violating the policy. However, none of the policies discussed the provision for training.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In conclusion, although the majority of AACSB-International accredited universities in the SREB South Central Region of the United States have links to social media tools on their university web site, a minimal number of universities have social media policies posted on their web sites. Given the popularity of social media tools and the results of this study, it is evident that more universities need to develop and/or publish their policies on their web sites. This study also indicates the need for schools when revising or developing their policies to address the issues of training, monitoring, and penalties for noncompliance.

To ensure university administrators, faculty, and staff are aware of expectations relating to the use

of social media tools, it is recommended that universities post their policies on their web sites and educate all university employees on policy implementation. Being proactive is much better than waiting to react to an unforeseen social media situation wherein a university is unexpectedly positioned negatively in the national news.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Aguilar, M. K. (2011, January). *Facebook Firing Tests Social Media Policies.* Retrieved February 22, 2011, from Compliance Week: www.complianceweek.com

Aguilar, M. (2009, August). *The Compliance Challenges of Social Media*. Retrieved November 11, 2010, from Compliance Week: www.complianceweek.com

Bauer, M. A. (2010, April). *I Know I Need a Social Media Policy: Now What Should It Say.* Retrieved November 11, 2010, from Franchising World: http://www.franchise.org/Franchise-News-Detail.aspx?id=50532

Bennett, S.C. and Day, J. (2010, January 5). *Social Networking Policies: Best Practices for Companies. Retrieved October 20, 2010 from The Metropolitan Corporate Counsel: http://www.metrocorpcounsel.com/current.php?artTypeview&artMonth-January&artYe...*

Best Practices for Developing a Social Media Policy. (2007, March). Retrieved October 20, 2010, from Society for New Communications Research: http://sncr.org/wp-content/uploads/2008/09/sncr-social-media-policy-best-practices.pdf

Boudreaux, C. (2009, December 16). *Analysis of Social Media Policies: Lessons and Best Practicies*. Retrieved February 22, 2011, from Social Media Governance: http://socialmediagovernance.com/

Boudreau, C. (2010, October 19). *Does Your Social Media Policy Cover Listening Ethics?* Retrieved November 11, 2010, from Social Media Governance: http://socialmediagovernance.com/blog/

Boudreaux, C. (2010, January 5). *Tips for Scaling Social Media*. Retrieved February 23, 2011, from Social Meda Governance: http://socialmediagovernance.com/blog/

Burnett, R. (2011, March 10). *Social Media Presents Problems.* Retrieved March 23, 2011, from The Daily Evergreen: http://www.dailyevergreen.com/story/34077

Carrouth, M. (2010, October 18). *Craft a Social Media Policy That Protects Your Business.* Retrieved November 11, 2010 from Hotel & Motel Management: www.hotelworldnetwork.com

CNN. (2007, October 4). *Student tells paper she's sorry for 'Jena 6' re-enactment*. Retrieved November 11, 2010, from CNN U.S.: http://articles.cnn.com/2007-10-04/us/jena.six.reenactment_1_justin-barker-black-teens-video?_s=PM:US

Grensing-Pophal, L. (2010, March) *The New Social Media Guidelines.* Retrieved November 11, 2010 from InformationToday: www.infotoday.com

Kiernan, V. (2003, June 6). *Louisiana Court Dismisses Suit Against Creator of 'Truth at ULM' Web Site*. Retrieved November 11, 2010, from The Chronicle of Higher Education: http://chronicle.com/article/Louisiana-Court-Dismisses-Suit/19364/

Kroski, E. (2009, October). *Should Your Library Have a Social Media Policy?* Retrieved November 11, 2010 from School Library Journal: www.slj.com/socialmedia.com

Lazar, B.A. (2010, May). *Drafting Social Networking Policies.* Retrieved November 11, 2010 from InformationToday: www.infotoday.com

Mah, P. (2010, July 27). *How to Build a Social Networking Policy*. Retrieved November 11, 2010, from ITBusinessEdge: http://www.itbusinessedge.com/info/LA-SocialNetworkingPolicy-pg1.aspx

Shinder, D. L. (2009, July 9). *10 Things You Should Cover in Your Social Networking Policy*. Retrieved November 11, 2010, from TechRepublic: http://www.techrepublic.com/blog/10things/10-things-you-should-cover-in-your-social-networking-policy/875

Social Media Policies. (n.d.). Retrieved February 22, 2011, from socialmedia.biz: http://www.socialmedia.biz/social-media-policies/

Spencer, B. (2009). *Continuing Blog on Social Networking*. Retrieved on October 18, 2010 from Twenty Seconds in the Future: http://www.tsif.com/socialnetworking.htm

The Associated Press. (2002, June 3). *Anonymous University Web Critic Steps Forward* . Retrieved November 11, 2010, from First Amendment Center: http://www.firstamendmentcenter.org/%5Cnews.aspx?id=3823

The Smoking Gun. (2007, October 2). *Students In Blackface "Jena 6" Reenactment*. Retrieved November 11, 2010, from The Smoking Gun: http://www.thesmokinggun.com/documents/college/students-blackface-jena-6-reenactment

Udiligence. (2011). *Udiligence*. Retrieved March 23, 2011, from Udiligence -- Responsible Social Networking: http://www.udiligence.com/

YouTube. (2007, October 2). *Blackface Jena 6 Reenactment Louisiana Kristy Smith Racism* . Retrieved November 11, 2010, from YouTube: http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=8MDsyjp82lQ

Wise, P.A. (2009, Summer). *Tweet, Tweet, You're Fired. Retrieved November 11, 2010 from Employment & Labor Relations Law: http://web.ebscohost.com/ehost/delivery?vid-3&hid-13&sid_d9243.*

This page intentionally blank.

Leader Derailment in Academe: Does the Training Match the Problems?

Feruzan Irani Williams
Assistant Professor of Management
Department of Management
Georgia Southern University
Statesboro, Georgia

Constance Campbell
Professor of Management
Department of Management
Georgia Southern University
Statesboro, Georgia

William McCartney
Professor of Management
Department of Management
Georgia Southern University
Statesboro, Georgia

Carl Gooding
Professor of Management
Department of Management, Marketing, and Info. Management/E-Commerce
Jacksonville State University
Jacksonville, Alabama

ABSTRACT

Leader derailment of middle managers in higher education is most often attributable to self-defeating behaviors (SDBs) and problems with interpersonal relationships (PIRs). This study attempted to determine whether training provided for middle managers in Academe sufficiently addresses these issues. Our findings suggest that while little more than half the responding institutions provided some sort of training to first-time administrators; it was focused mostly on administrative issues. Less than half of the surveyed institutions offered any kind of training relating to PIRs or SDBs. We end the paper with recommendations and suggestions for improvements in training programs aimed at decreasing the incidence of leader derailment in Academe.

INTRODUCTION

Leader derailment occurs when a leader who is perceived to have high potential for future career advancement fails to achieve his or her potential, instead either plateauing at a lower level than expected in their organization, being demoted, or voluntarily or involuntarily leaving the organization (Lombardo & McCauley, 1988). The rate of derailment is estimated to be as high as 50 – 75% (Hogan & Kaiser, 2005; Van Velsor, Taylor, & Leslie, 1993), making this an issue of concern for organizations, whose best interests are served when managers reach their full potential.

The small, but growing (Burke, 2006), body of scholarly literature indicates that derailment is primarily attributable to leadership, or people-related issues, rather than management, or task-related, issues (McCartney & Campbell, 2006). Specifically, leaders who engage in self-defeating behaviors (SDBs) and who have problems with

interpersonal relationships (PIRs) are more likely to derail. These findings suggest that the manner in which a leader interacts with others is a major factor in leader derailment (Van Velsor & Leslie, 1995).

The preponderance of past research on leader derailment focuses on business settings, but recent efforts to expand the study of leader derailment into other areas, such as higher education administration, have shown that the pattern of leader derailment is similar across settings. Leader derailment in higher education administration is associated with problems with interpersonal relationships and self-defeating behaviors, just as it is in business settings (Campbell, McCartney, & Gooding, 2010). A clear implication to be drawn from these findings is that every effort should be made to assist high-potential individuals who are in higher education administration with enhancing their interpersonal skills and mitigating self-defeating behaviors, particularly through training and development efforts.

Unfortunately, higher education administrators, particularly at the middle levels of administration, may not be provided with extensive leadership training (Gmelch, 2002). When training is provided, the topics covered may pertain more to task-related issues, such as completing paperwork, and less to people-related issues. Our purpose in this study was to address the issue of leadership training in higher education in order to understand the extent to which higher education administrators are provided with leadership training programs and, if so, whether the programs include a strong focus on interpersonal skills, addressing the issues of SDBs and PIRs.

CONCEPTUAL BACKGROUND

In an early study of leader derailment, Lombardo and McCauley (1988) conducted interviews with executives for the purpose of profiling successful and unsuccessful high-potential individuals with whom the executives' had direct experience. As research on leader derailment in business settings continued, themes began to emerge across studies. Four themes were identified that appear to capture the major issues associated with leader derailment; (1) Problems with Interpersonal Relationships, (2) Failure to Meet Business Objectives, (3) Failure to Build and Lead a Team, and (4) Inability to Change and Adapt During a Transition (Van Velsor & Leslie, 1995). In subsequent studies of business-leader derailment using these themes, the first theme, Problems with Interpersonal Relationships (PIRs), consistently demonstrated the strongest association with leader derailment (e.g., McNally & Perry, 2002; Rasch, Shen, Davies, & Bono, 2008). The same theme appears to be a factor in academic-leader derailment as well (Campbell et al., 2010).

One issue that may contribute to problems with interpersonal relationships is self-defeating behaviors (SDBs), behaviors that are actually counterproductive to the intended outcome (Baumeister & Scher, 1988; Renn, Allen, Fedor, & Davis, 2005). Parks and colleagues (1975) speculate that, although they are unsuccessful, self-defeating behaviors persist because they are coping mechanisms learned in past situations that are not adapted to the present (Parks, Becker, Chamberlain, & Crandell, 1975). For example, one study demonstrated that workers who wanted to increase their level of belonging in their organization attempted to do so by engaging in social interactions in such a way that they were less likely to be accepted by the group (Thau, Aquino, & Poortvliet, 2007).

A recent study of SDBs and leader derailment in higher education settings found that SDBs involving interactions with others (alienating, overly critical, inability to trust others, suspicious, rigid, defensive, hostile, over-controlling) were indicative of leader derailment (Irani Williams, Campbell, McCartney, & Gooding, Forthcoming). Avoiding hiring leaders who exhibit SDBs might be considered a first step in reducing the incidence of leader derailment, however, Irani Williams and colleagues (2011) note that SDBs are very difficult to detect during hiring procedures. This implies that organizations must attempt to reduce leader derailment that is attributable to SDBs through direct means, such as training.

