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Abstract

With the rising need for community college administrators, many colleges are looking outside of academia for individuals to fill upper-level positions. Controversy has risen over administrative hires as to whether the incumbent should be from within academia or from business. This leads us to question if there is a difference between individuals that have been working within academia versus those that have worked in business.

Considering that an individual’s perception is one of the major inputs into the decision-making process, testing the individual’s perception might yield some insight and help to determine if any differences do exist between those individuals who have worked in either academia or business. This research tests if community college administrator’s work history and/or educational background have a relationship with their perception. If selective perception is evidenced, then it might influence whether community colleges should take professional background into account when looking to academics or to business professionals to hire as administrators.

This research consists of two studies collecting basic background information on selected subjects, along with their respective educational backgrounds, work histories, survey responses, and interviews. The research methodology utilized was based on the studies of Dearborn et al., Walsh, and Beyer et al. The first study requested each subject to read a case, identify the
issues in the case, rank each identified issue on a Likert scale (1-7), and note which of all the identified issues is most important. The second study examined variances in subjects’ issue perception, word utilization, and mental content in a more open ended interview format.

The research shows strong support for selective perception based on professional background. It also shows that administrators from the two groups tend to preference different mental models, academics preferring ‘inclusive’ approaches, compared to the more ‘top down’ approaches of administrators with business background. Finally, the research raises questions as to the differential impact of ‘on the job socialization’ on both groups.
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Chapter I

Introduction

For several years, experts on community colleges have made predictions regarding a large number of upper-level community college administrators’ retirement.¹ A study conducted by the American Association of Community Colleges (AACC) in 2001 of 936 US Community College Presidents reports that 79% of the presidents showed interest in retiring within the next 10 years (2001 – 2011).² Data also suggest that the majority of the individuals expected to assume these vacant positions are nearing retirement age themselves.³ One report by the National Council of Institutional Administrators claimed the leadership crisis is even greater than expected.⁴

With the increasing demand for upper-level community college administrators, incumbents have been coming from within the ranks of academia as well as corporate business. A resultant controversy has arisen concerning

³ Note: Most recent data available.
backgrounds of upper-level community college administrators. Should these upper-level community college administrators evolve through the academic ranks or can these administrators come from outside academia? While controversy exists on the individual’s background (i.e. academia vs. business) the question arises as to whether or not there is a difference in the individual’s decision-making.

The decision-making process is at the core of educational administration. One of the major inputs into the decision-making process is the administrator’s perception. The variances in perception of upper-level administrators can lead to diversified deductions. Therefore, these diversified deductions will most likely yield varying inputs into the decision-making process.

The evaluation of a decision-making process, good or bad, is typically derived from retrospective analysis on decision outcomes. When a negative outcome is reverse engineered, the decision causing the negative outcome would have occurred from incorrect actions that were chosen from flawed analyses because of inaccurate perceptions. It is possible that the negative outcomes can be contributed to performance errors, temporary lack of attention, memory deactivation, or other sporadic information processing mishaps. One would have to admit the rationales provided are possible causes for negative outcomes. While admitting other factors can cause bad outcomes, it is also

---

possible that the bad outcomes of a decision has nothing to do with mistakes in
process, errors, or mishaps but rather in the actual perception of the framework
of the problem. If the perception of a problem is varying, it would stand to
reason the effects of decisions made on those varying perceptions could have
various impacts on the institution.

Therefore, understanding perception that leads to decision-making is
essential. Does the perception of an individual with an academic background
differ from the perception of an individual with a corporate background? One
way to assess to see if there is a discrepancy would be to collect perceptions of
individuals and compare their backgrounds. Is an administrator's background an
indicator to their perception? More importantly, does an administrator's
background indicate what they perceive and what they fail to perceive?

The Dearborn et al., Walsh, Waller et al., and Beyer et al. research studies have sought empirical evidence to support the conclusion that
administrators have selective perception. That is, administrators selectively
perceive objective reality based upon their background. If this were true, then a
stronger argument could be made to support a conclusion one way or another to

---

8 Stanovich et al., p. 162.
9 D. Dearborn and H. Simon, “Selective perception: A Note on the Department Identification of
Executives,” Socio Metry, June 1958, pp. 140-144.
10 James P. Walsh, “Selectivity and Selective Perception: An Investigation of Managers’ Belief
4, pp. 873-896.
11 Mary J. Waller, George P. Huber, and William H. Glick, “Functional Background as a
38, No. 4, pp. 943-974.
12 Janice M. Beyer, Prithviraj Chattopadhyay, Elizabeth George, William H. Glick, Dulce Pugliese,
“The Selective Perception of Managers Revisited,” Academy of Management Journal, 1997,
select community college administrators from either an academic or corporate background.

This proposed research is based on those four studies and proceeds to explore the possibilities of a relationship between an individual’s functional background (e.g. work histories and educational background) and their perceptions. Thus, the research will question if an administrator’s functional background has a relationship with their conceptualizations. If so, since the perceptions of an individual are an input into decision-making, then there would be a difference between academic and business backgrounds. The answer to this question is worthy of research to determine if administrative perceptions vary among administrators. If, in fact, a difference exists between cognitive discernments of administrators based upon their professional backgrounds, subsequently both theoretical and practical implications may emerge.

Significance of the Study

Approximately 1,000 public community colleges nation-wide enroll nearly 50% of all undergraduate students. In addition, these community colleges have various pressures placed upon them including expectations of effectiveness, accountability, serving diverse populations, maintaining open access, comprehensiveness, and responding to local needs. While supporting almost half of the undergraduate students nation-wide and responding to various

---

pressures, these community colleges have projections of “extremely high number of management vacancies”\(^{16}\).

One could argue that it is a significant issue for higher education that there are so many projected vacancies in leadership positions at community colleges. Considering that the issues facing community colleges both internally and externally are vast,\(^{17}\) coupled with a large number of looming administrative vacancies, selection of new administrators to fill these vacancies is critical. These concerns facing community colleges have made the issue of leadership selection divisive.

The primary focal point of the controversy is selection of leaders.\(^{18}\) Should the selection be from within academia or from the corporate sector? While this research may not provide definitive answers as to whether to select a leader from academia or business, it might answer the more basic question of whether there is a disparity between academic and business leaders. It becomes significant to first answer the basic question if a distinction exists between administrators with distinct personal histories, which might yield insight to the larger question.

Some researchers (Dearborn & Simon\(^{19}\), Walsh\(^{20}\), Waller, Huber, & Glick\(^{21}\), and Beyer, Chattopdhyay, George, Glick, Ogilvie, & Pugliese\(^{22}\)) theorize that some amount of bias exists in perception of issues by administrators. Specifically, these researchers have theorized that administrators perceive

---

\(^{16}\) Cejda et al., 260.  
\(^{17}\) Cejda et al., 255.  
\(^{18}\) Viniar.  
\(^{19}\) Dearborn, et al.  
\(^{20}\) Walsh.  
\(^{21}\) Waller, et al.  
\(^{22}\) Beyer, et al.
issues differently based upon their functional responsibility or professional background, which they have termed selective perception. However, controversy and ambiguity have arisen. None of these studies provided evidence to support a clear link between the individual's functional responsibility/background and selective perception. Notwithstanding the lack of supporting evidence, all of these researchers have agreed that some type of selective perception is occurring based upon functional responsibility and/or background.

The purpose of this research is to extend current research to establish a clear link between functional background and selective perception. In addition, this research could possibly provide foundational information for future investigations. This research may have a significant impact on educational administration problems specifically surrounding leadership selection in community colleges. If this research were to provide supporting evidence that there is a difference between the perceptions of academic and business leaders, then upper level administration selection might be increasing in complexity.

This research has both theoretical and practical applications. The theory will be in the area of improved understanding of decision-making inputs. The research may also provide practical applications for community college administrators to include others with specific educational background and work histories (i.e. functional background) having some influence (i.e. included perceptions) into the decision-making process. Administrators may learn how and when to include the appropriate individuals for a specific decision-making issue. Suggestions for administrators making decisions may also arise. If
exploring the possibilities of an individual’s functional background having a relationship with perceptions yields supporting evidence, then this research will contribute added meaning to the existing knowledge on decision-making and the roles of the administrators.

This research will be limited specifically to upper-level decision-makers within community colleges. The limitation to community colleges is primarily due to the current need for upper-level administrators, as well as the necessity to narrow the scope of this research to a realistic target. While the proposed research could be studied with a broader scope, to incorporate higher educational institutions including universities, colleges, and junior colleges both public and private, the option would require a large number of subjects to attain a representative sample. Such a sample consisting of several upper level administrators from each type of college both public and private would be unmanageable without significant financial support. Therefore, the scope of this investigation shall be limited to community college presidents and upper-level administrators that report to the president. All other institutions of higher education and decision-makers outside of these criteria will be considered out of scope and not included within this research.

**Overview**

This dissertation has seven chapters. Chapter I introduces the research question, discusses the need for this research, introduces the research, and provides an overview of the subsequent chapters. Chapter II is a literature
review of selective perception studies by Dearborn & Simon\textsuperscript{23}, Walsh\textsuperscript{24}, Waller, Huber, & Glick\textsuperscript{25}, and Beyer, Chattopdhyay, George, Glick, Ogilvie, & Pugliese\textsuperscript{26}. Chapter III develops the research question. This chapter also discusses a framework to test the research question. Chapter IV discusses the data collection and analysis. Chapter V discusses a need for a second study, the second study, and analysis of the second study. Chapter VI discusses mental models. Chapter VII draws conclusions based upon the evidence.

The creation of a framework, based on qualitative research, can provide a means to delve into the decision-maker’s inputs (i.e. perceptions) to the decision-making process to establish if a distinction exists between academic and business leaders. This framework is the basis for the creation of the instrument to collect evidence that will either yield supporting evidence or not for the research question. The research is predominately qualitative with a slight combination of quantitative analysis. A discussion of these research methods is in Chapter III.

The determination of the population and sample for the research is limited to institutions of higher education, specifically community colleges. Chapter III outlines the process and guidelines for the research. The chapter also defines the analysis measures. The Appendix provides samples of correspondence and the instruments employed in the research.

\textsuperscript{23}Dearborn et al., 140-144.
\textsuperscript{24}Walsh, 873-896.
\textsuperscript{25}Waller et al., 943-974.
\textsuperscript{26}Beyer et al., 716-737.
Chapter II

Literature Review

This review follows a similar format to four empirical probings on selective perception: the Dearborn & Simon\textsuperscript{27}, Walsh\textsuperscript{28}, Waller, Huber, & Glick\textsuperscript{29}, and Beyer, Chattopdhyay, George, Glick, Ogilvie, & Pugliese\textsuperscript{30} studies. These four analyses attempt to determine if functional background has a direct relation to selective perceptions. Controversy exists around the existence of as well as empirically identifying this relationship. There is a need for research to determine if there is a direct relationship between functional background and selective perceptions.

**Dearborn & Simon (1958)**

The research of Dearborn & Simon was based on responses of 23 executives from a single large company. The executives were considered middle-management in functional areas of sales, production, accounting, and other.\textsuperscript{31} The case problem provided to the executives for assessment was about

\textsuperscript{27} Dearborn et al., 140-144.
\textsuperscript{28} Walsh, 873-896.
\textsuperscript{29} Waller et al., 943-974.
\textsuperscript{30} Beyer et al., 716-737.
\textsuperscript{31} Dearborn et al., 140.
ten thousand words in length that contained descriptive material about the company and the respective industry. The recent history of both the company and the industry were provided. The executives were motivated to look at the case problem from a company-wide view and asked to identify the most important issue facing the company in the case.

The hypothesis of Dearborn & Simon’s research is that each executive will perceive those aspects of a situation that relate specifically to the activities and goals of his or her department. Dearborn & Simon concluded that the outcomes demonstrated that executives had a tendency to view the case problem from their respective functional department. Dearborn & Simon concluded the hypothesis was supported and that the executives do have a selective perception based upon their functional area. Therefore, it can easily be extrapolated that an executive’s selective perception is based upon the influences of their functional area.

Walsh (1988)

Walsh believed that Dearborn and Simon’s conclusions were not supported by the evidence provided. Walsh was to conceptually replicate and expand Dearborn & Simon’s research. Walsh’s research was based on responses of 121 students that were enrolled in a two-year, part-time executive

---

32 Dearborn et al., 141.  
33 ibid., 141.  
34 ibid., 142.  
35 ibid., 142.  
36 ibid., 143.  
37 Walsh, 889.  
38 ibid, 874.
master’s degree program at a large university. The respondents were middle to upper-level management executives from several companies from the functional areas of human relations, accounting-finance, marketing, and generalist.