Indeed, training has been identified as a valuable tool in preventing leader derailment (McCartney & Campbell, 2006; Van Velsor & Leslie, 1995) and in weakening dysfunctional behaviors (Hogan, Curphy, & Hogan, 1994). Due to several social trends, the need for leadership training in

higher education has never been more important than it is today (Marshall, Adams, Cameron, & Sullivan, 2000). As the baby boomer generation prepares to leave the workforce, there will be a significant need for replacement leaders. Both Maguire (2005) and Jacobzone, Cambois, Chaplain, and Robine (1998) have reported that there is significant concern about the pool of qualified leaders in Academe due to age-related attrition. In fact, Maguire estimates that more than 50% of College Presidents are over the age of 60. This attrition problem most likely means that lower level managers will move through the ranks at a faster pace and will assume leadership positions with less experience than their predecessors. Kezar and Eckel (2004) identify four trends that are likely to make governance in higher education more challenging in the future. The factors identified are "increased accountability and competition," "retiring faculty and staff," "more diverse faculty appointments," and "the need to respond efficiently to shorter decision time frames."

Although the need for leadership training and development in higher education would seem to be obvious, in practice the concept has not been fully embraced. Brown (2001) concluded that while business organizations spend considerable sums each year on programs to train and develop leaders, that approach seems to be "underutilized in most universities." In particular, higher education administrators, who sometimes receive little or no training when moving from an academic to an administrative position, could benefit from such training (Raines & Alberg, 2003). In fact, Anderson and Johnson (2006) state that most academic leaders learn their craft through on-the-job training rather than formal training and development programs; and Hoppe (2003) added additional emphasis by noting that department chairs are often selected from among peers on a rotational basis "with little or no (concern for) succession planning."

The lack of formal training in universities may be due to an under-appreciation of the value of leadership training. Marshall et al. (2000) asked Australian academic leader about their perceptions of leadership development needs in Academe. In response the individuals stated that they felt professional development was an important activity, but interestingly fewer than 50% felt that they themselves needed further training.

Given the anticipated need for increased numbers of higher-education administrators, and the apparent paucity of training for these administrators, in this study we examined two issues, (1) whether training is offered for new higher-education administrators, and (2) whether such training targets the enhancement of interpersonal skills and the management of self-defeating behaviors.

METHOD AND RESULTS

Participants and Measures

In an attempt to determine what sort of training programs are being offered to management (Department Chairs and other administrators) in Academe, Provost/Academic Affairs offices of 420 colleges or universities with AACSB International-accredited business schools were invited to participate in an online survey which asked whether or not their respective university offered any training for first-time administrators; and if so, the concepts covered by the training program. Of the 420 invitations sent out, 56 responses (a 13% response rate) were received.

The respondents were required to answer four broad questions: (1) Do you have a training program for first-level administrators (e.g., Department Chairs) at your university?; (2) What is the length of your training program?; (3) What is the format of your training program (face-to-face, online, or hybrid)?; and (4) Does your training program included any of the following items (Interpersonal Relations (examples: using an appropriate leadership style, building good working relationships, and overcoming problem personality issues such as arrogance, self-isolation, etc.); How to build and lead a team; How to change and adapt; How to meet unit objectives; and How to broaden horizons and think strategically)?

RESULTS

Based on the results of the online survey only 35 (62.5%) of the responding universities/colleges had some kind of training program available for first-level administrators. The training content

was wide-ranging but most often focused on the administrative aspects of being a Department Chair or other academic administrator. Less than half of the responding institutions (45%) included any type of interpersonal relationship topics in their training programs. Refer to Table 1 for examples of common issues that are covered in higher-education administrator training programs.

The length of these programs ranged from less than a day (28.6%) to more than 2 days (42.9%), with a majority of them (88.6%) conducted in a face-to-face format. Surprisingly, there were no fully online training programs offered, although some of the respondents indicated hybrid (face-to-face with some online components) programs.

DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Our results support [the idea] that higher-education administrators are unlikely to receive leadership training, despite the existence of research showing a need for such training. Furthermore, the training that is offered appears to be targeted toward general administrative issues such as the mechanics of running a department, budgeting, faculty evaluation, etc., rather than addressing the important factors of problems with interpersonal relations, particularly SDBs that may interfere with positive interpersonal relations.

Table 1
Examples of Common Issues Covered in Higher-Education Administrator Training Programs

Budgeting
Faculty evaluation
Planning
Promotion and tenure
Contract compliance
Campus specific issues and campus initiatives
Working with administration
Curriculum management
Resource management
Legal issues and how to handle them
FERPA and state laws
Governance
SACS accreditation
Internationalization
Sexual Harassment and HR issues
Mission and assessment
Mechanics of running a department

Although individuals may initially be selected for leadership positions because of recognized potential related to either management or leadership skills (McCartney & Campbell, 2006), it is leadership issues that have most often been shown to be indicative of leader derailment (Rasch et al., 2008). This information leads us to the conclusion that one way to lessen the occurrence of derailment in an organization is to focus on development activities that directly address the root causes.

David Day in his study on leadership development (2001) makes an unusual but interesting distinction between the concepts of "leader development" and "leadership development." Day concludes that the distinction between the two is related to differences in their competence base. "Leader development" focuses on individual and intrapersonal skills that relate mostly to personality, self-awareness, self-regulation and self-motivation. On the other hand, "leadership development" focuses on relational and interpersonal skills such as trust, mutual respect, social awareness and social skills. Day's distinction between the two approaches to development dovetails nicely with much of the recent research on self-defeating behaviors (SDBs). In fact as previously stated, leader derailment is most likely to be product of a subset of self-defeating behaviors relating to how the leader interacts with others (Irani Williams et al., Forthcoming). The SDBs significantly related to derailment were all "interpersonal" behaviors while the "intrapersonal" and work-related SDBs that were identified in the study were not significantly related to derailment.

Day (2001: 605) suggests that any of the traditional approaches to development (360 degree feedback, coaching, mentoring, developmental assignments, etc.) can be applied to either "leader development" or "leadership development." However, he states that the difference between the two is "more than mere semantics." He goes

on to say that "at the core of the difference is an orientation toward developing human capital (leader development) as compared with social capital (leadership development)."

This seemingly minor distinction becomes important since it gives us insight as to how to design appropriate training programs for academic leaders. If the goal is to lessen the occurrence of derailment, then our first recommendation would be that universities/colleges should provide their first-time administrators with training and development activities to better prepare them for their new roles. In addition to administrative topics, development programs ought to stress topics related to interpersonal behaviors (leadership development). Interpersonal topics such as team building, coaching and counseling, conflict management, managing change, etc. should have a prominent place in any training program designed to prepare academics for leadership. If cost is a consideration, then online training programs could be considered, even though they may not be optimal for training in interpersonal skills.

The evidence we found for low rates of training in interpersonal skills indicates that further research in this area is warranted. Additionally, an issue that was not covered in our survey, but one that should be addressed in future research, is whether leadership training, if provided, is mandatory for higher-education administrators. Similarly, according to one of our survey respondents, there is at least one state that provides leadership training for academic administrators at a state-wide level; however, there was no indication about whether this training was mandatory or optional for each public institution in that state. Knowledge regarding the number of other states which offer such programs, as well as their content, and whether they are mandatory would also be helpful.

In closing, with the expected shortage in the supply of high-potential academic administrators, it is imperative to ensure that these individuals are fully equipped for success in their new positions. The results of this study indicate that training and development of academic administrators, particularly first-timers, that includes a strong focus on enhancing interpersonal skills is one key element in decreasing the likelihood of leader derailment; and ought to be a high priority with universities/colleges looking to build good reputation and successful programs.

REFERENCES

Anderson, D., & Johnson, R. (2006). Ideas of leadership underpinning proposals to the Carrick Institute. Strawberry Hills, NSW: The Carrick Institute for Learning in Higher Education.

Baumeister, R. R., & Scher, S. J. (1988). Self-defeating behavior patterns among normal individuals: Review and analysis of common self-destructive tendencies. *Psychological Bulletin,* 104(1), 3 – 22.

Brown, L.M. (2001). Leading leadership development in universities: A personal story. *Journal of Management Enquiry*, 10(4), 312 – 325.

Burke, R. J. (2006). Why leaders fail: Exploring the darkside. *International Journal of Manpower*, 27(1), 91 – 100.

Campbell, C. R., McCartney, W., & Gooding, C. (2010; Online in 2009). Leader derailment: Does the business model apply to business schools? *Journal of Academic Administration in Higher Education,* 5(2), 47 – 56.

Day, D. V. (2001). Leadership development: A review in context. Leadership Quarterly, 11(4), 581 – 613.

Gmelch, W. H. (2002). The call for department leaders. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, New York, NY.

Hogan, R., Curphy, G. J., & Hogan, J. (1994). What we know about leadership: Effectiveness and personality. *American Psychologist,* 49(6), 493 – 504.

Hogan, R., & Kaiser, R. B. (2005). What we know about leadership. *Review of General Psychology,* 9(2), 169 – 180.

Hoppe, S.L. (2003). Identifying and nurturing potential academic leaders. *New Directions for Higher Education,* 124, 3 – 12.

Irani Williams, F., Campbell. C. R., McCartney, W., & Gooding, C. (Forthcoming). Leader derailment: The impact of self-defeating be-

haviors. Manuscript submitted for publication.

Jacobzone, S., Cambois, E., Chaplain, E., & Robine, J.M. (1998). The health of older persons in OECD countries: Is it improving fast enough to compensate for population aging? OECD Labour Market and Social Policy Occasional Papers, 37, DEELSA/WD.

Kezar, A., & Eckel, P. D. (2004). Meeting today's governance challenges: A synthesis of the literature and examination of future for scholarship. *Journal Of Higher Education*, 75(4), 371 – 399.

Lombardo, M. M., & McCauley, C. D. (1988). The dynamics of management derailment (Tech. Rep. No. 34). Greensboro, NC: Center for Creative Leadership.

Maguire, J. (2005, November 3). What college presidents think, colloquy. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*.

Marshall, S.J., Adams, M. J., Cameron, A., & Sullivan, G. (2000). Academic perceptions of their professional needs related leadership and management: What can we learn? *International Journal of Academic Development,* 5(1), 42 – 53.

McCartney, W., & Campbell, C. R., (2006). Leadership, management, and derailment: A model of individual success and failure. *Leadership and Organization Development Journal*, 27(3), 190 – 202.

McNally, B., & Parry, K., (2002, July). A phenomenological examination of Chief Executive derailment/failure. Paper presented at ANZAM-IFSAM 6th World Congress, Gold Coast, Australia.