Walsh’s research was comprised of two parts, a sorting task, and a case analysis. The sorting task was to rank 50 factors in order of importance to an organization’s success. The case analysis was to read a three-page case specifically formulated for this research, whereby the respondents were to answer two questions:

1) Identify the problem or problems facing the company.

2) Indicate what additional information they would need to thoroughly assess the company’s situation.

The complete work histories of 107 of the 121 executives were collected (the work histories of the remaining 14 executives was not available). Walsh’s research had four hypotheses relating to selective perception.

1) A manager with a belief structure focused on a single functional domain is likely to have worked in that domain.

2) In ill-structured decision situations, managers are only likely to identify problems that are from the same functional domain as the content of their belief structures.

3) In ill-structured decision situations, managers are only likely to use information that is from the same functional domain as the content of their belief structures.

4) In ill-structured decision situations, managers are only likely to seek additional information that is from the same functional domain as the content of their belief structures.

---

39 Walsh, 876.
40 ibid., 888.
41 ibid., 877.
42 ibid., 878.
43 ibid., 879.
Walsh’s results did not provide statistical significance for Hypothesis 1, although the mean supports the predicted direction, that a manager with a belief structure focused on a single functional domain had worked in that domain.\(^{44}\) Hypothesis 2 received some marginal support, that is the marketing group saw more external management problems than the human relations and generalist groups (significant at the .05 level).\(^{45}\) Hypothesis 3 did not have any statistical support. Hypothesis 4 received limited support; the accounting-finance group requested more accounting-finance information than the marketing, human relations, and the generalist groups (significant at the .05 level).\(^{46}\) Additionally, the marketing group requested more external management information than the human relations and generalist groups (significant at the .01 level).\(^{47}\)

Walsh concluded that these results, although similar to Dearborn & Simon’s conclusions, were only marginally supportive of the Dearborn & Simon’s conclusions since the difference between the functional areas was not statistically significant.\(^{48}\) Walsh concluded that an executive’s perceptions are not limited to their functional area.\(^{49}\) More so, Walsh concluded that some executive’s perceptions belonged to belief structures of other functional areas.\(^{50}\) For example, one Chief Fiscal Officer had a human resources belief structure in addition to their fiscal belief structure.

\(^{44}\) Walsh, 885.  
\(^{45}\) ibid., 885.  
\(^{46}\) ibid., 887.  
\(^{47}\) ibid., 887.  
\(^{48}\) ibid., 885.  
\(^{49}\) ibid., 887.  
\(^{50}\) ibid., 888.
Waller, Huber, & Glick (1995)

Waller, Huber, & Glick selected the top executive of 63 organizations (31 manufacturing, 17 health care, and 15 in other service) of which 10 US states (California, Louisiana, Maryland, Michigan, New York, Ohio, Oklahoma, Texas, Virginia, and Wisconsin) were invited to participate. Waller, Huber, & Glick were researching diverse organizations to assess their theory for applicability in general.

Waller, Huber, & Glick designed a study in an attempt to support Dearborn & Simon’s conclusions. Waller et al. decided to study perceived changes in a real work environment unlike Dearborn & Simon and Walsh who studied perceived steady state conditions. Waller et al. designed two hypotheses to investigate this related to selective perception.

1) The kinds of changes executives perceive in their organizations’ environment are related to their functional backgrounds.

2) The kinds of changes executives perceive in their organizations’ effectiveness are related to their functional backgrounds.

Waller, Huber, & Glick concluded that the first hypothesis was not supported. The second hypothesis however did receive support. Therefore, Waller et al. determined that functional background does have a relationship to perceptions in organizational effectiveness. However, tenure in functional background was not a significant predictor.

51 Waller et al., 952.
52 Ibid., 952.
53 Ibid., 950.
54 Ibid., 959.
55 Ibid., 959.
Beyer, Chattopdhyay, George, Glick, Ogilvie, & Pugliese (1997)

Beyer, Chattopdhyay, George, Glick, Ogilvie, & Pugliese’s research was a revisit of Walsh’s research that was based more on belief systems than selective perception. However, to be comprehensive and inclusive, Beyer et al. included and tested a hypothesis that was along the lines of the Dearborn & Simon study.\(^{56}\) Beyer et al. selected 137 regular full-time Master’s of Business Administration (MBA) students recruited at a large southwestern university to participate in the study (only 120 provided complete data).\(^{57}\) The participants were broken into two groups and each group was asked to identify either the most important problem in the case or all of the important problems in the case.\(^{58}\) The case utilized the same case created by Walsh.\(^{59}\) The hypothesis of their research is the greater the experience of decision makers in a functional area, the more that functional area will be represented in their perceptions.

Beyer et al. concluded that by using canonical correlation analysis, a multivariate statistical model that facilitates the study of interrelationships among sets of multiple dependent variables and multiple independent variables, the hypothesis was significantly related to selective perception (the study was based on information attended to and problems identified).\(^{60}\) However, regression analysis found no significance for information attended to and found only a few scattered significant relationships for problems identified.\(^{61}\) Notably, the

\(^{56}\) Beyer et al., 719.
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significant relationships were only found within the functional background groups of production/operations and finance/accounting. Further testing with regression analysis yielded results that were too scattered to exceed what might be expected by chance, therefore, Beyer et al. concluded the data failed to support the hypothesis.
Discussion of Selective Perception

Selective Perception Research Mixed Results

The controversy surrounding Dearborn & Simon’s research was caused by several factors. Each of the subsequent studies made minor changes in the research design. As each modification was made, additional questions arose. Despite this fact, the primary question is yet to be answered. Does functional background influence selective perception?

Walsh, while stating he was replicating Dearborn & Simon’s research, apparently did not explicitly scrutinize the identical hypothesis. Walsh did not directly test the relationship between functional background and problems identified. However, Walsh determined that Dearborn & Simon’s conclusion was not at all clear. Waller, Huber, & Glick concur with Walsh, that review of the data collected by Dearborn & Simon did not provide clear support for or against their hypothesis that functional background does have an influence on selective perception. Furthermore, Waller et al. concluded that Walsh’s research did not report any data explicitly measuring the relationship between
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functional background and selective perception; therefore, no support is offered either way to determine this relationship.  

Waller, Huber, & Glick researched a similar hypothesis to that of Dearborn & Simon, however, their study is based more upon Walsh’s study and did not concentrate on Dearborn & Simon’s investigation. Waller et al. based their hypothesis upon a specific type of perception that had mixed results. Therefore, even the Waller et al. research failed to answer the Dearborn & Simon hypothesis. By looking at the hypotheses of the four studies, it seems, with the exception of the Waller et al. research, the specific hypothesis of Dearborn & Simon has not been unequivocally confirmed.

Each study that was to replicate the Dearborn & Simon research introduced additional factors into the study. Walsh introduced belief structures. Waller et al. tested Walsh’s belief structures and specific areas of selective perception. Beyer et al. attempted to test breadth and direction of selective perception.

Each study, with the exception of Waller et al., utilized similar methodology but the data collection differed in an attempt to uncover the rationale for the mixed findings of the other inquiries. Dearborn et al., Walsh, and Beyer et al. used case analysis. Waller et al. used actual field studies. Although Waller et al. provide a seemingly strong rationale to perform field study, one could argue that the process of examining assumptions within a field study fails to provide constant domain. That is the one major advantage to utilizing a case study.

---
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Not all of the studies used identical managerial level participants. Dearborn & Simon’s participants were middle-managers, Walsh’s participants were middle-managers and top executives, and Waller, Huber, and Glick’s participants were top executives. Beyer et al. participants were MBA students. Each analysis modified the type of participants studied. Notwithstanding, no known effects of the different participants have been reported.

All of these changes (hypotheses, introduction of new elements, changes in what data are collected, and selection of participants at different management levels) in the research studies has added to the controversy and mixed results. Although all of these research studies have provided important information, the Dearborn & Simon hypothesis has not been supported and has resulted in a limited understanding of how functional background influences selective perception.66

Selective Perception Research Conclusions

Walsh reported that when evaluating the requests for more information, the executives in the accounting functional area requested more information on finance (significant at the .05 level), and executives in the marketing functional area requested more external management information (significant at the .01 level).67 This tends to suggest that some amount of selective perception is occurring based upon functional background. However, the identification of the relationship has been elusive.

67 Walsh, 887.
What has emerged from the research is that some amount of selective perception is most likely occurring, but not necessarily in the ways previously theorized and investigated.\textsuperscript{68} Bunderson and Sutcliffe suggest that selective perception exists and is influenced by other factors in addition to functional background.\textsuperscript{69}

\textsuperscript{68} Beyer et al., 734.
Discussion of Belief Structures’ Influence on Perception

While the core of this dissertation research is modeled on the four studies directly pursuing selective perception, several other studies have sought to provide some explanation of why the selective perception studies were unable to attain supporting evidence. Dearborn et al. concluded that the individual’s perception of stimuli is influenced (perceived or not perceived) by that individual’s functional background.70 Walsh concluded that Dearborn et al.’s supporting evidence regarding selective perception failed to uphold the conclusions. Walsh introduced the concept of belief structures as the direct influence to an individual’s perception, while concurrently reasoning that an individual has belief structures of different functional areas.71

Before further review of what influences perception, a consideration of the concept itself should be initiated. The concept of perception is defined here as to be how an individual takes objective reality and makes sense of it. Starbuck and Milliken provide an informational article supported by literature review and conclusions drawn from the available treatises. Starbuck et al. claim that administrators distort the objective reality and focus attention on their perceived reality.72 This distortion process is filtering out what they recognize as relevant and irrelevant. Starbuck et al. note that two administrators can divergently

70 Dearborn et al., 142.
71 Walsh, 888.
72 Starbuck, et al., 40.
perceive where one could identify a stimulus while another filters out that analogous catalyst.\textsuperscript{73}

Objective reality is presented to both administrators and yet, one accepts the stimulus while the other filters that same evidence out. Starbuck et al. also state that noticing is influenced by habits, beliefs about what is, and beliefs about what ought to be.\textsuperscript{74} This is consistent with Walsh’s conclusions that belief structures influence the individual’s discernment of objective reality.

**Stimuli Acquaintance and Strength**

Administrators notice subtle changes in foreground stimuli while ignoring substantial changes in background stimuli.\textsuperscript{75} These executives seem to also initiate a shift into the background stimuli that would normally be in their foreground by reducing receptivity to stimuli. This can occur by familiarity and habits in noticing foreground stimuli that can deaden sensitivity causing the foreground stimuli to become background noise.\textsuperscript{76} This suggests that people can filter or reallocate a stimulus to background, which potentially filtered out or removed this stimulus. This means that a person can filter or remove a stimulus while constructing their conceived reality. Reversing the process by exchanging stimulus from the background to foreground can also be initiated.

Bunderson et al. derive the proposition that “noticing and interpreting will not be functionally-biased when situational strength is high”.\textsuperscript{77} This proposition

\textsuperscript{73} Starbuck, et al., 41.
\textsuperscript{74} ibid., 42.
\textsuperscript{75} ibid., 43.
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\textsuperscript{77} Bunderson et al., 462.
emerged from a literature review set out to “carefully reexamine research and theory” in order to develop a set of propositions surrounding belief structures and selective perception. Bunderson et al. work from Dearborn & Simon’s selective perception and incorporate Walsh’s belief structures. Bunderson et al. agree with Walsh that a person’s functional-orientation creates a functional bias. Bunderson et al. also argue that additional influences cause a “reinforcement” of learning or expanding a person’s belief structure. While Walsh utilized a sorting task to order importance related to organizational success, this task neglected to capture strength. It also suggests that when the strength of a stimulus is high, that stimulus will be considered relevant. This identical reinforcement may or may not have been considered relevant to the subject without the strength that is associated with the given stimulus. Bunderson et al. argue that high strength stimulus will be noticed. Therefore, it would seem reasonable that a high strength stimulus that might normally be placed into background could now be in the foreground. Bunderson et al. argue that the strength of the situation can also be a perceptual factor. Yet this variable was not collected or at least not reported in the previous studies. This would lead us to consider some form of data collection that would capture a tendency of strength.