Parks, C., Becker, W. M., Chamberlain, J. M., & Crandell, J. M. (1975). Eliminating self-defeating behaviors and change in locus of control. *The Journal of Psychology*, 91, 115 – 120.

Raines, S. C., & Alberg, M. S. (2003). The role of professional development in preparing academic leaders. *New Directions for Higher Education,* 124, 33 – 39.

Rasch. R., Shen, W., Davies, S. E., & Bono, J. (2008). The development of a taxonomy of ineffective leadership behaviors. Paper presented at the 23rd Annual conference of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, San Francisco, CA.

Renn, R. W., Allen, D. G., Fedor, D. B., & Davis, W. D. (2005). The roles of personality and self-defeating behaviors in self-management failure. *Journal of Management*, 31(5), 659 – 679.

Thau, S., Aquino, K., & Poortvliet, P. J. (2007). Self-defeating behaviors in organizations: The relationship between thwarted belonging and interpersonal work behaviors. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92(3), 840 – 847.

Van Velsor, E., & Leslie, J. B. (1995). Why executives derail: Perspectives across time and cultures. *Academy of Management Executive*, 9(4), 62 – 72.

Van Velsor, E., Taylor, S., & Leslie, J. B. (1993). An examination of the relationships among self-perception accuracy, self-awareness, gender, and leader effectiveness. *Human Resource Management*, 32(2-3), 249 – 264.

Bullying and Mobbing in Academe: Challenges for Distance Education and Social Media Applications

Jo Ann Oravec, PhD, MBA, MS, MA
Associate Professor
Information Technology and Business Education Department
University of Wisconsin at Whitewater
Whitewater, Wisconsin

ABSTRACT

Bullying and mobbing are migrating to online realms, intensifying the damage involved and increasing the complexities of these issues. Social media (such as Facebook and Twitter) are intensely communal in many senses; they may serve to increase the negative aspects of bullying and mobbing as well as provide community-oriented tools for mitigation. Academic environments such as distance education also introduce intricate dimensions to these concerns, especially involving online freedom of speech and privacy issues. Younger individuals in academic realms may not be aware of the power of words and images to harm, especially in seemingly playful online contexts. Higher education institutions are legally and morally constrained in terms of student and employee privacy and free speech, which can make it difficult to protect victims and control the dissemination of often-damaging information. Many social media platforms allow for the surveillance and recording of incidents of bullying and mobbing, enabling some mitigation and disciplinary efforts. However, these capabilities also increase the responsibilities of administrators, faculty, and staff in dealing with bullying and mobbing, as well as their legal liabilities.

INTRODUCTION

Bullying and mobbing are disturbing social phenomena with long histories. They seem out-of-place in renowned academic institutions and modern online environments. However, as outlined in this article, they are flourishing along with other forms of incivility (Twale & De Luca, 2008). This article provides a critical analysis of bullying and mobbing in the context of distance education and social media applications in higher education. Although the very notion of "bullying" is very common its definitions and instantiations can vary, often leading to delays in organizational response (**Matthiesen & Einarsen, 2007;** Salin, 2003; WI, 2009). Einarsen and Skogstad (1996) define bullying as "harassment, badgering, niggling, freezing out, offending someone repeatedly over a period of time, and the person confronted . . . [can have] difficulties defending him/herself" (p. 191), adding that the incidents involved in bullying are not isolated events but part of larger patterns of behavior. Einaren and Skogstad incorporate the factor of power differences to the mix, and contend that behaviors do not constitute bullying if the parties involved have comparable strength and power in the relevant organizational setting.

Adding the component of motivation to these definitions of bullying produces the following: bullying occurs when demeaning gestures and comments, personal attacks, inappropriate representations, social ostracism and neglect, and other means of demoralizing individuals are levied over a significant period of time with the major motivation to bolster the ego of the bully and/or enhance the functioning of the group. In "mobbing," group members in the social arena recognize a level of personal gain from bullying and join in the ostracisms or attacks or allow them to proceed when they have some power to stop them. The effects of mobbing can be intense on the parties involved: Leymann (1990) provided a pioneering analysis of mobbing that linked it to psychological "terror." In the short run, mobbers can gain in terms of personal and professional status; in the long run, they do not benefit

from mobbing, as capable organizational participants choose to leave the setting or as other forms of disruption ensue.

The term "cyberbully" emerged in the 1990s as incidents of online harassment and misrepresentation increased in number and variety, along with various misconceptions and myths about these phenomena (Shariff & Churchill, 2010). Cyberbullying (both of young people and adults), became a major factor in public discourse on the Internet in the past decade as social media emerged in prominence (Shariff, 2009). Social media are online platforms and venues that allow for significant input on the part of participants; they include Facebook, Myspace, Flickr, Linkedin, Wikimedia, Youtube, and Twitter, as well as weblogs. Distance education classrooms (run with Desire2Learn, Blackboard, or other platform as infrastructure) often incorporate aspects of social media, requiring participants to interact with each other and provide multimodal input (Oravec, 2003). Growing numbers of faculty members incorporate aspects of blogging or other social media use into traditional, face-to-face classroom settings. Since many social media can also be accessed through mobile devices, the apparatus for bullying is thus literally close at hand. Cell phone cameras have also played a role in bullying, with the digital images of victims taken in locker rooms or other settings distorted and placed online in social media for the purpose of public ridicule (Miranda, 2005).

Some social media platforms are explicitly linked to bullying in higher education contexts, openly encouraging gossip and the destruction of reputations. For example, the social media platform "Juicy Campus" was explicitly designated as a vehicle for spreading rumours relating to individuals in particular colleges and universities (O'Neil, 2008). It was investigated by the State of New Jersey for potential consumer fraud (Young, 2008) since it may have contained false statements about various classes. Although Juicy Campus ceased operations in 2009 it has been replaced with a large assortment of comparable online venues. Social media that openly rate and often mock particular faculty members are also expanding in influence (Chaney, 2011; Stuber *et al*., 2009); for instance, students who have problems with particular professors can vent their grievances in public online forums with little or no way for their targets to respond. Such websites are off-campus entities protected by free speech rights (King, 2010), although they may have considerable on-campus influences.

BULLYING AND MOBBING IN HIGHER EDUCATION

Incidents of bullying and mobbing are becoming well documented in a number of higher education settings, including academic libraries. In "Workplace Mobbing: A Discussion for Librarians," Hecker (2007) describes mobbing as something that "occurs in libraries but is usually unrecognized and unchecked because the phenomenon has not been described and given a name" (p. 439). Other higher education workplaces have been described as sites of mobbing, including nursing education departments (Kennedy, 2011; Kolanko *et al*., 2006; Luparell, 2011), community colleges (Lester, 2009), information technology centers (Morales, 2004), and various academic services (Thomson, 2010). Bullying and mobbing are especially damaging in academic contexts because of the very nature of intellectual activity. These behaviors are often directed toward those who express innovative ideas and perspectives, which makes their effects upon academic interaction particularly detrimental (Westhues, 2005). Many individuals find it hard to believe that bullying and mobbing can occur in such distinguished settings as those found in higher education, so these negative behaviors can continue unchecked.

The problem of bullying and mobbing in social media realms is expanding in importance for higher education administrators, although much more of the attention of researchers is devoted to schools and the K-12 level (Coleyshaw, 2010; Keashly & Neuman, 2010). Online bullying incidents have been linked to the suicides of undergraduates (Cloud, 2011). These include the 2010 suicide of Rutgers student Tyler Clementi (Perez-Pena & Schweber, 2011). Clementi's roommate, who allegedly arranged a web-cam feed of dorm room sexual activity, was arraigned in 2011 for his involvement. Hutton (2006) documents the social and economic costs of workplace incivility and bullying, which sometimes results in deaths from physical attacks and stress. McMullen (2011) describes bullying incidents as deeply af-

fecting the reputations of higher education organizations. Lovell & Lee (2011) outline the negative implications of bullying and mobbing for mental and physical well-being, factors that can also lead to economic pain for organizations. Mobbing incidents in a particular institutional entity have also been linked to a lessening of organizational commitment in the entity's employees (Tengilimoğlu, Mansur, & Dziegielewski, 2010); rather than unifying employees (as they may appear to do at first), the mobbing incidents serve to make employees more distant from the organization and each other. Holt and Lukianoff (2010) outline how colleges may even be required to prevent bullying by their various stakeholders as well as by law enforcement. The strong moral arguments for the support of those who are being bullied and mobbed also provide justification for administrators' efforts in this regard (Dawson, 2005). Bullying and mobbing can affect the very meaning of work for those who are victimized (MacIntosh, *et al*., 2010), lessening the quality of life.

Changes in the climate of higher education itself may be linked to some bullying incidents. Twale and De Luca (2008) write of the "rise of the academic bully culture" in which opportunism and social ineptitude does not support civility in intellectual interactions. Such behaviors, considered individually, often appear to be insignificant. However, considered in context and combined with other inappropriate behaviors they can have direct impacts on the quality of instructional experience for students, as demonstrated in this narrative from a junior faculty member:

> I kept asking my mentor for help in dealing with an evening class of graduate students who were clearly indignant to me *during* class. But she clearly was not going to back me up on anything. I found out later that my mentor actually orchestrated the behavior of the class.
>
> Twale and De Luca (2008), pp. 53-54

Bully cultures can flourish when support for victims is lacking and no one intervenes in the early stages of bullying. Faculty members who do not work together and have the opportunity to establish emotional ties may not be as involved in the support of bullied colleagues. For faculty members without tenure, their own job security may be a factor in their responses to bullying (Gravois, 2006). They may not have the institutional resources to support colleagues who are being bullied or mobbed, so the increase in non-tenure track adjunct positions in many higher educational institutions may be a factor in the rise in incidents of these phenomena.

Some educational administrators themselves may be considered (sometimes unfairly) as bullies or as participants in mobbing (Westhues, 2005). The notion that bullying somehow improves the classroom or work environment by making administrations seem tougher still circulates in some higher education institutions (Westhues, 2005). Bullying still has strong associations with leadership, with many administrators portrayed in movies, television shows, and other dramatic venues as using fear and coercion as motivating factors. However, research in organizational systems demonstrates that such negative emotions as fear do not result in better work or learning outcomes, as outlined in the quality principles of W. Edwards Deming (2000). School principals have often been warned by their professional organizations and in their training about the effects that power imbalances can have in the insulated working environments that schools provide (Blasé & Blasé, 2004), giving them the means to inflict psychological pain upon subordinates. However, bullying and mobbing can emerge even without vast power imbalances, as in reported cases of teacher-on-teacher bullying (Matheny, 2010).

Online bullying incidents have already become a factor for academic administration (Babbitt & Rinehart, 2010). In the near future, higher educational administrators will have few excuses for why they did not work to mitigate the problem of online bullying and mobbing in their institutions. A number of administrative theorists are projecting that within the decade organizational leaders will be required to blog and participate in other social media venues on a regular basis as part of their regular responsibilities (Salopek, 2010); even US President Barack Obama conducted a "Twitter Town Hall" (Shear, 2011). Leaders engaged in online interaction may thus observe bullying behavior firsthand in their own

online media efforts, for instance, noticing that venomous remarks that are made over time are escalating in chat room or blog exchanges. They may also receive early warning signals online from other members of their institutions, thus providing them with little justification for not dealing with the bullying or mobbing.

DEALING WITH THE ONLINE BULLY

Research on case reports shows that bullying typically is a "long-lasting phenomenon that 'wears down' its victims" and often takes more than a year (Matthiesen & Einarsen, 2007). Bullies themselves are often "serial bullies," having more than one victim either in sequence or simultaneously (Chan, 2006). Bullies, as well as victims, can have suicidal ideation and behavior (Klomek, Sourander, & Gould, 2011). The kinds of behavior associated with bullying are seldom if ever warranted, but especially not when primarily linked to the bully's or group's own needs. The need for bullies to express power or be associated with the expression of power has been explored (Carter, 2011). Perlmutter (2010) outlines some of the complex rules of bullying in relation to the power structure of higher education departments:

> Bullies never reform; only in inspirational movies do they have a change of heart. If you can't avoid them, the most direct form of protection is to put yourself under the aegis of someone the bully does fear. It is one of the most important yet unwritten duties, for example, of a department chair to protect students and junior professors from **bullying** of any kind. A similar role should exist for the head of the promotion-and-tenure committee. Ideally, senior scholars should converge to defend the juniors when they are put upon by a supervillain. Alas, the ideal is not always the reality. Timid chairs may not feel like "interfering."
>
> Perlmutter, 2010, p. 38

In academic settings, those who are deemed as being bullied are often banned from campus (Bradley, 2007). Banning a bully whose harassment has been conducted in online venues (venues often not controlled by the institution) is a more difficult undertaking. Getting to the stage where a bully's behavior has been documented, the bully has been given due notice of campus policies, and in which administrators have acted to remove the individual either physically or virtually can be a lengthy struggle. Witnesses are needed to provide context for the situation and are often difficult to obtain, despite the fact that many individuals may have observed the matter at hand. In a declining economy, this syndrome is especially apparent; few people will risk their own careers to help a target, particularly in a complex and uncertain situation. Witnesses can fear retaliation for their intervention. However, some bullying cases may be so severe as to bring in law enforcement (Trump, 2011), so the notion of understanding how and why bystanders should be capable witnesses and reporters of bullying incidents must be communicated to everyone involved on campus.

Administrators would certainly find information as to what attracts bullies to particular victims of value in both prevention and mitigation efforts. Research is providing some clues, but often the circumstances are so multifaceted as not to provide straightforward explanations. Overweight children and adults are often singled out by bullies ("Obesity increases odds," 2010). Gender is sometimes a factor, although it is complex; girls are often bullied by other girls, and the syndrome of women bullying other women is also common (Billitteri, 2010). Although Hindujn and Patchin (2008) did not find race and gender to be significant factors in either the probability that an adolescent would be a cyberbully or the victim of one, they did find that proficiency and time spent online were indeed significant; adolescents who spent a great deal of time online often became drawn into bullying syndromes. Hate speech and harassment of various sorts has been a part of Internet interactions for a number of years, from the early days of chatrooms and listservs (Oravec, 2000); research on the evolution of online hate-related phenomena can be of use in understanding bullying and mobbing.

Many participants in online bullying and mobbing cases are young adults who may not under-

stand the full gravity of harassment, misrepresentation, or other forms of participation. They are being faced with a confusing and time consuming assortment of issues as they establish their social and intellectual lives online. For example, social media such as Facebook are exposing students to complex privacy concerns as they balance the needs for social contact with requirements for the release of information (Brandtzæg, Luders, & Skjetne, 2010). Student breakups and other romantic troubles can be broadcast quickly online, and potential stalking and harassment may ensue because of the surveillance-related capacities of social media (Tokunaga, 2011). Higher educational institutions have often been assigned some roles of responsibility for the well-being of young people, especially when they are living in on-campus housing (O'Neil, 2008), so higher educational administrators will not be able to avoid dealing with these concerns even if the social media involved are not directly provided by their campuses.

Systems approaches to bullying and mobbing can help by mapping the various parties and influences involved (Lee, 2011). It takes moral courage to expose the bullying "system": many profit from this abuse, because it identifies and punishes those who are "different" (which is very dangerous in institutional contexts). Many institutions have developed bullying policies that are designed for face-to-face interactions. There are serious questions, however, about how to handle online bullying and mobbing incidents (along with other online transgressions). Simpson (2011) and others have proposed that some online social problems be handled in virtual realms, and not brought into real-world, face-to-face venues. In the decades to come, societal consensus may emerge as to whether the online realm should be segregated from the face-to-face one in this or other ways (Oravec, 1996).

VICTIMHOOD, LEARNED HELPLESSNESS, AND CYNICISM

Administrators, faculty, staff, and students need to proactive in dealing with bullying and mobbing. However, higher education also emphasizes the building of resiliency and strength of character despite the odds (Tusaie & Dyer, 2004). The notion of labeling someone as a victim (or self-labeling) can seem counter to this mission. It may make individuals look "weak" to ask for help themselves or be concerned for others in this regard. However, establishing sound support structures for victims of bullying can serve to mitigate the effects of bullying and reduce the time it takes for the entire system to heal. Vickers (2010) shows how victims begin to produce various social performances in their often-futile attempts to normalize their working relationships during and after bullying incidents. Such performances, and the energy taken to engage in them, take away from productive organizational activity.

Bullying and mobbing are often linked to increased levels of stress as well as "learned helplessness:" the victim soon learns that little is going to be done about the bullying and mobbing, and that he/she will find it increasingly difficult to be effective in the workplace, school, or other social venue. Personal health issues can emerge in these scenarios with the increased stress, especially with middle-aged employees (Hansen, Hogh, & Persson, 2011; Helkavaara, Saastamoinen, & Lahelma, 2011). Cynicism is also a major byproduct (of everyone involved) as administrators appear to be out-of-touch with what is going on. The following narrative from Twale and De Luca (2008) exhibits how even well-meaning academic participants can be worn down by bullying and made less capable of countering effectively a bully culture:

> In the meantime, I do my job. I work well with the other profs in my department. I am trying to make inroads into another department and at other institutions. In general it is a pleasant place to work. But I make statements as the conscience of the group. I don't try to anger anyone. There isn't too much you can do. You get passive. You can't make yourself sick over it.
>
> Twale and De Luca, 2008, p. 163

Bullying is seldom an isolated struggle between two people; other individuals (students, faculty, and staff) generally know about the bullying,

whether because resources are being denied to the victim or the bully is sending signals directly to them that the target is "not right" (Westhues, 2005). These bullying and mobbing incidents often provide "teachable moments" for administrators that can illuminate a variety of critical concerns if addressed quickly and with adequate resources. Lack of response can foster the kinds of cynicism and lack of energy portrayed in the narrative above. Social media add complexities to the situation, allowing participants and observers to be part of the situation while not physically proximate. Social media also provide more tools for invasion of the victim's terrain as well as empower bullies to enlist others in venues distant from the victim.

How can administrators respond to these matters, and not act the role of the "victim" or the "savior"? There is indeed growing contempt for "victim-style" thinking in the US, which can forestall discussion of bullying and mobbing and how the system itself supports them. Administrators generally want to reduce the "drama" in our workplaces and schools. However, administrators need to prevent the growth of cultures that create a conducive environment for bullies, in which the bullies are perceived as "winners." A systems approach is required; administrators need to look at the entire system (including its online and offline dimensions), and understand how the system may support bullying. Bullying and mobbing create fear, and put everyone "on edge;" people are happy if the bully passes them by. People are suspicious of each other, and look for any positive sign from administrators. Very useful social media tools can be tainted and changed in character by bullying and mobbing, and administrators can work to ensure that these tools will be used for solid academic and purposes.

SOME CONCLUSIONS AND REFLECTIONS

Focus on bullying and mobbing has increased dramatically: in the *Journal of Psychohistory*, Dervin (2010) labeled 2010 as "The Year of the Bully" because of the many shocking incidents involving young people, many of which incorporated some online media component. Although many adults exhibit bullying and mobbing behavior, a number of these behavioral patterns begin in childhood. Individuals learn how to bully or be a part of a mob from the schoolyard. The literature on childhood bullying can be of help for adults who are attempting to counter the effects of bullying and mobbing on their organizations (Danby & Osvaldsson, 2011). Shariff (2009) develops themes from *Lord of the Flies* (Golding, 1959) as ways of clarifying the moral dilemmas that are faced by educators dealing with bullies and mobs in cyberspace; with little guidance and structure, some individuals indeed adopt primitive ways of dealing with human relations.

Education, rather than criminal sanctions, has often been promoted as a strategy to deal with bullying and mobbing in the realm of online media (Currie, 2010; Meredith, 2010). Often, organizations have policies concerning bullying and related behaviors but the policies are not well explained or widely disseminated (Cowan, 2011; WI, 2009). Generic campus policies about personal safety and harassment are not adequate; policies must face openly the new factor of social media. For example, organizational participants need to be informed of the kinds of monitoring that will be conducted of their online activities (Maryott, 2010). They also need some clarity as to how their activities in social media venues that are not controlled by their institutions (such as Facebook or Twitter) will affect their on-campus lives. Educational efforts can help to bridge the gap between mere statements of policy and active understanding and compliance. Forming an "ombudsperson" or advocacy office specially skilled in this arena can also be a part of a solution (Miller, 2010; Morse, 2010). In the early stages of recognition of bullying and mobbing problems, self-help books have often been of use (such as Namie & Namie, 2010), along with a number of online support groups (Osvaldsson, 2011). These books and support groups can assist victims in understanding the various stages of bullying and mobbing from real-life examples of comparable cases. The after-bullying adjustment period is especially critical, as the victim tries to regain his or her former status and return to normal activity (Matsunaga, 2011); counseling can be of help for everyone involved. The strategy of establishing "bully-free zones" (along with various promotional efforts) has also been effective in some educational contexts. Cowie and Col-

liety (2010) recommend that educational institutions engage in "preventing and reducing cyberbullying through a process of awareness-raising, the education of the emotions and active participation" (p. 261). Organizational participants can be encouraged to be supportive yet critical of each other (while attempting to achieve lofty educational goals), and listen for clues that they are pushing each other too hard.