**Functional Background and Belief Structure Influence**

When situational strength is low, it would suggest the administrator would not automatically foreground the stimuli and perceive without situational strength
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biases. However, according to Sutcliffe, an administrator has other biases affecting their perception.

Sutcliffe collected data from a 154 item questionnaire completed by 369 top executives of 89 firms.\textsuperscript{81} The respondents came from the top managers of 502 businesses in 35 industries. Sutcliffe argues that limitations in functional diversity within a managerial group will also restrict, and potentially constrict, the perceptions of that group while a functionally diverse managerial group will recognize more features of the same events that are overlooked by those of a limited functional diversity.\textsuperscript{82} This would provide further support that a person’s functional background influences their perception.

Sutcliffe concludes that accurate perceptions are influenced by team demographic characteristics, organizational scanning, and organizational structure: all integrant elements under the control of top managers.\textsuperscript{83} This tends to suggest influence to a person’s belief structures. Thus, Sutcliffe’s study seems to be consistent with Starbuck et al. that functional background and belief structures influence a person’s perception.

Sutcliffe and Hubber study organizations of diverse industries. Data were collected from 307 top executives from 58 organizations drawn from 29 industries.\textsuperscript{84} Sutcliffe et al. note that there are two opposing theoretical arguments. Some scholars argue executives in distinct establishments observe


\textsuperscript{82} ibid., 1362.

\textsuperscript{83} ibid., 1375.

the same environment differently, due to variance among their organizations’ structures and processes. Counterarguments support social processes that induce common perceptions within and among subpopulations of organizations inhabiting the same environment.\(^85\) This study attributes deviations in perception to various social processes, organizational processes, and organizational structures; these alterations relate directly to functional background or can be said to influence the administrator’s belief structures. This renders further support that both functional background and belief structures influence selective perception in some way. However, since Sutcliffe et al. are considering both functional background elements along with belief structure elements, a merging of these two as a rationale of selective perception seems to suggest a possible relationship.

**Functional Background and Belief Structure Relationship**

One of the studies advancing Walsh’s Belief Structures was by Chattopadhyay, Glick, Miller, and Huber.\(^86\) This study included 371 executives and sought support for six hypotheses regarding belief structures. Three of the six hypotheses were supported. The third hypothesis concludes that social influence within a business team has a strong moderation tendency such that the team members will have a relationship to their executives’ belief structures.\(^87\) The fourth hypothesis was supported showing that a strong relationship exists
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where executives who have similar beliefs also have comparable functional backgrounds. The fifth hypothesis concluded that age is a determinant of the strength of the relationship between the beliefs. This study supports the suggestion that a relationship does exist between functional background and belief structures.

Markoczy further supported the suggestion of this relationship in a study that selected 111 managers from five different organizations. The subjects were asked to sort 64 issues into two piles; relevant and not relevant. The subjects then had to perform this sorting task repeatedly on the relevant pile until only ten issues remained. This approach provided data demonstrating a relationship between functional experience and managerial beliefs in four-out-of-five organizations. This is additional support to the Chattopadhyay et al. study that a relationship does exist between functional background and belief structures.

Interdependent Influences on Perception

George and Chattopadhyay examine a stream of research and conclude studies have moved from a simple paradigm of functional background to an increasingly complex model of social influence. This tends to imply a more complex paradigm than Dearborn et al, while maintaining the basic premise that selective perception is lurking somewhere in the mix. Markoczy supports this implication and envisions functional area to influence beliefs although the extent
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is unknown.\textsuperscript{91} George et al. conducted an experiment including 137 full-time MBA students with an average of 4.71 years of work experience.\textsuperscript{92} The experiment was a replication of Dearborn et al. and Walsh’s studies. Half of the subjects were asked to identify the most important issue, paralleling Dearborn et al., and the other half were asked to identify the most important issues, analogous to Walsh. Both groups did not show any relationship between functional background and issue identification.\textsuperscript{93} George et al. noted some demographic similarity, specifically age and functional background, resulted in similarity in beliefs. In addition, it was also noted that dissimilar people also shared comparable beliefs.\textsuperscript{94} Again, this becomes a recurring theme where the paradigm seems to be more complex than Dearborn et al.’s simplistic selective perception. This finding also brings into question the belief similarities among dissimilar groups.

Dearborn et al. concluded functional background influenced perception, which Sutcliffe, Bunderson et al., Waller et al., and Geletkanycz et al. also argue but could not provide supporting evidence. Walsh concluded that belief structures influenced perception, which was agreed to by Bunderson et al.

Bunderson et al., Markoczy and George et al. all concluded that a link exists between belief structures and functional background. This informs us that perception is directly influenced by functional background. It also informs us that functional background influences belief structures that influence perception.

\textsuperscript{91} Markoczy, 435.
\textsuperscript{92} George et al., 48.
\textsuperscript{93} ibid., 48.
\textsuperscript{94} ibid., 49.
Therefore, perception is influenced by functional background directly and indirectly.

**Reconsidering Selective Perception**

While considering the influences of belief structures, strength of stimuli, noticing, not noticing, foregrounding and backgrounding perception, all of these elements are either directly or indirectly influenced by functional background; again, the extent is unknown. What has been acknowledged and theorized is that functional background does have a direct or an indirect influence on perception, again, the extent is unknown. Anecdotally it is agreed that selective perception is occurring. Bunderson et al. brought forward several propositions, ultimately calling for a re-visitation to selective perception. Markoczy and George et al. also believe that selective perception needs to be revisited.
Chapter III

Methods and Research

The four studies on selective perception by Dearborn & Simon\textsuperscript{95}, Walsh\textsuperscript{96}, Waller, Huber, & Glick\textsuperscript{97}, and Beyer, Chattopdhyay, George, Glick, Ogilvie, & Pugliese\textsuperscript{98} all agree that some form of selective perception is occurring. If selective perception is occurring based upon functional background, then there is a difference between academic and business leaders. However, the above prior studies were unable to identify the relationship between functional background and selective perception empirically. Therefore, until this time no support prevails in order to substantiate the claim that there is a difference between academic and business leaders.

Starbuck and Milliken expanded an executive’s perceptions to include filters. Accordingly, a filter of an individual is what he/she removes from the objective reality in their process of perceiving.\textsuperscript{99} The executive will amplify some stimuli while attenuating others. The filtering is the process of removing (attenuating) the irrelevant information and cerebrating on the germane

\textsuperscript{95} Dearborn et al., 140-144.
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information.\textsuperscript{100} The filtering process is developed in the individual and eventually becomes instinctive.\textsuperscript{101} Therefore, assuming a filtering process is occurring, executives/managers are filtering out objective reality they deem inconsequential.

This filtering out process of objective reality is the individual attempting to identify “what is really going on.”\textsuperscript{102} In general, objective reality enters as a stimulus and is either noticed (considered relevant) or not noticed (considered irrelevant).\textsuperscript{103} When a stimulus is perceived by all and all agree on a level of importance, we accept the stimulus as reality, which will be referred to as a shared perception. When a stimulus is perceived by some and not all or all do not agree on level of importance, this will be referred to as selective perception.

Our perception is created by recognizing what from the objective reality can be ignored and what needs attention.\textsuperscript{104} An individual has a cognition that represents organized knowledge about a given concept or stimulus.\textsuperscript{105} This becomes their perspective. Managers are not simple selective perceivers, but keep a reasonable range of options open and obviate alternatives sequentially rather than attend to only a few aspects that fit into their beliefs.\textsuperscript{106} The question becomes at what point does objective reality become so negligible that it does not need attention and at what point does objective reality become perceived as important? That is the point where some individuals will begin to reduce the
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interpreted level of importance or eliminate portions of objective reality as inconsequential, while others will accept those same components of objective reality as essential.

**Selective Perception**

It has been reasoned that one executive may filter out the stimuli another executive perceives.\(^{107}\) I argue that at some point selective perception occurs, where executives with different professional backgrounds can discern the same stimuli, interpret the stimuli differently, and therefore disagree about the meanings, causes, or effects.\(^ {108}\)

Starbuck and Milliken concluded that a person’s noticing is influenced by the perceiver’s habits, beliefs about what is, and beliefs about what ought to be.\(^ {109}\) Walsh concludes that a belief structure acts as a guide to an information domain.\(^ {110}\) This belief structure sets the boundary, which defines the individual’s particular perspective.

Walsh concludes that Dearborn & Simon’s 1958 research oversimplifies an individual’s perception beliefs, such that the research is misleading.\(^ {111}\) Walsh also concludes that individuals do work within their belief structure. However, most individuals do not have a “simple selective perception” as noted by Dearborn & Simon. Individuals have complex selective perceptions and their belief structures may include several different perceptions from various group
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activities. Beyer et al. concluded that functional experience does influence a manager’s information processing but not in the simplistic ways noted by Dearborn & Simon and Walsh. Waller, Huber, & Glick, although agreeing with Walsh’s findings, do not believe these findings to be exclusive. Therefore, the possibility of a relationship between professional background and selective perception may exist.

Waller, Huber, & Glick also noted that both Dearborn & Simon and Walsh’s research were bound to a hypothetical situation with a structured stimulus instead of being examined in the individual’s actual work environment. However, attempting to evaluate an executive within their actual work environment could cause an issue of inconsistency in the actual observations, as each executive would be facing different stimuli, thus not providing an environment where “all other things being equal.” Therefore, both the stimuli and the respondent’s reaction would be varying. This would cause an additional level of complexity that may introduce problematic issues in the design.

**Implications**

It would seem that each of the studies assumes that selective perception causes exclusive biases to some extent. On the surface, this supposition would make sense, since if a person were biased he or she would have a tendency to follow his or her biases. The research studies have an implied definition that a
person with a bias cannot perceive important issues outside of his or her biases. However, one could argue that perception is not exclusive but an inclusive bias, which has two types of perception; shared perception and selective perception. It is possible that a person who is biased (that does have selective perception) has more than one set of perceptions. Both Walsh and Waller et al. agreed that managers/executives do not seem to be suffering from impoverished world views. This would tend to suggest that academic and business leaders having a shared set of perceptions would most likely yield similar inputs to the decision-making process. This would also tend to suggest that academic and business leaders might have different inputs into the decision-making process if they have selective perception.

The question would then be: Is the background of academic and business an indicator to their problem perception? Testing this question might yield some insight to the question if there is difference between leaders from academia and business. If so, then groundwork for future studies would emerge.
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Methods and Data

The data collection in this research is both quantitative and qualitative in an attempt to determine if there is a difference between academic and business leadership based upon professional background. This will be determined by testing to see if selective perception is occurring. If selective perception is occurring, does selective perception have a relationship with educational background and/or work history? If so, then there is a difference between academic and business leadership and more information will exist. This information will assist hiring practices for community college upper-level administrators in making the decision from within academic ranks or corporate business. This will be determined by acquiring administrators’ work histories and educational backgrounds (see appendix) and their responses. If the research tends to suggest that administrators with a specific type of educational background and/or work history is an indicator to selective perception then supporting evidence exists for the research question.

Population and Sample Description

The selection of the population is employees from community colleges and businesses. The selection process is similar to that of Dearborn & Simon’s research.\(^\text{117}\) The initial contact requested the subject to participate in my research. The instruments were sent via email (see Appendix). Since the email

\(^{117}\) Dearborn et al., 140-141.
contains the instrument, the subject can participate any time or location that was ascertained to be suitable.

The sample was one of self-selection. The respondents self-selected by either participating or not responding to the email. Self-selection is always an issue where the respondents are returning the instrument on their own behalf. This process may have restricted or not included subjects simply because they did not want to respond for whatever reason.\textsuperscript{118} The selection of the administrators is based on their position within their organizations, which is a purposive sample.\textsuperscript{119}

The sample validity measure used will be criterion validity. The data is considered valid if each of the subjects provides their educational background, work history, gives consent, and responds to the survey. The survey is a self-reporting tool, such that the subject is recounting his or her “belief” on the topic that may or may not be the actual case.\textsuperscript{120}

**Instrumentation**

Researchers tend to choose one investigative style; qualitative or quantitative. To extremely simplify the issue; Quantitative Style is grounded in “measurements” and Qualitative Style is grounded in a “construct of social reality, cultural meaning.”\textsuperscript{121} It should be noted that both are “error-prone” and
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uncertainty exists in reporting research.122 This research implemented a combination of both.