Ridding organizations of bullying and mobbing has indeed become more complex because of social media. Instructors of distance education classes, with many responsibilities and large numbers of students, will have even more to handle. Social media often provide some form of documentation that bullying is occurring; however, this material can also demonstrate when administrators became aware of the bullying and mobbing and what they did to mitigate the situation. Watching out for bullying and mobbing can involve a complex process of balancing concerns for free speech rights with the need to protect individuals from harassment and reputational attacks. As previously discussed, some theorists have pointed to a rise in bullying in academic settings linked to broad cultural changes in academe. Social media themselves have also served to alter campus climate, adding new dimensions to the social component of higher educational institutions and making community-based solutions to these issues more feasible.

Bullying and mobbing are ancient in their origins but are migrating to very modern online realms in higher education. Academic administrators should not be afraid to ask whether bullying or mobbing are occurring either in workplace or classroom settings. They may increasingly be required to do so because of their professional liability (Koonin & Green, 2004). Increasingly, effective support is available for those who are being bullied and for those who aim to stop bullying. Preventive efforts to stop bullying and mobbing before they start are often the most effective overall strategies. By talking and asking questions, academic administrators can blunt the attacks of bullies and can prevent mobs from forming in their institutions.

REFERENCES

Babbitt, E., & Rinehart, K. (2010). Dealing with serious employee issues. *Academic Leader*, *26*(12), 1-6.

Billitteri, T. J. (2010). The issues. *CQ Researcher*, *20*(43), 1015-1024.

Blase, J., & Blase, J. (2004). The dark side of school leadership: Implications for administrator preparation. *Leadership & Policy in Schools*, *3*(4), 245-273.

Bradley, G. (2007). Banned professor settles. *Academe*, *93*(6), 17.

Brandtzæg, P., Luders, M., & Skjetne, J. (2010). Too many Facebook 'friends'? Content sharing and sociability versus the need for privacy in social network sites. *International Journal of Human-Computer Interaction*, *26*(11/12), 1006-1030. doi:10.1080/10447318.2010.516719

Carter, S. (2011). Bullies and power: A look at the research. *Issues in Comprehensive Pediatric Nursing*, *34*(2), 97-102. doi:10.3109/01460862.2011.574455

Chan, J. F. (2006). Systemic patterns in bullying and victimization. *School Psychology International*, *27*(3), 352-369. doi:10.1177/0143034306067289

Chaney, S. (2011). Rankings and ravings in the academic public. *Rhetoric Review*, *30*(2), 191-207. doi:10.1080/07350198.2011.552381

Cloud, J. (2010). Bullied to death? *Time*, *176*(16), 60-63.

Coleyshaw, L. (2010). The power of paradigms: a discussion of the absence of bullying research in the context of the university student experience. *Research in Post-Compulsory Education*, *15*(4), 377-386. doi:10.1080/13596748.2010.526799

Cowan, R. L. (2011). 'Yes, we have an anti-bullying policy, but ... :' HR professionals' understandings and experiences with workplace bullying policy. *Communication Studies*, *62*(3), 307-327. doi:10.1080/10510974.2011.553763

Cowie, H., & Colliety, P. (2010). Cyberbullying: Sanctions or sensitivity? *Pastoral Care in Education*, *28*(4), 261-268. doi:10.1080/02643944.2010.528017

Currie, D. (2011). University of North Dakota awareness campaign targets bullying. *Nation's Health*, *41*(5), 27.

Danby, S., & Osvaldsson, K. (2011). Bullying: The moral and social orders at play. *Children & Society, 25*(4), 255-257. doi:10.1111/j.1099-0860.2011.00381.x.

Dawson, K. L. (2005). Bullying: A spiritual crisis. *Interpretation: A Journal of Bible & Theology*, *59*(1), 102.

Deming, W. E. (2000). *Out of the crisis*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Dervin, D. (2011). 2010: The Year of the bully. *Journal of Psychohistory*, *38*(4), 337-345.

DeSouza, E. R. (2011). Frequency rates and correlates of contrapower harassment in higher education. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, *26*(1), 158-188. doi:10.1177/0886260510362878

Einarsen, S., & Skogstad, A. (1996). Bullying at work: Epidemiological findings in public and private organizations. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, *5*, 185–201.

Goulding, W. (1960). *Lord of the Flies*. London: Faber & Faber.

Gravois, J. (2006). Mob rule. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, *52*(32), A10-A12.

Hansen, Å., Hogh, A., & Persson, R. (2011). Frequency of bullying at work, physiological response, and mental health. *Journal of Psychosomatic Research*, *70*(1), 19-27. doi:10.1016/j.jpsychores.2010.05.010

Hecker, T. (2011). Workplace mobbing: A discussion for librarians. *The Journal of Academic Librarianship, 33(*4), 439–445

Helkavaara, M., Saastamoinen, P., & Lahelma, E. (2011). Psychosocial work environment and emotional exhaustion among middle-aged employees. *BMC Research Notes*, *4*(1), 101-108. doi:10.1186/1756-0500-4-101

Hinduja, S., & Patchin, J. W. (2008). Cyberbullying: An exploratory analysis of factors related to offending and victimization. *Deviant Behavior*, *29*(2), 129-156. doi:10.1080/01639620701457816

Holt, R., & Lukianoff, G. (2010). Should colleges be required to prohibit bullying and harassment? *CQ Researcher*, *20*(43), 1029.

Hutton, S. (2006). Workplace incivility: State of the science. *Journal of Nursing Administration*. 36(1), 22-27.

Keashly, L., & Neuman, J. H. (2010). Faculty experiences with bullying in higher education. *Administrative Theory & Praxis (M.E. Sharpe)*, *32*(1), 48-70. doi:10.2753/ATP1084-1806320103

Kelly, R. (2011). Preventing bullying in the higher education workplace. *Student Affairs Leader*, *39*(10), 4-7.

Kennedy, M. (2011). For Nurses Week, a call for mutual respect: Surely we deserve better from each other. *American Journal of Nursing*, *111*(5), 7.

King, A. (2010). Constitutionality of cyberbullying laws: Keeping the online playground safe for both teens and free speech. *Vanderbilt Law Review*, *63*(3), 845-884.

Klomek, A., Sourander, A., & Gould, M. S. (2011). Bullying and suicide. *Psychiatric Times*, *28*(2), 27-31.

Kolanko, K., Clark, C., Heinrich, K., Olive, D., Serembus, J., & Sifford, S. (2006). Academic dishonesty, bullying, incivility, and violence: Difficult challenges facing nurse educators. *Nursing Education Perspectives*, *27*(1), 34-43.

Kolowich, S. (2009). The fall of an academic cyberbully. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, *55*(28), A1-A11.

Koonin, M., & Green, T. M. (2004). The emotionally abusive workplace. *Journal of Emotional Abuse*, *4*(3/4), 71-79. doi:10.1300/J135v04n03_05

Lee, C. (2011). An ecological systems approach to bullying behaviors among middle school

students in the United States. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, *26*(8), 1664-1693. doi:10.1177/0886260510370591

Lester, J. (2009). Not your child's playground: Workplace bullying among community college faculty. *Community College Journal of Research & Practice*, *33*(5), 446-464. doi:10.1080/10668920902728394

Levy, P. (2011). Confronting cyberbullying. *T H E Journal*, *38*(5), 25-27.

Lewis, D. (2004). Bullying at work: The impact of shame among university and college lecturers. *British Journal of Guidance and Counseling, 32*(3), 281-299.

Leymann, H. (1990). Mobbing and psychological terror at workplaces. *Violence and Victims, 5*, 119–126.

Lovell, B. L., & Lee, R. T. (2011). Impact of workplace bullying on emotional and physical well-being: A longitudinal collective case study. *Journal of Aggression, Maltreatment & Trauma*, *20*(3), 344-357. doi:10.1080/10926771.2011.554338

Luparell, S. (2011). Academic education. Incivility in nursing: The connection between academia and clinical settings. *Critical Care Nurse*, *31*(2), 92-95. doi:10.4037/ccn2011171

Marley, D. (2009). Stress help for 'bullied' staff. *Times Educational Supplement*, (4840), 13.

Maryott, M. L. (2010). Social networking in the workplace creates peril for employers. *In-House Litigator*, *24*(3), 3-6.

Matheny, K. (2010, April 7). Schools tackle teacher-on-teacher bullying. *USA Today*, 3A.

Matsunaga, M. (2011). Underlying circuits of social support for bullied victims: An appraisal-based perspective on supportive communication and post-bullying adjustment. *Human Communication Research*, *37*(2), 174-206. doi:10.1111/j.1468-2958.2010.01398.x

MacIntosh, J., Wuest, J., Gray, M., & Cronkhite, M. (2010). Workplace bullying in health care affects the meaning of work. *Qualitative Health Research*, *20*(8), 1128-1141. doi:10.1177/1049732310369804

Matthiesen, S., & Einarsen, S. (2007). Perpetrators and targets of bullying at work: Role stress and individual differences. *Violence and Victims*, 22(6), 735-753.

McMullen, J. (2011). Balancing the right to manage with dignity at work. *Perspectives: Policy & Practice in Higher Education*, *15*(1), 3-6. doi:10.1080/13603108.2011.548145

Meredith, J. P. (2010). Combating cyberbullying: Emphasizing education over criminalization. *Federal Communications Law Journal*, *63*(1), 311-340.

Miller, D. (2010). Bullying - What can ombudsmen do? *Journal of the International Ombudsman Association*, *3*(2), 7-9.

Miranda, C. A. (2005). Cam phones, Go home. *Time*, *165*(6), 18

Morales, A. (2004). Facing the mob. *Software Development*, *12*(10), 11.

Morse, J. (2010). Tackling systemic incivility problems: The ombudsman as change agent. *Journal of the International Ombudsman Association*, *3*(2), 34-38.

Namie, G., & Namie, R. (2000). *The bully at work: What you can do to stop the hurt and reclaim your dignity on the job*. Naperville, IL: Sourcebooks.

O'Neil, R. M. (2008). It's not easy to stand up to cyberbullies, but we must. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, *54*(44), A23.

Obesity increases odds of being bullied. (2010). *JOPERD: The Journal of Physical Education, Recreation & Dance, 81*(7), 5.

Oravec, J. (1996). *Virtual individuals, virtual groups: Human dimensions of groupware and computer networking.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Oravec, J. (2000). Countering Violent and **Hate**-related Materials on the Internet: Strategies for Classrooms and Communities. *The Teacher Educator, 35*(3), 34-45.

Oravec, J. (2003). Blending by blogging: Weblogs in blended learning initiatives. *Journal of Educational Media*, *28*(2/3), 225-233. doi:10.1080/1358165032000165671

Osvaldsson, K. (2011). Bullying in context: Stories of bullying on an Internet discussion board. *Children & Society*, *25*(4), 317-327. doi:10.1111/j.1099-0860.2011.00383.x

Perez-Pena, R., & Schweber, N. (2011, May 24). Roommate is arraigned in Rutgers suicide case. *New York Times*, p. 22.

Perlmutter, D. D. (2010). Spotting your enemies. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, A37-A39.

Salin, D. (2003). Ways of explaining workplace bullying: A review of enabling, motivating, and precipitating structure and processes in the work environment. *Human Relations, 56,* 1213-1232.

Salopek, J. J. (2010). The 2020 workplace. *Workforce Management*, *89*(6), 36-40.

Shariff, S. (2009). *Confronting cyber-bullying: What schools need to know to control misconduct and avoid legal consequences.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Shariff, S., & Churchill, A. (2010). *Truths and myths of cyber-bullying: International perspectives on stakeholder responsibility and children's safety*. New York: Peter Lang.

Shear, M. D. (2011, July 6). For Obama, brevity is not the soul of Twitter. *New York Times*, A1.

Simpson, B. (2011). What happens online stays online? Virtual punishment in the real world. *Information & Communications Technology Law*, *20*(1), 3-17. doi:10.1080/13600834.2011.557494

Skogstad, A., Torsheim, T., Einarsen, S., & Hauge, L. (2011). Testing the work environment hypothesis of bullying on a group level of analysis: Psychosocial factors as precursors of observed workplace bullying. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, *60*(3), 475-495. doi:10.1111/j.1464-0597.2011.00444.x

Stuber, J. M., Watson, A., Carle, A., & Staggs, K. (2009). Gender expectations and on-line evaluations of teaching: Evidence from RateMyProfessors.com. *Teaching in Higher Education*, *14*(4), 387-399. doi:10.1080/13562510903050137

Tengilimoğlu, D., Mansur, F., & Dziegielewski, S. F. (2010). The effect of the mobbing on organizational commitment in the hospital setting: A field study. *Journal of Social Service Research*, 36(2), 128-141. doi:10.1080/01488370903578082

Thomson, A. (2010). Workplace bullying rife in the sector, union claims. *Times Educational Supplement*, (4894), 1.

Tokunaga, R. S. (2011). Social networking site or social surveillance site? Understanding the use of interpersonal electronic surveillance in romantic relationships. *Computers in Human Behavior*, *27*(2), 705-713. doi:10.1016/j.chb.2010.08.014

Tusaie, K., & Dyer, J. (2004). Resilience: A historical review of the construct. *Holistic Nursing Practice, 18*(1), 3-10.

Twale, D., & De Luca, B. (2008). *Faculty incivility: The rise of the academic bully culture and what to do about it.* New York: Jossey-Bass.

Vickers, M. H. (2011). Bullying targets as social performers in the public administration workplace. *Administrative Theory & Praxis (M.E. Sharpe)*, *33*(2), 213-234. doi:10.2753/ATP1084-1806330203

Westhues, K. (2005). *Workplace mobbing in academe: Reports from twenty universities*. Toronto: Edwin Mellen Press.

WI, A. (2009). An old problem that keeps reemerging without a clear solution. *Internet Journal of Law, Healthcare & Ethics*, *6*(1), 2.

Young, J. R. (2008). New Jersey investigates gossip site for possible consumer fraud. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, *54*(29), A16.

Innovative Team-Teaching: Faculty Perceptions and Administrative Policies

Lawrence O. Hamer
DePaul University
Chicago, Illinois

Robert O'Keefe
DePaul University
Chicago, Illinois

ABSTRACT

Team-teaching is a classroom innovation with the potential to address many criticisms of business-school curricula (e.g., the "silo" mentality) and provide significant benefits to students and faculty members. While the existing team-teaching literature identifies the positive outcomes that are associated with team-teaching, less is known about the extent to which these positive outcomes are perceived by faculty at large and about the costs faculty members associate with team-teaching. This paper investigates faculty members' perceptions of team-teaching and the implications of those perceptions on administrative policies.

Business schools have been criticized for maintaining a departmental "silo" mentality (Corcos, Durschlag and Morris 1997; Chelte 2001; Lasher and Manners 2005; Ottewill, McKenzie and Leah 2005; Larange 2010 and Hunt 2011). The criticism of business schools reflects similar problems in business practices (Gorman 2006). In business schools, where faculty members' personal silos exist within a department or program, activities critical to the innovativeness, integration, and sustainability of curriculum are impeded. Curricular revisions may certainly be in evidence but, frequently these are individually undertaken micro revisions made by the individual faculty members to the courses that they are scheduled to teach. Individually undertaken revisions to existing courses and individually created new courses should be both encouraged and recognized. However, a total reliance on individual initiatives is at variance with achieving the frequently expressed objective of creating an integrated curriculum. If academic administrators are serious about new course and program development and the integration of curriculum within and across academic units then they must find ways to lure faculty members from the comfortable certainty of their personal silos and provide incentives which will stimulate cooperation between and among faculty members and, where necessary, between and among academic units.

The activities involved in team-teaching courses have been identified as potential mechanisms for stimulating cooperation between and among faculty members. Leavitt (2007) for example, has asserted that team-teaching does serve as a stimulus for faculty members to break out of their personal conceptual silos and to view concepts and topics from other than their personal perspectives. Additionally, Leavitt's work suggested team-teaching provides an opportunity for faculty to validate their personal perspectives.

This paper offers a look at team-teaching from the perspectives of both faculty and administrators. More specifically, qualitative and quantitative data are used to investigate the costs and benefits that faculty associate with team-teaching. Then, given these perceived costs and benefits, the paper discusses how administrative policies may be crafted in order to properly incentivize and support faculty members' team-teaching activities.

LITERATURE REVIEW
BENEFITS OF TEAM-TEACHING

Team-teaching has been the focus of several research studies from a variety of disciplines, and

these studies have identified several ways in which team-teaching benefits students and faculty.

Benefits to Faculty

Active participation in the activities that constitute the development and implementation of team developed and team-taught classes can represent an important addition to a faculty member's professional and intellectual development. Hornyak and Wagner (1995) reported that team-teaching moves participating faculty members beyond imparting basic knowledge and focuses their attention on application, analysis, synthesis and evaluation. Examining the manner in which existing assumptions, propositions, hypotheses, conclusions, models and theories included in the curriculum are supported or not supported by the collection and interpretation of empirical data opens participating faculty members to new directions and, importantly, may very likely engender cooperative research, publication and other intellectual contributions (George and Davis–Wiley 2000; Hunt 2011).

Benefits to Students

A number of studies have indicated that students who completed carefully planned and implemented team-taught classes were also likely to experience and to adopt broader topical perspectives. It was further reported that these classes also contributed to the development of the students' capacity for critical thinking, an outcome frequently sought when assessing academic programs (Cowen, Ewell and McDonnell 1995; Wentworth and Davis 2002; McDaniels and Colarulli 1997; Benjamin 2000; Wentworth and Davis 2002 and Vogler and Long 2003).

Team-teaching has also been demonstrated to yield other important positive learning assessment outcomes (Shafer,1983; Austin and Baldwin,1991; Robinson and Schaible, 1995; Watkins,1996; Anderson and Speck,1998; Hornyak and Wagner,1999; Benjamin, 2000; Buckley, 2000; George and Davis, 2000; Wentworth and Davis, 2000; Cohen, DeMichiell and Manning 2003; Helms, Alvis and Willis 2005 and Yellowley and Farmer 2005). Lasher and Manners (2005), for example, found that student achievement in advanced MBA courses was significantly higher when the students had completed integrated team-taught business foundation courses. Further, the same researchers reported that students who were enrolled in these classes reported an increase in their level of personal satisfaction with the team-taught foundation courses. Taking all these validated positive findings into account and considering the frequently stated importance and relevance attributed to working toward an integrated curriculum leads one to question why, in so many business schools, the silos within larger silos are so well insulated that team course development and team-teaching are considered more as the exceptional rather than the conventional approach to both course and curricular revisions.

FACULTY PERCEPTIONS OF TEAM-TEACHING

Qualitative Data

While the literature identifies many benefits of team-teaching, team-teaching activities also come with a number of costs. Qualitative data, gathered from one-on-one interviews with faculty who were undertaking significant revisions to an existing MBA program, were used to investigate the negative associations faculty had with team-teaching. These informal discussions uncovered some deep seated concerns and reservations about team course development and team-teaching, and these concerns suggest that faculty perceive team-teaching as having significant costs to both faculty members and to the administration.

Those faculty members who were most adamantly opposed to implementing a program which included team-teaching considered team-teaching to be too radical a departure from the time honored tradition of having one teacher and one class interacting over a defined academic term. Studies conducted by (Davis 1995; Chelte 2001, and Lasher and Manners 2005) reported similar reservations. Other faculty members responded by characterizing team-teaching activities as too "soft" or too "touchy-feely" for a business school program. Still other faculty members responded that they had, in fact, "teamed" with invited guest speakers who offered an informed perspective on specific topical areas of the course. More

often than not, however, the discussion revealed that the invited speaker's perspective did not differ radically from that of the instructor and so reinforced the viewpoint that the faculty member wished to get across to the class. Discussions with faculty members who had expressed positive views regarding team course development and team-teaching, but had been unwilling to become involved in these activities, posed what appeared to be an inconsistency. Upon further discussion, however, this inconsistency between their stated opinions and supporting actions stemmed from a practical and a very understandable rationale. Their reticence to express both operational and active support for the concept of team-teaching as a path to curricular integration was a reaction to the perceived possibility that departmental or college administrators might focus on the acceptance of some of the benefits of team-teaching and, giving less weight to faculty members' reservations, impose a team-teaching approach.

Quantitative Data

The previous sections document both positive and negative aspects of team-teaching. However, the extent to which faculty members have awareness of, and belief in, these aspects remains unknown. Thus, a quantitative study was conducted to ascertain the benefits and costs faculty at large associate with team-teaching.

Methodology and Data Collection

Data were collected by administering a survey to business school faculty members from a large, private, and urban University in the Midwest. A total of 111 completed surveys were collected (69 from full-time instructors and 42 from adjunct instructors). Respondents were solicited via email and directed to a web-based questionnaire that collected their responses. The survey presented respondents with a number of items that each contributed to one five scales discussed in the following section.

Measurement Scales

A five-item scale was used to measure "Student Benefits". The items asked respondents for their opinion regarding the degree to which team-teaching positively impacted students' ability to make decisions, think critically, integrate concepts, apply concepts, and generally learn. The scale, which proved to be reliable for the data set as a whole (α = .957) as well as for full-time professors (α = .957) and adjunct instructors separately (α = .958), was calculated as the mean of the five individual items.

A four-item scale was used to measure "Faculty Benefits". The items asked respondents for their opinion regarding the degree to which team-teaching was rewarding, helped them stay current, helped them become better instructors, and should be part of their normal responsibilities. The scale, which proved to be reliable for the data set as a whole (α = .878) as well as for full-time professors (α = .849) and adjunct instructors separately (α = .925), was calculated as the mean of the five individual items.