An instrument (a survey with a Likert scale) was used to gain empirical evidence to demonstrate tendencies and perceptions. By defining variables both independent and dependent, inferences can be made. This means an element will be selected as the independent variable and a change in that variable will cause the dependent variable to change.123 In this case, the independent variables are educational background and work history and the dependent variable are the perceptions. The collected data was analyzed with statistical analysis to support such influences by an element.

The quantitative instrument collected control and preliminary data on the subjects. For example, this instrument was used to group the individuals’ educational background (0 – Non-Administration, 1 – Administration, 2 - Leadership). The categorization of a subject was based upon the career title they reported and could have been verified if necessary through personal contact. The qualitative instrument was the identification of issues within the case.

The actual case instrument utilized by the two research studies by Walsh124 and Beyer et al.125 was attained for this study along with approval from both to utilize the instrument. However, upon further review, it was concluded the case would not be appropriate for my research. More “noise” specific to this

123 Ibid., 77.
125 William Glick, Personal Communications, August 3, 2008.
study would be required to solicit the data set needed for analysis. Therefore, I utilized the methodology Walsh and Beyer et al. employed for their research. The methodology of these two studies was similar to the methodology Dearborn et al. utilized in their study. Thus, the methodology has been tested. However, the actual case will need to be changed for the objectives of this research.

For the purpose of this research, it was decided a case specifically about community colleges would be more appropriate than the case utilized by Walsh and Beyer et al. Therefore, the case needed to address current issues facing community colleges. “Issues Facing Community Colleges” by Cejda and Leist provided subject matter for the creation of the case.

The research instruments are appropriate for the population. The population is highly educated employees of community colleges and businesses. The instruments are short and straightforward, which yielded a high response rate. The instruments provided the needed data to meet the goals of this research.

The instruments are also assumed to be reliable as they should yield similar outcomes under similar conditions.\(^\text{126}\) The instruments use the most basic kind of validity, which is face validity.\(^\text{127}\) That is, on the face of it, people should believe the definition and method of measurement defined within this research. The validity of the quantitative instrument should be self-evident. The qualitative instrument is not necessarily self-evident. However, it should be accepted based upon the methods and results reported.

\(^{126}\) Neuman, 164.
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Research Paradigm

The definition of professional or functional background for this research is a combination of educational background (formal and informal education such as credit and non-credit course work) and work history (longevity in a position or responsibility). Educational background can vary from having no degree major or minor in that field in which the individual is employed (W2) to having several degrees with either a major or minor in that field.

The subjects self-reported their degree majors and minors (if any) and these have been coded as follows;

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Representing Degree Major and Minor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Non-Administration Related</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Administration Related</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Leadership Related</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 – Degree Subject Category for Major and Minor Coding.

This code was used to classify educational background (E1). In this case, the analysis will be using the independent variables educational background and work history, to predict the dependent variable decision-making approach.
The work history was coded based upon the following table;

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Longevity in years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1-3 Years in related field</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4-6 Years in related field</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>7-10 Years in related field</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>11-15 Years in related field</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>More than 16 years in related field</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 – Work Longevity Coding.

Data Collecting Procedures

Each subject was assigned a Respondent ID that is used throughout the research. The Respondent ID, which is a simple incremental number, was created by the computer system. The identity of each subject is protected. The only link between the subject’s identity and their Respondent ID is their background information form and the consent form. Their identifying information was removed and only their Respondent ID was available during the analysis.

The subject gave consent to participate by signing the consent form (see Appendix) and provided all of the requested information; educational background and work history followed by the survey. Upon completion of the survey, all data required for the investigation was complete and the subject was included in the research and considered valid.

Human Subjects Considerations

This research did not collect any data that would present a human subject consideration. The State University at Albany IRB had approved the instrument prior to usage (see Appendix). The IRB had reviewed the instrument to ensure no human subject considerations were being overlooked. Any subject could
have denied inclusion without any penalties. Each respondent was informed of the option to decline participation in this research project. There are no adverse affects realized at this time.

**Design Issues**

The most significant design issue is the vagueness of the inputs into the decision-making process by the subject. Since the subject has control over the entire decision-making process, it becomes difficult to isolate influences regarding this decision-making progression and even more specifically, the development of an individual's perception. The narrow scope of this research may inadvertently cause the problem of “endogeneity.” This is the problem of when the dependent variable is not caused by the independent variable.\(^\text{128}\)

Again, using face validity, it would seem appropriate that work history and educational background would have a correlational relationship with the subject’s perception. I would, however, admit this is my conclusion supported by limited research herein. One could argue that work history and educational background have no relevance to an individual’s decision-making process. I would concede to this if this research shows that no relationship exists. However, if some relationship does exist, I would continue to believe that an individual’s functional background is a valid indicator of that person’s perception.

\(^\text{128}\) King et al., 94.
Chapter IV

Study One:
Issue Identification in a Hypothetical Case Study

Data Collection

Of thirty-one individuals invited to participate, twenty-four agreed to participate and completed the activities. The activities included reporting education, work histories, consenting to the study, reading the case, reporting what they felt were the most important issues of the case, and ranking each identified issue.

Due to the requisite time to complete the activities (approximately one and a half hours), scheduling was inordinately challenging for some respondents. Approximately 42% rescheduled once, 25% rescheduled twice, 13% rescheduled three or more times. Most rescheduling caused a postponement of two to three months per occurrence. Thus, the actual completion of data collection took significantly longer than expected. The approximate data collection timeframe from commencement to fruition was 19 months.

The 19 month timeframe has no known or anticipated impact to the data set. It is assumed that the time lag did not introduce any unwarranted issues or problems with the data set.
Three groups were defined and eight respondents were sought for each aggregation based upon predetermined criteria. Comparable upper level administrative hierarchy representation existed in each subcategory. That is, each group has equivalent representatives of the Presidential, Vice Presidential, and Associate Vice-President levels from of its respective organizational hierarchy.

The first group (G1=1) are administrators that have been working within a community college (academia) as an administrator for five or more years (senior academic administrators). The second group (G1=2) are administrators that have been working within a community college (academia) as an administrator for less than one year that came from the business sector (new academic administrators). The third group (G1=3) are administrators that are in the business sector (business administrators).

The number of important issues that were identified and subsequently reported by each administrator ranged from four to eleven. Eight administrators identified 5 issues, which is the largest number of administrators identifying the same number of reported issues. Only one administrator identified 11 issues.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Issues Identified</th>
<th>Number of Administrators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 3 – Number of Issues Identified by Administrators.**

Of all the identified issues, the administrators acknowledged five major themes. The themes are Leadership (L#), Increasing Enrollment (I#, which has financial implications), Staffing (S#), Developmental Education (D#), and Finances (F#). (See Data Codes and Coded Data in the Appendix.)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Academic Background</th>
<th></th>
<th>Academic with Business Background</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8</td>
<td>9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L1 - Poor Communications/Shared Decision Making</td>
<td>1 4 1 1 1 1</td>
<td>1 1 1 1 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L2 - Relatively new President &amp; VPs</td>
<td></td>
<td>5 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L3 - Participatory Governance</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 1 4 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L4 - Lack of Planning</td>
<td>1 3 3 2 1</td>
<td>1 2 1 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L5 - Gain Faculty Support</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L6 - Poor Relations</td>
<td>4 2 5 3 1 4</td>
<td>3 3 3 1 5 4 3 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L7 - Technology Decisions</td>
<td>7 6 4 1 2 2</td>
<td>2 1 1 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L8 - Implementation Task Force</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L9 - Board of Trustee's Oversight</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I1 - Student Demand</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3 3 2 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D1 - Developmental Education</td>
<td>6 3 2 2 5</td>
<td>3 6 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In Activity II, the administrators were asked to indicate what they felt were the most important issues within the presented case. The responses from the senior academic administrators and new academic administrators are shown in Table 4. Step three of Activity II requested the administrators to enumerate what they felt was the single most important issue which are denoted in the same table with an underline.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>S1 - Aging Faculty</strong></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>S2 - Staffing with Multiple Roles</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>S3 - Faculty Support</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F1 - Declining Revenues</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F2 - Student Tuition</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F3 - Increase Pres/VP Support</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F4 - Hire Fundraiser/Grant Writer</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4 – G1=1 and G1=2 Rankings
Top Three

The data was collated by each individual’s responses to perform a qualitative analysis. The top three most important issues identified by each administrator were listed. Table 5 represents senior academic administrators (G1=1). Table 6 represents new academic administrators with a business background (G1=2). In certain cases, respondents provided multiple rankings of what they defined as the third place, demanding a fourth item to be enumerated. For example, on Table 5, the fourth respondent identified Lack of Planning (L4) and Developmental Education (D1) both with the rank of three. Since it cannot be determined if one is more important than the other based upon the data collected, both ideas are included.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Issues identified</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1 Respondent 1 | Poor Communications L1 (1)  
Lack of Planning L4 (1)  
Student Demand I1 (1) |
| 2 Respondent 2 | Declining Revenues F1 (1)  
Poor Relations L6 (2)  
Poor Communications L1 (4) |
| 3 Respondent 3 | Declining Revenues F1 (1)  
Aging Faculty S1 (2)  
Lack of Planning L4 (3) |
| 4 Respondent 4 | Poor Communications L1 (1)  
Board of Trustee’s Oversight L9 (2)  
Lack of Planning L4 (3)  
Developmental Education D1 (3) |
| 5 Respondent 5 | Poor Communications L1 (1)  
Technology Decisions L7 (1)  
Developmental Education D1 (2) |
| 6 Respondent 6 | Poor Communications L1 (1)  
Participatory Governance L3 (1)  
Poor Relations L6 (1)  
Student Tuition F2 (1) |
| 7 Respondent 7 | Poor Communications L1 (1)  
Lack of Planning L4 (2)  
Technology Decisions L7 (2) |
| 8 Respondent 8 | Poor Communications L1 (1)  
Lack of Planning L4 (1)  
Hire Fundraiser/Grant Writer F4 (1) |

**TABLE 5** – Top Three Identified Issues by Senior Academic Administrators
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Issues identified</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Respondent 9</td>
<td>Participatory Governance L3 (1), Gain Faculty Support L5 (1), Declining Revenues F1 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Respondent 10</td>
<td>Poor Communications L1 (1), Lack of Planning L4 (1), Declining Revenues F1 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Respondent 11</td>
<td>Poor Communications L1 (1), Implementation Task Force L8 (2), Poor Relations L6 (3), Aging Faculty S1 (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Respondent 12</td>
<td>Poor Communications L1 (1), Poor Relations L6 (1), Lack of Planning L4 (2), Student Demand I1 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Respondent 13</td>
<td>Poor Communications L1 (1), Participatory Governance L3 (1), Lack of Planning L4 (1), Technology Decisions L7 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Respondent 14</td>
<td>Poor Communications L1 (1), Technology Decisions L7 (1), Declining Revenues F1 (2), Hire Fundraiser/Grant Writer F4 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Respondent 15</td>
<td>Increase Pres/VP Support F3 (1), Aging Faculty S1 (2), Hire Fundraiser/Grant Writer F4 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Respondent 16</td>
<td>Technology Decisions L7 (1), Student Tuition F2 (1), Hire Fundraiser/Grant Writer F4 (1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE 6** – Top Three Identified Issues by New Academic Administrators
From the top three ranked issues from Table 5 and Table 6, each variable was then accumulated to determine the frequency of the top three ranked issues of each administrator. This task yielded the results provided in Table 7.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Academic Background</th>
<th>Academic with Business Background</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L1 - Poor Communications/ Shared Decision Making</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L2 - Relatively new President &amp; VPs</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L3 - Participatory Governance</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L4 - Lack of Planning</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L5 - Gain Faculty Support</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L6 - Poor Relations</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L7 - Technology Decisions</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L8 - Implementation Task Force</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L9 - Board of Trustee’s Oversight</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I1 – Student Demand</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D1 - Developmental Education</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S1 - Aging Faculty</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2 - Staffing with Multiple Roles</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S3 - Faculty Support</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F1 - Declining Revenues</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F2 - Student Tuition</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F3 - Increase Pres/VP Support</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F4 - Hire Fundraiser/ Grant Writer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE 7 – Frequency of Top Three Identified Issues**
From Table 7, the top five in each group was taken. However, in each group there was more than one topic put into the third place standing. In the first group (G1=1) four identified issues had placed third, expanding the resultant to six entries. In the second group (G1=2) three identified issues had placed third making up the top five. The following data yielded from the top five:

**Administrators with Academic Background (G1=1)**

- Poor Communications (L1) 7 high out of 7 in group
- Lack of Planning (L4) 5 high out of 5 in group
- Technology Decisions (L7) 2 high out of 6 in group
- Declining Revenues (F1) 2 high out of 6 in group
- *Poor Relation (L6) 2 high out of 6 in group*
- *Developmental Education (D1) 2 high out of 5 in group*

**Administrators with a Business Background (G1=2)**

- Poor Communications (L1) 5 high out of 5 in group
- Lack of Planning (L4) 4 high out of 4 in group
- Technology Decisions (L7) 3 high out of 4 in group
- Declining Revenues (F1) 3 high out of 4 in group
- *Hire Fundraiser/Grant (F4) 3 high out of 5 in group*

The data show that the top five topics actually contain four identified issues that are in both groups. This would tend to suggest that a shared perception is occurring with the majority of the top five ranked issues. It can also be noted that two identified issues that came into the top five for the academic administrators (G1=1) were not shared with the administrators with a business background (G1=2), which is denoted with an asterisk (*) prefix. In addition, it can be noted that one of the top five for the administrators with a business background (G1=2) was not shared with the administrators with an academic background (G1=1).
Except for the limited non-shared issues denoted with an asterisk, the majority of the data does not support a conclusion that perceptions differ between academic and business backgrounds. This evidence would lead to a conclusion that since the two administrative groups (G1=1 and G1=2) have a majority of same top five identified issues, they have the same perception. Since they have the same perception regardless of their background grouping, they perceive most of the issues similarly.

**Emerging Relationships**

While the analysis was expected to demonstrate that selective perception is occurring, evidence did not emerge. In an attempt to find more support for the research question, the data set will be analyzed to determine if any relationships exist. One of the possible causes that support did not emerge could be that shared and non-shared perceptions overlap such that selective perceptions are being obfuscated. For example, if all of the administrators perceived the same issue, identified the same issue but only ranked the issue slightly differently based upon their functional background, the previous analysis might not have revealed it.

Perhaps when considering a group of administrators there is more of a diminishing of shared perception and emergence of selective perception that is not abrupt but a vague blending of the two perceptions. Therefore, we need to concentrate on what did emerge based upon the group, which is not an abrupt transition. A limited divergence between shared and non-shared perception did emerge based upon the analysis but barely appeared in the high five analysis.
The identified issues L1, L3, L4, L5, L6, L7, D1, F1, F2, and F4 are not significant, thus do not have a relationship with administrative association to academia or business (G1). I would argue that any identified issue that has zero for N in any group (G1=1, G1=2, or G1=3) is not viable. Therefore, L2, L8, L9, S2, S3, and F3 are not considered, leaving the identified issue increasing enrollment and student demand (I1) that has limited responses and the identified issue of aging faculty that may retire (S1).

It needs to be noted that I1 has only 3 responses from senior academic administrators (G1=1), 2 responses from new academic administrators (G1=2), and only one response from business administrators (G1=3). While I1 has limited responses (6), S1 has more responses (16) from the three groups.

**Increasing Enrollment and Student Demand Relationship**

Creating a scatter plot diagram of increasing enrollment and student demand (I1) against the various groups of administrators (G1) shows the tendencies (see Figure 1). The circles identify the central tendency of this data set.

![Figure 1 – Scatter diagram of I1 grouped by G1.](image-url)
Drawing a line through the tendencies shows that a negative association exists (see Figure 2). This negative association has an $r$ of -$0.833^*$. This tends to suggest that as administrators from business (G1=3) perceive increasing enrollment and student demand (I1) issues more important than newly hired community college administrators (G1=2). It also shows that newly hired community college administrators perceive increasing enrollment and student demand (I1) issues more important than community college administrators that have been in employment for more than five years (G1=1). This tends to suggest that tenure with in a community college diminishes perception of the relative importance of increasing enrollment and student demand (I1) issues.

This does not necessarily mean that community college administrators do not place as much importance on increasing enrollment and student demand (I1) as administrators from business. It is possible that community college administrators are more accepting of this issue. Considering over the past few years community colleges have seen double digit increasing enrollment and increase in student demand, it could be possible this issue has simply become a fact to community college administrators. Several writings over the past decade suggest community college administrators are aware of the increasing student enrollment and demand. One article in 2001 notes student enrollment increases
beyond expectations.\textsuperscript{129} Another article nine years later, reiterates the same student increase without adequate financial support.\textsuperscript{130} There are also reports and services available to community college administrators to follow student enrollment trends. One example is the American Association of Community Colleges, which provides student trends as well as various other statistics. Recall that Starbuck et al. noted familiarity to a stimulus reduces receptivity.\textsuperscript{131} Academic administrators seem to be reducing receptivity to this issue and their familiarity to the issue would explain this finding. While these questions are not part of this study, they become real questions that deserve future scrutiny.

The relationship between I1 (increasing enrollment and student demand) has an $r$ of -.833*. By squaring the $r$ we get the value -.694. This means that 69\% of the perception of increasing enrollment and student demand is “explained” by the administrators’ grouping. It should be noted that this relationship is very strong at 69\% associated to administrative aggregation.

**Aging Faculty that May Retire Relationship**

Creating a scatter plot diagram of aging faculty that may retire (S1) against the various groups of administrators (G1) shows the tendencies. Drawing
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\textsuperscript{131} Starbuck et al., p. 42.
attention to the tendencies, we are concerned with the centrality and not the outliers.

Drawing a line through the tendencies shows that a negative association exists (see Figure 4). This negative association has an $r$ value of $-0.503^*$. This tends to suggest that as administrators from business (G1=3) perceive aging faculty that may retire (S1) more important than administrators that have become an administrator in a community college within the last year (G1=2). It also shows that newly hired community college administrators perceive aging faculty that may retire (S1) more important than community college administrators that have been in employment for more than five years (G1=1). Again, this tends to suggest as a community college administrator’s tenure increases their perception regarding aging faculty that may retire (S1) diminishes in importance.

This does not mean that seasoned community college administrators do not have concerns regarding aging faculty that may retire (S1). It is possible that seasoned community college administrators simply feel that there are more important issues to consider. It is also possible that seasoned community college administrators accept that aging faculty may retire and it is a known concern within community colleges. A plethora of writings noted the aging faculty in community colleges. In 1987, an opinion paper “The Aging Faculty of the
Community College” was published. In 2001, the Association of American Colleges and Universities elucidated the topic of aging faculty that may retire. As recently as November of 2010, the issue of aging faculty has been noted. Considering this is not a new subject facing community college administrators, they could have a different perspective on importance whereas it might be construed more of a trend than an issue. Therefore, it is possible that community college administrators perceive this as less important than the other groups respectfully as they have less exposure to the trends occurring within community colleges. Again, the rationale could be familiarity with the issue. While these are not questions to be answered within this study, they are questions to ponder and worth future attention.

The relationship between S1 (aging faculty that may retire) and G1 (administrator grouping) has an $r$ value of $-0.503$. By squaring the $r$ value we get the value $-0.253$. This means that 25% of the perception of aging faculty that may retire is “explained” by the administrators’ grouping.

If we consider the two negative association of I1 and S1, this would support the conclusion that administrators from business (G1=3), as they merge into academia (G1=2) begin to change their perception pertaining to I1 and S1. Thus, administrators from business perceive the two issues I1 and S1 as more important than newly hired administrators entering into academia. This would

---

further be changed as their longevity in academia increases (G1=1), leading to the conclusion that as administrators spend more time in academia, their perception of I1 (increasing enrollment and student demand) and S1 (aging faculty that may retire) become less important. This would tend to suggest that some form of cultural influence or indoctrination into academia is changing how administrators perceive issues, at least in this case, based upon the evidence collected.

Further analyses of other independent variables reveal more evidence of relationships. The responses of the administrators working within the field of their education (W2) and position level (P1) provided two more relationships.

**Poor Relations with Constituents Relationship**

Twenty of the twenty-four administrators identified poor relations with constituents (L6) as an important issue. Creating a scatter plot of administrators working in the field of their attained degree major with regards to variable L6 shows a relationship emerges. Drawing attention to the tendencies is shown in Figure 5. Grouping these administrators by working in the field of their attained degree major (W2) has a significant (.047) relation (r of .448) with poor relations with constituents (L6). Administrators not working in the area of their education (W2=0) found poor relations with constituents more
important than those who were working in the fields corresponding to their education (W2=1). This would tend to suggest that working in the area of one’s educational expertise lowers the individual’s perceived importance of relations with constituents.

By squaring the $r$ value we have the $r$ squared value of .200, which means that approximately 20% of the perception of poor relations with constituents is “explained” by the administrator’s attained degree major.

Unfortunately, little information was found in a preliminary search on the subject of working within or outside of one’s attained degree major. Thus, little information is available or known at this time to attribute this relationship finding to any rationale. While the previous relationships could be given some rationale of their occurrence, this relationship eludes validation. Has this relationship emerged simply by chance in this data set? Is this a new relationship that has no research associated to it at this time? Could having a functional career within the same field of one’s degree attainment have a significant relationship that lowers the individual’s perceived importance of relations with constituents? This introduces a thought provoking possibility for future research.
Developmental Education and Issue Identification Relationship

Thirteen of the twenty-four administrators identified developmental education (D1) as an important issue. Creating a scatter diagram and identifying the central tendencies is shown in Figure 7. Noting attention to the tendencies and drawing a line shows the slope (see Figure 8).

Grouping these administrators by position level (P1), has a significant (.04) relation (.575) with developmental education issue identification. Based upon this evidence, Presidents (P1=1) consider developmental education issues more important than Vice Presidents (P1=2). In addition, Vice Presidents perceive developmental education as more important than Associate Vice Presidents (P1=3). This would tend to suggest that as individuals rise through the ranks from associate vice president toward president, perceptions toward developmental education become progressively more important.
The squared $r$ is .331, which means approximately 33% of the administrator’s perception of developmental education issues are “explained” by their hierarchical position. This tends to suggest that the higher the administrator is in the organization, regardless of their educational background, developmental education is perceived to be more significant.

While this relationship was not expected within this research, it is not surprising that it emerged. The research of Payne and Mansfield demonstrated a relationship between hierarchical position and perception.\(^{135}\) Thus, this relationship emerging within this research is not introducing any new information. This is a known relationship documented by other researchers and is most likely not occurring within this data set by chance.

While the statistical power of this data set once converted from a qualitative to a quantitative data set is worse than that of a flip of a coin, these relationships add speculation that selective perception is occurring. While the relationships alone are statistically worthless due to the small number of administrators studied they do, however, provide direction on what issues should be considered for further study to attempt uncovering stronger evidence.

With some evidence existing, it seemed appropriate to further pursue the study of selective perception. The evidence that suggests some amount of selective perception is occurring and the relationships from this first study will be used to further pursue supporting evidence in a second study.

Chapter V

Study Two: Issues and Perceptions in Open Ended Interviews

As some indication has been recorded that selective perception is occurring, the supposition of selective perception not occurring diminishes from the possibilities leaving either instrumentation failure or shared perception as more pervasive a reality than theorized, which in the past was obfuscated and eluded detection of evidence supporting selective perception. That being said, with a measure of conviction that selective perception does transpire in some fashion, the research needed to be extended to determine whether the instrument failed to capture the facts supporting selective perception or if the pervasiveness of a shared perception is more significant than suspected.

Since, in the first study, it was unclear whether the failure to capture evidence supporting selective perception was instrument based or an issue of the pervasiveness of shared perception, a more open approach was required. It seemed that the best approach to a second study would be a structured interview process that would allow the collection of data to progress without the restriction of a structured instrument. This interview process would increase the confidence in the data by reducing the limitations of the assessment tool and would
simultaneously allow for a conversation to assist in determining if shared perception was more pervasive than theorized.

The interview process would need a specified level of structure to maintain a consistent or at least a relatively focused dialogue with a definitive goal of comparing the assorted discourses of the participants. The ultimate objective would be to attain evidence to support or reject the occurrence of selective perception, which transpired in limited form within in the first study. With this in mind, the interview questions need to focus on subject matter that would be suitable for comparative analysis.