A three-item scale was used to measure "Faculty Costs". The items asked respondents for their opinion regarding the degree to which team-teaching detracted from their ability to focus on research, required too much time, and required too much preparation. The scale, which proved to be reliable for the data set as a whole (α = .911) as well as for full-time professors (α = .899) and adjunct instructors separately (α = .930), was calculated as the mean of the three individual items.

A five-item scale was used to measure "Administrative Costs". The items asked respondents for their opinion regarding the degree to which team-teaching activities were difficult to administer in terms of the required coordination across faculty members, the faculty evaluation and compensation, and resource allocation. The scale, which proved to be reliable for the data set as a whole (α = .679) as well as for full-time professors (α = .735) and adjunct instructors separately (α = .581), was calculated as the mean of the five individual items.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Faculty Perceptions of Team-Teaching

To investigate faculty perceptions of team-teaching, means for each scale were calculated and t-tests were used to see if the means were significantly different across faculty groups (i.e., means

for full-time faculty were compared to means for adjunct faculty). The results reveal that there are differences between types of faculty in terms of perceptions of the faculty costs and faculty benefits of team-teaching, but not in terms of the student benefits and the administrative costs (see Table 1).

Table 1
Scale Means for Full-Time and Adjunct Faculty

Scale	Full-time Faculty Mean (SD)	Adjunct Faculty Mean (SD)
Student Benefits	4.1 (1.2)	4.3 (1.4)
Faculty Benefits	**3.9 (1.3)**	**4.6 (1.5)**
Faculty Costs	**3.2 (1.5)**	**2.5 (1.3)**
Administration Costs	4.3 (1.2)	3.9 (1.0)

Bold type indicates significant differences in means across groups (95% confidence level).

Confidence intervals were calculated for the mean of the Student Benefits scale and for the Administrative Costs scale using the data set as a whole. The confidence interval for the Student Benefit scale suggests faculty have a neutral opinion of the degree to which team-teaching benefits students. That is to say, faculty members as a whole perceive team-teaching has having no significant impact on student learning. Similar to the data regarding Student Benefits, the confidence interval for the Administrative Costs scale suggests faculty have a neutral opinion of degree to which team-teaching is burdensome to administer. That is to say, faculty as a whole seem to perceive team-teaching as having no significant administrative costs.

The perception of relationship between team-teaching and the benefits and costs to individual faculty members was different across the two types of faculty. With regard to faculty benefits, scale means indicate adjunct faculty perceived team-teaching to be more personally beneficial than did full-time faculty (scale means of 4.5 and 3.9 respectively). Additionally, full-time faculty perceived team-teaching as more costly than did adjunct faculty (mean of 3.2 and 2.5 respectively). Both groups indicated that team-teaching offered more benefits than costs.

Relationship Between Team-Teaching Experience and Faculty Perceptions

Further analyses were conducted to see if faculty who differed in terms of either team-teaching behavior or team-teaching intentions also differed in terms of their perceptions of the benefits and costs of team-teaching. The results revealed that there were significant differences in the perceptions of team-teaching when faculty were grouped based on team-teaching intentions (see Table 2). More specifically, faculty who have considered team-teaching (as compared to those faculty who have not considered team-teaching) think team-teaching leads to greater student outcomes, lesser faculty benefits, and lesser faculty costs. It should also still be noted that the faculty benefits of team-teaching seem are perceived to outweigh the faculty costs for those faculty who would consider team-teaching.

However, among faculty who have considered team-teaching (n = 69) there are no differences in perceptions of team-teaching regardless of whether or not those faculty had actually team-taught a course (see Table 3). These results imply that there is a significant hurdle to overcome to get faculty to *consider* team-teaching, but the

Table 2
Differences in Perceptions of Faculty Grouped Based Upon Team-Teaching Intentions

	Scale Means			
Response (sample size)	Student Benefits	Faculty Costs	Faculty Benefits	Admin. Costs
Have not considered team-teaching a course.(n = 30)	3.6	3.5	3.4	4.4
Have considered team-teaching a course. (n = 69)	4.4	2.8	4.4	4.1

Italics indicate significant differences in means across groups (95% confidence level).

Table 3
Differences in Perceptions of Faculty Grouped Based Upon Team-Teaching Experience

	Scale Means			
Response (sample size)	Student Benefits	Faculty Benefits	Faculty Costs	Admin. Costs
Have not team-taught a course. (n = 21)	4.1	4.1	3.0	4.3
Have team-taught a course. (n = 49)	4.4	4.6	2.7	4.0
Significance of Difference (p-value)	.407	.424	.195	.270
*Among those faculty who have considered team-teaching.				

expectations faculty have once they cross that hurdle are consistent with the experience of team-teaching. In other words, the perceptions of benefits and costs that faculty have once they consider team-teaching do not change after they actually team-teach.

Overall, the qualitative and quantitative data suggest that there are significant obstacles to overcome in getting faculty to consider team-teaching. However, once faculty consider team-teaching as a viable option, they perceive many benefits to engaging in team-teaching activities and these benefits do not change once faculty actually do engage in these activities. These findings have policy implications (discussed in the following sections) for schools and colleges that seek to encourage more team-teaching among faculty.

POLICY IMPLICATIONS

While team-teaching is dependent upon faculty actions, administrative policies can be used to promote these actions. Incorporating knowledge regarding faculty members' perceptions of team-teaching into the policy development process can help ensure that policies foster desired faculty activities without creating barriers to those same activities. The data collected for the present study suggest that administrative policies designed to promote team-teaching should be designed to achieve two goals: (1) persuade faculty to consider team-teaching, and (2) ensure that the team-teaching experience delivers the benefits and costs that faculty expect. The following discussion focuses on policy considerations that can be used to accomplish these two goals.

Incentives to Persuade Faculty to Consider Team-Teaching

Evidence for the critical importance of using incentives to stimulate desired initiatives has, in recent years, been made very clear (Levitt and Dubner 2005 & 2009). From the point of view presented in this article incentives and administrative policies are considered to be related. Incentives can stimulate the activities considered necessary to attain stated objectives and clear and relevant administrative policies can aid in sustaining these activities. Incentives can take many forms in order to correspond to a wide variety of motivating factors:

- Financial incentives (e.g., $2000 for developing a new team-taught course)
- Faculty development opportunities (e.g., support faculty attendance at conferences/seminars that allow faculty to expand their knowledge bases)
- Course releases (e.g., reduce teaching loads to allow faculty time to develop team-taught courses)
- Evaluation exclusion (e.g., allow faculty to exclude evaluations from team-taught courses from their performance evaluations when the course is initially taught by the faculty member)

Ensuring a Quality Team-Teaching Experience through Faculty Leadership

Team-teaching initiatives should be led by faculty who volunteer to champion the concept of team-teaching and/or lead team-teaching efforts for specific courses. These faculty volunteers are likely to be viewed as credible advocates and thus

their advocacy efforts are likely to be more fruitful. Implementing a program of team-teaching requires the attention and efforts of a "concept champion" and eventually individual "course leaders". Successful team-teaching initiatives rely heavily on the service of volunteers who will develop the requisite course schedule, specify the educational materials and assignments to be incorporated within the course and state both the teaching and learning objectives of the course (Davis 1995). The team must also arrange a time period(s) for the course; pilot test offering(s) and methods for evaluating the course and assessing its learning objectives (Cowan, Ewell and McDonnell 1995, Cohen, DeMichiell and Manning 2003). All of these activities are components of a faculty member's workload and all are related to his or her teaching performance and teaching evaluations.

Policy Statement

A formal written policy regarding team-teaching could provide a mechanism for engaging faculty in conversations regarding team-teaching that could lead to an increase in the number of faculty who would consider team-teaching (please see Appendix for a sample policy). A statement of policy regarding team-teaching must address the issues and answer the questions that are raised by faculty members (Robinson & Shaible 1995, Goetz 2000, Yellowley & Farmer 2005). Given the negative issues that could arise from team-teaching, the policy should address the following elements:

- Teaching load issues: The policy should state the impact that team-teaching will have on the faculty member's teaching load. It is recommended that team-taught courses count the same as sole-instructor courses when calculating the teaching load for individual faculty members.
- Impact on Tenure and Promotion: The policy should include language that assures faculty that their team-teaching efforts will be recognized as legitimate teaching and/or service activities when presented within the documentation used to evaluate faculty for contract renewal, salary adjustments, and tenure and promotion.

CONCLUSION

Team-teaching and cooperative curricular revision and innovation are group activities that stimulate faculty members to work together. They must, however, also realize that these important activities are not likely come about spontaneously. And so administrators at all levels should be prepared to offer directions and incentives to stimulate those activities which are in the service of both long and short term objectives. On the other side of the interaction, faculty may also recognize the necessity and importance of cooperation in achieving both long and short term objectives. They will respond to incentives if and only if the administration adheres to a stated policy which governs how these cooperative activities are defined and especially how they are recognized, evaluated and, beyond the limited period of initial incentives, how these activities will be rewarded.

The right combination of incentives and policy matters means that both the faculty members and the administrators can get what both parties are likely to want. Both groups can benefit from positive program recognition; increasing enrollments in programs; increased revenues from tuition; enhanced levels of scholarship; the continuity of cooperation and , not to be understated, security.

In conclusion clear statements of policies covering expectations, incentives and rewards must be communicated to and understood by faculty members. The policy could be as simple as stating that "development activities are considered as an integral part of the faculty members' workload." Or it could state that "released time for course and program development is a matter to be decided at the discretion of the chair(s) contingent on the needs of the college." The final language of the policy must be discussed, agreed upon, announced, applied and reinforced. The important point is to assure faculty members who engage in course development and innovative course delivery efforts that these efforts will be recognized.

REFERENCES

Anderson, Rebecca S. and Bruce W. Speck (1998) "Oh What a Difference a Team Makes: Why

Team-teaching Makes a Difference", *Teaching and Teacher Education.* 14, 7, p 671-86

Austin, Ann E. and Roger G. Baldwin (1991) *Faculty Collaboration : Enhancing the Quality of Scholarship and Teaching.* Washington DC: The George Washington School of Education and Human Development.

Benjamin, Joan (2000)" The Scholarship of Teaching in Teams. What Does It Look Like in Practice?" *Higher Education Research and Development* 19, 101-204.

Buckley, Francis J. (2000) *Team-teaching: What, Why and How.* London UK: Sage Publications Inc,

Chelte, Anthony F. (2001) "Toward Collaboration and Inclusion: The Electronic Portfolio and Outcomes Assessment". *The Journal of Behavioral and Applied Management.* Summer/Fall, Vol. 3, 1, 13-27.