The interview questions for the second study (see Appendix) originated from the unanswered questions and inquiries that arose from the first study. These questions are centered on various selective perception probes that could generate supporting evidence. The issues that emerged in the first study were made the focal point of the interview;

- Relations with constituents
- Developmental education
- Expanding staffing for revenue streams such as a fundraiser or grant writer
- Student demands
- Collegial Self governance
- Aging faculty

**Research Assumptions**

When a stimulus is perceived by all and all agree on level of importance, we accept the stimulus as reality, which will be referred to here as a shared
Perception. When a stimulus is perceived by some and not all or participants do not agree on level of importance, this is referred to as selective perception.

Starbuck and Milliken concluded that filters are what individuals use to create their perception from objective reality.\textsuperscript{136} At this point I feel it appropriate to clearly state some of the assumptions that were taken: It is assumed that this research has correctly acquired the administrators’ perception of the case study. It is also assumed that the results derived from the case study has given valid direction toward a second study. It is further assumed that personal biases have not influenced the analysis of the first and second studies.

**Research Limitations**

As noted earlier, not all of the referenced studies in the literature review used participants at the same managerial level. Recall that Dearborn & Simon’s participants were middle-managers\textsuperscript{137}, Walsh’s participants were middle-managers and top executives\textsuperscript{138}, and Waller, Huber, and Glick’s participants were top executives\textsuperscript{139}. Beyer et al. participants were MBA students\textsuperscript{140}. Each investigation changed the participants of the research. While no known effects of the different participants have been reported it is possible that this disparity does introduce an issue that is unrealized at this time. It is possible that the participants selected in this research were conducive to the emerging data. Perhaps a different selection of participants would yield different results.

\textsuperscript{136}Starbuck et al., 41.
\textsuperscript{137}Dearborn et al., 140.
\textsuperscript{138}Walsh, 876.
\textsuperscript{139}Waller et al., 952.
\textsuperscript{140}Beyer et al., 722.
The previous studies by Dearborn et al., Wallsh, Waller et al., and Beyer, et al. had a much broader scope. The limited scope of this research could explain why these findings emerged. If the scope of the first and second studies were enlarged, it is possible these findings may not have emerged. That is, once the scope was to be enlarged beyond community colleges, perhaps the findings would become obfuscated and undetectable with this research approach.

**Selecting Candidates**

The target group for the second study is similar to that of the first study. The candidates are senior SUNY community college administrators with either a strictly academic background or some business background prior to changing their careers to become community college administrators. A total of twelve interviewees were sought, six in each group.

The first attempts to directly contact the senior administrators by phone or email (see Appendix) did not yield many responses. Phone attempts were not productive. I attempted to contact eight senior administrators by phone. Only two answered my request and participated in the study. I had several follow up calls in an attempt to solicit their participation that were not fruitful. I had emailed eleven senior administrators of which seven responded. Of the seven that responded, two declined and five participated.

Phone attempts yielded a 25% response rate while email yielded a 64% response rate. This led me to believe that electronic communication would be a
better method for contacting and attaining the remainder of the needed participants for the second study. An email was then sent to every SUNY community college. The email contained a short synopsis of the second study and what personnel criteria would be necessary to participate. Similar to the first study, this is self-selection candidate pool. The advantage to this approach is that only those that are interested, that are willing to participate, and commit to completion of the study will respond. The emails sent attained the remainder of the candidates needed for the study. There were three individuals that were interested in participating that were excluded as the number of contributors for the academics group had already been met. The responses to the email provided the participants needed, but only allows for approximation of response rate. The email was sent to 30 community colleges. There is no knowledge of how many administrators actually read the email. What is known is that the email attained interested candidates at the President, Vice President, and Associate Vice President levels from SUNY community colleges resulting in the required number participants.

The interviewees had similar demographics. The administrators with a business background had more females. No gender based influences were found. The coding below is from Table 1 and Table 2 utilized in the first study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent ID</th>
<th>A1</th>
<th>A2</th>
<th>A3</th>
<th>A4</th>
<th>A5</th>
<th>A6</th>
<th>B1</th>
<th>B2</th>
<th>B3</th>
<th>B4</th>
<th>B5</th>
<th>B6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longevity</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Interviews

The first interview lasted over two hours and some of the questions (see Appendix) were only superficially discussed or not at all. The first interview ultimately was not included due to incompleteness lacking comparative information. The interview process had to be streamlined for two reasons. First, the interested candidates were informed that the interview would be about 90 minutes. The first interview was well over 120 minutes and did not allow coverage of all topics identified to be discussed due to the duration of the interview encompassing a longer timeframe than estimated. Secondly, more than one of the candidates scheduled had informed me that the interview must be completed within an hour. One solution could be to increase the pace of the first seven questions and concentrate on the last question, which contained the issues identified in the first study. However, increasing the pace did not solve the issue as the second interview lasted almost two hours to complete. While all of the topics were discussed, the timeframe was escaping the acceptable time parameter.

A different approach need to be deployed while staying in the bounds of IRB approval. The next approach was based upon the first two interviews and where they seemed to provide the best source of information. The first three questions are background related data that is needed for grouping and IRB administration. This data can be collected prior to the interview, which would reduce the interview duration. However, these three questions were insignificant
time wise. Thus, additional streamlining was necessary. Since question eight with respect to the first two interviews seemed to elicit the most significant source of data from the interviewees, the questions 4, 5, 6, and 7 seemed less informative and lacked variance among the participants. The next approach was to ask the participants to respond the first seven questions prior to the interview and have the interview concentrated on question eight. This approach allowed the third and all subsequent interviews to be conducted within 60 minutes except for one participant (interviewee 10) that utilized 90 minutes for the interview.

The questions 4, 5, 6, and 7 all fell within a similar theme of response and did not present any data that seemed to be substantive for the study. With such rich data collected by question eight, I did not require those candidates that did not respond (NR) to questions 4, 5, 6, and 7 prior to the interview to do so. The responses to the questions were all in the affirmative and provided no insight other than all believed that selective perception exists. Therefore, questions 4, 5, 6, and 7 were not included in the qualitative analysis.
Table 8 – Interview Questions 4, 5, 6, and 7

Question eight was created by the focal points determined in the first study. Question eight is actually a series of successive questions to elicit a discussion, which are as follows:

- How do you create and maintain relations with constituents?
- What can you say about developmental education and the cause?
- Given the choice of a fundraiser or grant writer, which one and why?
- What are your thoughts regarding demands placed upon students?
- What are your comments regarding collegial shared governance?
- What are your thoughts regarding aging faculty?
- Would you like to say anything about business versus academia?

The interview discussions of question eight provided a very rich data set. This data set was analyzed in various ways. The first analysis is to review the issues discussed in question eight. The second analysis is to review what terminology was utilized by the participants, which seemed interesting but insignificant. Therefore, the second analysis was placed in the appendix. The
third analysis is to discuss what mental models emerged from this data set. Each analysis will include an inventory of what was within the participant’s interview and what convergence and divergence exists based upon the participant’s background.

Each interview was recorded and reviewed. While reviewing each interview, the material that had the most substance was meticulously chronicled verbatim delineated by the interview topic. The transcribed interviews were individually stored in electronic documents. All of the files were then merged into one single text delineated by interview topic, and then by the interviewee’s identification data. The complete document was utilized for categorizing reoccurring data themes and analysis.

**Issue Inventory**

Each interview was audio recorded, with permission (see Second Study Consent Form in Appendix). The substantive material that seemed most relevant was transcribed into an electronic document. In the process of reading through the transcribed source, as each issue was mentioned, it was added into Table 9. An “X” was then placed under the respective identification (e.g. A1, A2, etc.) for the respondent who mentioned the concern. After reviewing the entire transcribed material, all issues that had only one “X” were removed. Table 9 is an inventory created from the resultant of this activity.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue Inventory</th>
<th>Administrators with an Academic Background</th>
<th>Administrators with a Business Background</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A1</td>
<td>A2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Believes there is a (slight) difference between internal and external audiences</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 No Child Left Behind – teach to the test – causes increased need for Developmental Education</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Work with K-12 faculty to better align student expectations to be consistent with community college expectations</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Change community college’s approach/education in order to streamline/reduce Developmental Education requirements</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Lack of parental involvement causes Developmental Education</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Believe students have a growing sense of entitlement</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Believe students have a growing sense of immediate gratification</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Believe students are not making the time commitment to their higher education</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Believe some sort of learning while working partnership needs to be incorporated</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Hire Fundraiser</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Hire Grant Writer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Believes in /Supportive of Shared Governance</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Perceives frustration with Shared Governance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Believes Shared Governance moves too slowly or time consuming</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Believes Shared Governance builds buy in</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Believes Shared Governance introduces ideas</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Believes the institution needs to preserve institutional memories and knowledge</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Believes the institution needs to cultivate a positive organizational cultural</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Concerns over losing senior faculty members who possess so much subject knowledge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Retiring faculty provides opportunity for new younger faculty with new perspectives</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Retiring faculty provides cost savings</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Believe we need some kind of succession planning</th>
<th></th>
<th>Seek entrepreneurial individuals</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>- - - X - - I - - - X X -</td>
<td></td>
<td>X X - - X - D &lt; - - - - - - -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Recognizes rapid pace decision making in private sector businesses</td>
<td></td>
<td>Colleges cannot move forward with projects to meet the needs of businesses in a timely fashion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>- - X - - - D &gt; - X X X X -</td>
<td></td>
<td>Frustration with bureaucracy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>- - X X - - I - - - - X -</td>
<td></td>
<td>Loss of time in bureaucratic decision-making procedure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>- - - - - D &gt; - X X - X -</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of responsiveness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>- - - - X - I - - X - - -</td>
<td></td>
<td>The concept of urgency is limited or non-existent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>- - - - - D &gt; - X X - - -</td>
<td></td>
<td>Deadlines have no consequences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>- - - - - D &gt; - X X X X -</td>
<td></td>
<td>Going into academia might have been a mistake</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>- - - - - D &gt; - - - X - X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>- - - - - D &gt; - X - - - X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE 9 – Issue Inventory**

**Note:**  
X represents unsolicited mention of issue  - represents no mention of issue  
D represents Divergent  Academic > Business  C represents Convergent  I represents indiscernible
As the above table demonstrates, the issue inventory items show several convergent as well as divergent topics. The column between Academic Administrators and Business Administrators contains the tendency of the issue. The direction of diverging tendencies is noted under the “D” in Table 9. The convergent tendencies are noted with a “C” in the table. The issues that had only a one to one or two to one ratio is considered indiscernible and noted with an “I” in the table.

There are six topics that are indiscernible;

7  Believe students have a growing sense of immediate gratification
15  Believes Shared Governance builds buy in
21  Retiring faculty provides cost savings
22  Believe we need some kind of succession planning
25  Colleges cannot move forward with projects to meet businesses in a timely fashion
27  Loss of time in bureaucratic decision-making procedure

Since item numbers 7, 15, 21, 22, 25, and 27 are considered indiscernible due to the low number of occurrences, these issue items will not be reviewed. Both convergent and divergent themes will be reviewed. The first review will be the items of convergence. The second will be a review of items that are apparently divergent.

Areas of Convergence

When the number of administrators (within one) of both groups has noted the same issues similarly, it will be considered an area of convergence. Therefore, when reviewing the issue inventory items, when the number of X’s
appearing for each group are similar (within one) for a given entry, it will be considered an area of convergence.

There are five topics of convergence;

10 Hire Fundraiser
11 Hire Grant Writer
14 Believes Shared Governance moves too slowly or time consuming
16 Believes Shared Governance introduces new ideas
20 Retiring faculty provides opportunity for new younger faculty with new perspectives

Hire a Fundraiser

Issue inventory item 10 was only chosen by four administrators, two in each group. The question was if you were given the choice of a fundraiser or a grant writer, which one would you choose and why. The following responses were collected from two academic administrators (A1 and A6) and two business administrators (B2 and B4);

A1 Response;
   “A Fundraiser for us…”

A6 Response;
   “A fundraiser…”

B2 Response;
   “I think that people can be trained to write grants. A good fundraiser has skills to develop letters and correspondence for direct mail. … it takes a unique person to be a fundraiser.”

B4 Response;
   “Fundraising to me is most important to me.”

All four of these administrators have selected a fundraiser. Both administrative groups with different backgrounds have selected similarly.
Hire a Grant Writer

Issue inventory item 11 was derived from a question placed to each administrator. The question was if you were given the choice of a fundraiser or a grant writer, which one would you choose and why. The following responses were collected from both academic and business administrators A2, A3, A4, A5, B1, B5, and B6;

A2 Response:
“Probably grant writer. …”

A3 Response:
“Grand writer … the problem with a fundraiser is you generally cannot raise money for operations. … most of the money that comes in from private fundraising is restricted by the donor. The vast, 90% of the money is restricted by the donor, so it does not provide us much flexibility for operating funds during times like this. Whereas the grant funds … go direct to operations.”

A4 Response:
“Grant writer … I think with a grant writer, you have somebody, that skill is something that I would think you could work with other people to develop.”

A5 Response:
“On the grant side, with any grant, there are requirements that have to be fulfilled. There are primary outcomes. … A grant writer has greater capability for us to accomplish mission and goals that the college is all about.”

B1 Response:
“Grants have really allowed us to do things we would never have been able to do otherwise. …. Fundraising … is very narrow and people give to scholarships. … A new scholarship does not get us a new program.”

B5 Response:
“Right now, I would take a grant writer, only because a grant writer can work with our advancement office to help with bringing in revenue into the college. … What I like about grant writing is the opportunity to take a community need, take a community problem, to work in collaboration with
the community and the college to then shape a deliverable program as meaningful outcomes. I am an outcomes base person or I would not exist. What I learned many years ago when my career, if you do not do it well, you don’t produce outcomes, if you don’t share those outcomes, if you don’t show return on investment, those dollars and how it helps somebody, then you are not going to be around. So, I have based my leadership … in almost a prove it to me and grow your value mindset that every grant we make needs to be tied to mission, vision, and community need.”

B6 Response:

“There are negatives and positives to both, but I would pick the grant writer. The reasons, before I get to the positives, the obvious negative is paperwork. Not only that, once you ask for a grant, you have to prove where the money is going, and it is going to what the grant is about. Whether you defined it or the grant defines it, because there are a lot of grants out there that you get to define what the grant is for as opposed to grants that dictate what it is for. … A lot of the grants we get here at the college are annual and they will continue to do this and you get the money as long as you do you due diligence, your work for it, your writing. The other good thing about grants is you ask for a certain amount and what happens is you speculate how much you are going to spend. Then you times by a certain percentage because you assume it [costs] is going to go up. But with a lot of technologies, the prices go down over time, which is great and what we are able to do is use the extra money. Of course we write it into the grant as an amendment and we get additional items for instance extra hardware, monitors, cable locks, and we are able to use this for stock or other labs. So, I really like grants.”

Sixty seven percent of the academic administrators (A2, A3, A4, and A5) and fifty percent of the business administrators (B1, B5, and B6) identified this issue and perceived it similarly.

Believes Shared Governance Moves Too Slowly Or Time Consuming

Issue inventory item 14 was identified by administrators A3, A4, A5, A6, B1, B2, B4, and B5. The following excerpts were taken from the collected statements;
A3 Response:

“In the bigger picture it [Shared Governance] is a great advantage, even as a president. The downside is that it is very time consuming. So, when you get in tough times like these and major decisions need to be made fairly quickly and in order to keep the ship maintaining some forward momentum. Sometimes you have to make decisions very quickly and shared governance does not lend itself to that at all. So that is the downside, during good times, shared governance is 98% a blessing. During bad times, it is 75% a blessing, it makes hard to make decisions in a timely fashion.”

A4 Response:

“There was a considerable amount of time that was spent not only creating buy in and understanding with academic area… You have to work with people that were part of the process to make sure they understood.”

A5 Response:

“So, it does require that investment of time and energy and people. To be able to work through items in a way that will be productive. The danger of course, is that we spend all of our time discussing and not doing anything. I think that is were the balance needs to be found. … In consideration of whatever it is being proposed you will have the opportunity to weigh in. I think from that shared governance approach comes better decision making because you got more eyes and more brains that are looking at it, working on it. It allows us to avoid that situation where maybe a person or a small group of people end up making decision based upon information that may or may not be complete and may or may not be accurate. So, it is not as tidy as perhaps people would like it to be. It is messier. It takes longer.”

A6 Response:

“From an administrative perspective, I will get to how it is important in a minute, the downside it [shared governance] appears that things take a really long time. Sometimes an administrator might think this is a really good idea, even faculty agree it’s a great idea, but once it goes to a committee, it takes forever.”

B1 Response:

“When I went to … [college name omitted] from the outside [business] world, this whole [community college] world of shared governance was tough for me to get, to really understand it, to figure out how to work in it. It is such a contrary thing to the business world. It just kind of smacks you upside your face about how does this [shared governance] thing works. Initially, I will be honest, I thought [shared governance] as a real hindrance to getting things done. … I will say that over the years I have come to really value it because of the richness it
brings to the decision making process, to have ways for different people to express their opinions, to try to diffuse this idea that all decisions are made at the top. Now, I cannot imagine working without a shared governance system. … It is a very, very difficult thing [shared governance] for somebody who comes in … as a new senior leader … to understand what it is and how it works.”

B2 Response:
“Because I did come from a private sector background … I like to do things fast and accomplish things fast. And I am not real good with shared governance. It is not a strong suit, I like to make my own decisions and move quickly but I see how it fits into the academic model. I appreciate the fact that it happens. But, man, it kills me that we have been going since September and still writing By-Laws. That kind of thing they like, I struggle with that.”

B4 Response:
“But it is the time sensitivity of those decisions with the shared governance, I think that is the only downfall of the shared governance, is time sensitivity. Because when you have such a large group, it takes a lot of time for those decisions to be made. … When you see an opportunity in the market and one of your divisions are ready to hit the ground running with this, the whole academic process takes probably 90 days to get off campus. Then you are talking another 90 to 120 days to go through SUNY. Just things like that. Those are time sensitive because if you do not have it done by a certain date, you just put yourself another 30 days behind, because your senate might not meet for another 30 days. Most senates meet only once a month. If you have not hit your deadline, even if it is of no fault of your own, again, you just put yourself back 30 days. And then you don’t have any idea what is going to happen at the senate meeting. Will people support or not, so you could have put yourself back 60 days if your explanation was not good or sub par at senate.”

B5 Response:
“We have different assemblies, one for the faculty, one for the administrators, and then one for the ones unionized. … I think, for example, we at the time debating to become a smoke-free campus. I inherited that concern from two chairs prior to me to tell you how long that took. So, we are on probably our fourth year debating whether to become a smoke-free campus and every meeting we would come. What I find, some ideas are just ahead of its time or the culture of the campus is not ready. For us, it was a matter of people really just did not want to have a smoke-free campus. So, we have faculty that say they have a five minute break between my classes and I am going to smoke where I want to smoke and then the bigger issue became how do you enforce these policies. Long story short, we just went smoke-free last semester. If I
look, it probably took ten years to get to the point where the campus community was ready to do that. … I think the hardest part in the governance is to realize when your climate is ready to hear why people do not want something and then to begin looking at the data. … Understand why they do not want something and then what would it take to change their mind and what would they need to move something forward. … It just takes time. … You cannot just put a sign, don’t smoke within fifty feet of a building. So, it was more realizing it is a slower process, culturally, to get buy in even in our governing system. Compared to what I do in the work force, decisions are made far more quickly. … Change is slow, organizationally, it is more comfortable to stay the way we are, than to [change], because that evolves risk.”

Sixty seven percent of the academic administrators (A3, A4, A5 and A6) and sixty seven percent of the business administrators (B1, B2, B4, and B5) identified this issue and perceived this issue similarly.

**Believes Shared Governance Introduces Ideas**

Issue inventory item 16 was identified by administrators A2, A4, A6, B1, and B4. The following excerpts were taken from the collected statements;

**A2 Response;**

“I think it is good to have shared governance on a college campus. I will go back to there are a lot of smart people on campus that have a lot of bright ideas. You cannot rely on one person, the president, to have all of the good ideas of where things should go.”

**A4 Response;**

“Colleges are built with very capable, very bright people that are experts in their areas. So, to build mechanisms where all those folks can contribute to the betterment of the institution, I think, is a valuable experience.”

**A6 Response;**

“You also have the benefit of really good ideas from people, from your perspective you might not have seen, and coming from faculty, I see sometimes I come up with an idea or have a reaction and one of my colleagues in administration will say, oh, you are still a faculty member…”
B1 Response;  
“I will say that over the years I have come to really value it because of the richness it brings to the decision making process, to have ways for different people to express their opinions.”

B4 Response;  
“I think the shared governance drives overall better decisions. I truly believe that the more minds you put to it, the better your decisions are going to be.”

These five administrators with varying professional backgrounds have converged on a common belief that shared governance introduces ideas.

**Retiring Faculty Provides Opportunity For New Faculty And Perspectives**

Issue inventory item 20 was identified by A1, A3, and A6 academic administrators and B2, B3, and B4 business administrators. The following are excerpts taken from their responses.

A1 Response:  
“But then the opportunity of course you have new young, younger faculty coming in. “

A3 Response:  
“Anytime you can bring in new faculty members in this environment is a plus. … The faculty coming in today, since it is an employer’s market, the faculty coming in are just fantastic. … Some of our senior faculty … are terrific and would hate to see them go, in spite of the fact they are making six figure salaries and we can hire someone new behind them for half.”

A6 Response:  
“I would see it as something that could be made into a positive, even if it weren’t and I am not saying it isn’t a positive. By all means you need people to move on so there are positions for younger folk who are bring new ideas into the classroom.”

B2 Response:  
“I think there is a fresh perspective among the young. … As I am getting closer to retirement, I think wow, some of the younger people on campus don’t have enough experience. Sometimes that is not a bad thing, because there is a fresh perspective.”
B3 Response:

“Retirement of those older faculty, while I am sure at higher pay grades, allows for us to continue bring new and more experienced people into the programs. There is still the risk that great breadth of experience in the classroom or maybe writing papers or doing other things, we are going to be missing. … With union structures, sometimes those problems are exacerbated and made worse by the economics surrounding a tenured professor. A professor that has been here can be replaced for half his salary.”

B4 Response:

“That person that has seen how things work and able to show the younger faculty how things work. The other plus to that you do have fresh ideas coming in that could be good or it could be bad. Depending on how the ideas are, again, we are in the process of shared governance, if you got ten ideas, it is good to have senior faculty that can say lets try to run with this one, but hold off on these other nine.”

Fifty percent of the academic administrators (A1, A3, and A6) and fifty percent of the business administrators (B2, B3, and B4) identified this issue and perceived this issue similarly. Fifty percent in each group demonstrates a convergence of this topic.

Five topics (10, 11, 14, 16, and 20) were identified similarly regardless to professional background. This convergence demonstrates a shared perception on these five topics. It can be concluded that the administrators’ background does not influence their perception on these particular topics.
Areas of Divergence

It will be considered an area of divergence when one administrative group’s members identify two or more of an inventory item over the other group. There are twenty such inventory items that meet this definition of divergence. The diverging inventory items are 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 12, 13, 17, 18, 19, 23, 24, 26, 28, 29, 30, and 31.

Communications with Internal and External Audiences

Reviewing the issue inventory, only one issue (1) has complete divergence between those with a strict academic background and those with a business background. This issue questions if the respondent feels they communicate differently between internal and external relationships. The following responses were collected;

A1 Response:

“I think I am always very attentive to audience. So, when I am away from the academic environment, I do not use educationese. So, if I am talking to manufacturers, I am pretty much giving them the same information. The only difference is the language is probably different. … the vocabulary is different. It is not a significant difference, but my language is different off campus and on. I am talking about the same subject, but the language is somewhat, could be, somewhat different.”

A2 Response:

“The campus culture requires a little different and more nurturing approach in dealing with faculty and staff. There is a culture of equals on the college campus. So, it requires you to think in more of committees more in terms of shared governance and responsibility for the institution. So, you need to approach it that manner. In the community, often times I think, that while we still form committees and when I am dealing with areas CEOs, it is different. It is hard to describe. It is different when community leaders get together. There is almost a certain immediate sense of respect for each other that is a little more automatic than on the college campus. I think that your ideas and direction is valued a little more
outside the campus, a lot less questioning what you say and what you really mean. So, it is a little different. It is not night and day, but it is a little different.”