Cohen, Maxine S., Robert L. DeMichiell, and Richard D. Manning (2003)" Team-teaching Online: Perspective from the Trenches", *www Sloan Consortium Org/Conference Proceedings*

Corcos, Christine A., Melvyn R. Durchslag, and Andrew P. Morriss (1997) Teaching a Mega-course: Adventures in Environmental Policy, Team-teaching, and Group Grading", *Journal of Legal Education* 47, 2, 224-239.

Cowan , Michael A., Barbara C. Ewell and Peggy McConnell (1995)" Creating Conversations: An Experiment in Interdisciplinary Team-teaching", *College Teaching* 43, 4, 127-131.

Davis, James R. (1995) *Interdisciplinary Courses and Team-teaching.* Phoenix AR: Oryx Press.

George, Marshall A. and Patricia Davis-Wiley (2000)" Team-teaching a Graduate Course", *College Teaching* 48, 2, 75-80

Goetz Karen and Michele Jacobsen (2000)" Perspectives on Team-teaching", *E Gallery* Vol.1 No.4 August

Gorman , Carol K. (2006)" Tearing Down Business Silos", http:www.sideroad.com/Management/business-silos.html

Hunt, Shelby Keynote Address: Proceedings of the Marketing Management Awards Brunch. Proceedings of the MBAA International Conference, Chicago IL., March 24 p.14

Helms, Marilyn, John M. Alvis, and Marilyn Willis (2005) "Planning and Implementing Shared Teaching : An MBA Team-teaching Case Study", *Journal of Management Education* 81, 1, 29-34.

Hornyak, Mike S. and Martin J. Wenger (1999)" Team-teaching for Higher –Level Learning: A Framework of Professional Collaboration", *Journal of Management Studies* 23, 311-328

Lage, Maureen J. and B. Kay Snavely (1999)" Benefits and Costs of Team-teaching: Experience from an Interdisciplinary Collaboration", *Newsletter of the Status of Women in the Economics Profession. http//www cswep.org/ lage and snavely.htm*

Larange, Peter (2010) "A New Model for Management Education", *Biz Ed* January/February, 38-41.

Lasher,Harry J, & Manners, George E. (2005) "Innovative delivery of MBA business foundation coursework: Does Integrated Team-teaching Make a Difference?" *ournal of College Teaching and Learning* 2, 6, 57-62.

Leavitt, Melissa C. (2007) "Team-teaching: Benefits and Challenges", *Tomorrow's Professor Blog* Pp. 1-5 *http:// tomprofblog.mit.edu*

Letterman, Margaret R. and Kimberly B. Dugan (2004) "Team-teaching a Cross Disciplinary Honors Course: Preparation and Development", *College Teaching* 55, 2, 76-79.

Levitt, Stephen D. and Stephen R. Dubner (2005) *Freakonomics*, New York: HarperCollins Publishers.

------ and ------ (2009) *Super Freakonomics*, New York: HarperCollins Publishers.

McDaniels, Elizabeth A. and Guy c. Colarulli (1997) Collaborative Teaching in the Face of Productivity Concerns: The Dispersed Team Mode", *Innovative Higher Education* 22, 1, 19-36.

Ottewill, Roger, George McKenzie and Jean Leah (2005) "Integration and the Hidden Curriculum in Business Education", *Education +Training* 47, 2, 89-97 .

Robinson, Betty and Robert M. (1995) Collaborative teaching: reaping the benefits. *College Teaching* 43, 2, 57-60.

Shafer, Ingred (1983) "Team-teaching: Education for the Future" Presented at the *National Meeting of the American Culture Association,* Wichita, KA, April 23-26 *http://www.usao.edu*

Vogler, Kenneth E. and Emily Long (2003) "Team-teaching Two Sections of the Same Undergraduate Course", *College Teaching* 51,4, 122-126

Watkins, Tom (1996) "Stage I: Creating a New MBA Core with Team-teaching", *Journal of Management Education*, 20, 411-421.

Wentworth, Jay and James R. Davis (2002), "Enhancing Interdisciplinarity Through Team-teaching", In Carolyn Hayes (ed.) *Innovations in Interdisciplinary Teaching.* Westport CT: The Oryx Press pp.16-37.

Yellowley, Wendy and Marilyn Farmer (2005), "Team-teaching in Higher Education: Reflections on the Added Value of Team-teaching on Student and Staff Learning Experiences", *International Journal of Learning,* 12, 6, 85-90

APPENDIX

A Sample Policy for Participating in Team-teaching

Some of the proposals for curriculum revision and program development currently being considered require the coordination and integration of course content. Meeting the objectives addressed by these proposals, or at least, that are implied within them will require course development and course presentation by teams composed of faculty members within individual departments and between different departments within the College. Other proposals will require team development and teaching by faculty from Commerce and other colleges within the university.

Team course and program development and team-teaching is a departure from the standard operating procedure within the college. Because these activities must be factored into the faculty work load and departmental operations, we needed a set of agreed upon policy statements The policy statements should have to be simply stated, clear to both faculty and administrators, and as fair as possible to the individual faculty members and to the departments, and colleges involved. In sponsoring and implementing team-teaching.

There are three major categories of activities which require policy statements. These are as follows:

1. **Team Development: Individual Teaching**

   This activity involves a team of faculty members within the same department or from two or more departments who work together to develop a new course; a sequential program of courses, or to revise a single or sequence of courses. Once developed, the new or revised course or courses in the program would be taught by individual faculty members.

   For example, within the Department of Economics, two faculty members have worked together to develop a new course called "Business Conditions Analysis." This course was designed to be a requirement for the MBA program(s) and to be taught in several sections by individual faculty. Another course, "The Global Economy" was revised by faculty from several departments and is scheduled to be taught in several sections by individual faculty members. Another course, "Communication 499" was developed by three faculty members from different departments and will be taught by the three as a team.

   Faculty teaching loads, credit hour generation and reporting are matters already covered by departmental and college policies. For the team course development and team-teaching initiatives mentioned above the college administrative committee and, most especially the departmental chairs, require a unified policy regarding the inclusion and recognition of development efforts as important components of a faculty members' workload.

   Reporting of activities related to course development was included in the teaching portfolio distributed to each faculty and these activities were to be considered in rating a faculty member's overall performance evaluation. The uniform policy, therefore, must distinguish between development efforts which are considered part of the normal work load and those activities for which a faculty member should expect p be rewarded with released time either as an incentive to engage in course development activities or as a reward for having engaged in course development activities.

   Because course development and course delivery activities may occur between two or, in some cases, among several academic departments, the policy statement must be uniform for all departments.

2. **Team Development: Team-teaching.**

   This activity involves either an interdisciplinary or an intra-disciplinary team of faculty members who are working to develop a new or extensively revise an existing course or courses and teach the

emergent courses as a team to one or several sections of students.

The purpose of the following policy statement is to encourage interdisciplinary team-teaching in order to enhance our overall course and program offerings.

A. Each of the two or more faculty members who team teach a course offered by the the College shall receive course credit equivalent to one full course. In other words the computation of the course load of a faculty member who teaches a course with the assistance of another faculty member shall not be affected by that assistance. Each faculty member will receive full course credit for teaching the course.

B. Where more than one faculty member teaches a course in the College, the respective departments of those faculty members shall divide equally the credit hours and any costs generated by the course, without regard to the actual division of labor between the faculty members teaching the course.

C. Where more than one faculty member teaches a course in the College, the respective faculty members will be separately evaluated using the current student teaching evaluation form.

D. The policy statement is comprehensive and clear. The credit hours generated could be expected to fall below those of an average class during the pilot testing (first offering) of the course. From that point on, assuming multiple sections and larger enrollments per section, the credit hour apportionment issue should resolve itself.

JOINT CONFERENCE
May 22nd, 23rd and 24th 2013 in Nashville, TN at the Holiday Inn Vanderbilt

Academic Business World International Conference (ABWIC.org)

The aim of Academic Business World is to promote inclusiveness in research by offering a forum for the discussion of research in early stages as well as research that may differ from 'traditional' paradigms. We wish our conferences to have a reputation for providing a peer-reviewed venue that is open to the full range of researchers in business as well as reference disciplines within the social sciences.

Business Disciplines

We encourage the submission of manuscripts, presentation outlines, and abstracts pertaining to any business or related discipline topic. We believe that all disciplines are interrelated and that looking at our disciplines and how they relate to each other is preferable to focusing only on our individual 'silos of knowledge'. The ideal presentation would cross discipline. borders so as to be more relevant than a topic only of interest to a small subset of a single discipline. Of course, single domain topics are needed as well.

Conferences

Academic Business World (ABW) sponsors an annual international conference for the exchange of research ideas and practices within the traditional business disciplines. The aim of each Academic Business World conference is to provide a forum for the discussion of research within business and reference disciplines in the social sciences. A secondary but important objective of the conference is to encourage the cross pollination of disciplines by bringing together professors, from multiple countries and disciplines, for social and intellectual interaction.

Prior to this year, the Academic Business World International Conference included a significant track in Learning and Administration. Because of increased interest in that Track, we have promoted Learning and Administration to a Conference in its own right. For the full call for papers and more information go to http://ABWIC.org and http://ICLAHE.org

International Conference on Learning and Administration in Higher Education (ICLAHE.org)

All too often learning takes a back seat to discipline related research. The International Conference on Learning and Administration in Higher Education seeks to focus exclusively on all aspects of learning and administration in higher education. We wish to bring together, a wide variety of individuals from all countries and all disciplines, for the purpose of exchanging experiences, ideas, and research findings in the processes involved in learning and administration in the academic environment of higher education.

We encourage the submission of manuscripts, presentation outlines, and abstracts in either of the following areas:

Learning

We encourage the submission of manuscripts pertaining to pedagogical topics. We believe that much of the learning process is not discipline specific and that we can all benefit from looking at research and practices outside our own discipline. The ideal submission would take a general focus on learning rather than a discipline-specific perspective. For example, instead of focusing on "Motivating Students in Group Projects in Marketing Management", you might broaden the perspective to "Motivating Students in Group Projects in Upper Division Courses" or simply "Motivating Students in Group Projects" The objective here is to share your work with the larger audience.

Academic Administration

We encourage the submission of manuscripts pertaining to the administration of academic units in colleges and universities. We believe that many of the challenges facing academic departments are not discipline specific and that learning how different departments address these challenges will be beneficial. The ideal paper would provide information that many administrators would find useful, regardless of their own disciplines

Conferences

Prior to this year, Learning and Administration was a primary track of the annual Academic Business World International Conference. Because of increased interest, we have promoted Learning and Administration from a Track to Conference in its own right. For the full call for papers and more information go to http://ICLAHE.org and http://ABWIC.org.