A3 Response:
“Our primary constituents are our students. … The primary way I build and maintain those relationships is through the various organizations I belong to individually or sit on the board of the chamber, or on the board of the local hospitals, I sit on the county economic development board, … I tend a lot of economic related events, I tend the major fund raisers in the area where I network with all of the other CEOs and the people who represent all of the constituent sectors I just mentioned. I go to Albany regularly … I go to Washington … a lot of individual meetings and a lot of group meetings. … there is a organizational hierarchy at this college as with any college, so there are things here, I can ask for as CEO and usually get, given I can find the resources to get what I am looking for … With our faculty, our faculty really control our academic programs and our academic offerings. We can be more responsive in a business fashion, with our non-credit and we do a lot of that. We have one of the largest non-credit organizations in the state. … On the credit side, it is all of a matter of what our faculty are willing to do, if there is something that needs to be done to meet a community or regional demand that we are not already doing. Ultimately, it comes down to whether the faculty are willing support that and feel it is an appropriate academic thing to do. So, it is a little different depending upon the constituency.”

A4 Response:
“I see a distinction between internal and external. Really along the lines of the focus of what those individuals are most concerned with. I think for the most part, try to communicate effectively as you can to try to provide a clear vision … Internally, I like to do what I can to create, foster a collaborative environment where we are all working together on similar purposes. Externally, a lot of it is spending time keeping people aware of the institution and the impact the institution has, not only locally, but throughout the region we support. Make sure they are comfortable with what we are doing. How we are doing it and how it affects them.”

A5 Response:
“If there is a difference, it is probably one of depth. The depth of information, the depth of data, the depth of understanding that is shared. I think once again, that the internal stakeholders have a deeper knowledge and a deeper expectation that some of the external stakeholders are. … Because they have access to a good deal of the same information and they are testing the validity of what they see and hear from any source against what the information tells them. … It is by sharing information, that the real power is found in everyone. Having access to the level of
information they need, rather than I try to control it. … Many people will accept [student learning outcomes] that at face value, but there are those [internal stakeholders] that will push deeper and say they will need the data that demonstrate that there is an increase by students who are going through your courses. What measures are taken? What are the surveys? What are the evaluations? What are the appraisals that are done and what is the validity of those appraisals that are done? Can we control for those factors that have an impact, be it positive or negative, on those measured outcomes? So, it is thinking about college operations at the level that people who understand it more deeply would be interested in.”

A6 Response:

“Many of the relationships I have with internal constituents I have had over many years being associated with the college, as first, a faculty member before being an administrator. So that was definitely an advantage coming into this position, those relationships that already exist, I just build upon through contact, through notification, through informal and formal meetings that things like that contact. But we have new people to the college and new roles and relationships and so it is not that you can ever rest on your laurels and think that you know everybody. … I think the role is different. I think the people of the community … see me as the administrator of the college here, which I am. To them, I am talking to the Vice President. Sometimes you just have to lower those, make people feel more comfortable. … But in the college community, people have known me for years. So you do not have to make sure people are comfortable with you or that they are not intimidated with you or by your position. … So in the external community I make an extra effort to be approachable and to be seen as approachable and I don’t think in the college it is that much of a challenge.”

B1 Response:

“What I really pride myself on is being real with people. So, I try, I find it very important for me to be the same person, whether I am dealing with an internal constituents, external, or even a friend or member of my family. I am not good at having the business …[person] versus home …[person]. I call it being real. I do not know what others call it, I call it being true to myself in terms of how I establish relationships with constituents. It is really important, because I never, ever have to worry about tripping myself up. No, that is just the private …[person] that talks about that stuff. So, I try to be pretty clear there. I also, I think this goes without saying, but unfortunately you see too much of it, I find being 100% truthful is absolutely required. I don’t much spin doctoring or trying to twist things around so that I can say well that was true but… Be up front and honest, candid and real are the ways I establish the relationships with any constituency. Certainly the job is to do more listening than talking and for people to know that you are not just listed but heard them. Again, that is
true whether we are talking about a legislator, student, faculty member, that does not much matter.”

B2 Response:
“I treat everyone the same. I am a face to face person. I like to be visible and keep involved.”

B3 Response:
“I try to treat everyone the same. Obviously, with external stakeholders, there maybe reasons to be more cautious with what is being communicated. … In terms of basic respect for individuals, I am a big we are all colleagues kind of guy, I am not a big title guy, I am not a big power guy, we all bring different talents to the table and all of those talents need to be respected. … So I would hope that I treat others, whether internal or external, the same way.”

B4 Response:
“I really don’t treat anyone different. … We try to treat everyone as though they are a customer. Internal or external people, we treat them the same. … As an organization as a whole, I think we treat everyone pretty equally.”

B5 Response:
“I believe in collaboration [internally or externally] and you need to sit down and start from grassroots level. … I believe you have to have those collaborations and the more I think that we work together more from a grassroots level to say, does this meet everyone’s needs? Those seem to be the most effective partnerships.”

B6 Response:
“Showing your face … is the first part. … The bigger part … is to talk about projects. … Internal and external are treated the same, with respect. I give respect, I show respect, and expect respect. … communications is very important. I pride myself on having good relations with people and that to me is very important.”

These responses represent 100% of each administrative group. This evidence supports a conclusion that the individuals with an academic background believe themselves to communicate slightly differently or present themselves slightly differently to internal versus external audiences compared to their counterparts that have a business background. The individuals with a
business background believe themselves to communicate and present themselves homogeneously to internal and external audiences.

**Developmental Education (DE) - No Child Left Behind**

The respondents with an academic background have a strong belief that the No Child Left Behind legislation (item 2) is an influence and is a cause of the increasing need for developmental education. They are not claiming it is the only influence or cause, but one of the influences or causes. The No Child Left Behind Act was identified or referenced by the respondent and was not an interview question. The interview question was for them to identify what they felt the cause is for the increasing need of developmental education. When conducting the interview, No Child Left Behind was not referred to until the respondent first mentioned the legislation or referred to “the test.” The following data was collected from the respondents regarding No Child Left Behind;

**A1 Response:**

“65% of incoming freshmen are placed into at least one developmental course that does not count toward anything. Almost 40% are placed into two or more. … I know what the cause is and I know what the solution is. The real culprit is that the public schools K12 are in fact, the phrase the faculty use in schools is that they are held hostage, that is the phrase they use, by what they just refer to the tests. In New York, they are called regents, but every state does the same thing. As a result of the worst piece of legislation that went through congress, No child Left Behind. The test manufactures, this is a multibillion dollar industry. The College Board and the rest of them obviously got to congress before we did, and convinced congress that the solution to accountability and making public education better… is testing. So what happens is that, what we expect incoming freshmen to know and be able to do, it is not that the kids are not bright or the teachers aren’t, they are as bright as they always were. The public schools are teaching on this track and we expect them to be on this one. They are teaching on that track because they are forced to do it, and they will tell you, we are teaching for the test.”
A2 Response:

“My thoughts on the cause of that [developmental education] are a couple of things. I think that one, you are seeing more people going to community colleges because they do not know what else to do. You have to remember, not that long ago, twenty years ago, you could graduate from high school or not graduate from high school, go to work in a factory and really earn a middleclass salary. Those opportunities are far fewer than they were before. There are a number of students that I think that we are seeing would not have even considered going to college at any level, that are doing that and are coming now. So, that is one factor. I think the other factor, the No Child Left Behind legislation, while well intended, I think lowered the bar for high school graduation all across the country and what we are seeing is a result of that. We are seeing students under prepared in Math, English, Science, and Reading. They are so use to taking multiple choice tests because of No Child Left Behind and some things the New York State Regents had put in place. That their level of comprehension and reasoning has dropped considerably as well.”

A3 Response:

“I think No Child Left Behind has done some very good things, overall I do not think it was the best federal policy. … the focus on the test, the teaching to the test and all that … that is the really bad part of No Child Left Behind and that is not good for preparing kids for college, where we do not do a lot of multiple choice tests. … There is not a ton of route memorization in college, it is more critical thinking. And that is the problem with No Child Left Behind is it mitigates the pedagogy toward critical thinking, problem solving, and creativity and pushes toward a very finite these are the answers for the test. So, I think that is bad. That was just an awful part of No Child Left Behind and we are certainly paying a price for that. Now, the upside is that No Child Left Behind put a focus on kids that were otherwise marginalized in the past. … I think it was a good thing to put a focus on all the kids across the board, rich or poor, black or white, No Child Left Behind did have that thrust to it and that was a good thing.”

A4 Response:

“The concept of No Child Left Behind is one thing. The process they put in place to support and implement it is another and as far as the process of looking at some restrictive testing as being measurement of success I do not think has been beneficial at all. It may provide some type of scale that folks can look at and use to try to get some sense of, according to that instrument, how they would perceive as school or students to be doing. But, in terms of really being a valuable way of establishing learning, student learning outcomes, I do not think has been successful.”
A5 Response:

“The other piece tied to it is the emphasis that our K-12 colleagues have had placed upon them. They end up fundamentally teaching to the test, because their own performance is, either as individuals or schools or as school districts, based upon achievement on those nationally normed instruments. Are those the right instruments to give us a real look and a real understanding of their own student learning outcomes or is this because it is being driven externally through Albany or Washington? … You teach to the test. That is good, but do you accomplish the learning goals that we want our students to have as they move from high school to college?”

A6, B1, B2, B3, B4, B5 and B6 did not mention or refer to No Child Left Behind or testing. These responses support the claim that the majority (83%) of the administrators with a strictly academic background believe the No Child Left Behind Legislation is one of the influences or causes of the increasing demand for developmental education.

**DE - Work with K-12 Faculty**

During the question, what do you believe the cause is for the increasing need for developmental education, a majority of the academic background administrators believed the solution was not at the college level. The majority of the academic administrators believe that the solution is preparing the K-12 students prior to graduating high school to know what expectations will be placed upon them during college level courses. The following are the responses collected;

A1 Response:

“… I know what the solution is. … We have two or three pilots going on now… We engage the kids when they are juniors in high school. We administer, this is all free to them, we administer our academic placement test, score it, and then in their junior and senior year, we intervene, their teachers intervene, and things. We have reduced in our
pilots, you remember that 65%, they went down to 9. Because, they now know what we expect, it has nothing to do with Regents… and they have a concentrated here is what we expect in terms of writing, they have two years to figure it out, we will work on it. They come back, they take our assessment again and they place in college freshmen level stuff. … It has increased [college in the high school] … educational partnership. You do not take the assessment battery, you are already a college student.”

A2 Response:
“We have to rethink what we are doing with developmental education. … We are starting to do some things with the school districts and I think that is the approach we need to take. I do not think we can start pointing fingers, I think we have to work together. We are going to this year, and I know a lot of other community colleges are trying this as well, … in the junior year [of high school], we are working with the districts and they are going to administer our compass test, which is our placement test… and see how many are college ready and how many are not. That will give them the senior year to provide some addition instruction where they are weak to see if we can, at least close that gap for some of the students that we will be seeing.”

A3 Response:
“So, I think the culture of the U.S. having done so well, for so long, you can parallel it with GM, … you can parallel it with IBM in the eighties, our culture is a victim of its own success, in a very substantial way. … We did not have enough time we typically have had to make these economical and cultural adjustments. … [To combat developmental education, we need to] work more closely with the [K-12] schools. That brings challenges unto itself because the schools are such silos and are so tradition and rule bound. It is even harder for them to get past their traditions and rules, than it is for us as public colleges. … We need to get more involved with in the cradle to 12 and we are. We are in a big way … We need to do more with K-12.”

A4 Response:
“I do not know that the curriculums between K-12 and higher ed. are as well aligned as you would like to see them to be and starting to really prepare students for the differences in college versus their K-12 experience of what they are going to need to do in college to be successful. I think some of the things we can do and trying to do is to reach back into the K-12 environment. Have our faculty talking to faculty from the area school districts and to look at what types of programs and services that we can partner on to provide, so that students start to understand what they are going to have to do to be successful when they get to college.”
A5 Response:

"Certainly, one of them is the alignment, or lack thereof, between what a high school graduate is ready to do and the expectation that a new college student should be ready to do as well. Some of it is how those high school graduation requirements are locked down. For instance how many high school graduates have completed their Math requirement by the end of their junior year? So they have not touched with anything that deals with Mathematics directly for their entire senior year, which has most people, seem to think, a wasted year. It is the year that seniors play in rather than to work hard in. So they come to us probably after a good twelve months, if not more, sixteen, eighteen months of not really having any work in Mathematics directly. Then we take them into a placement test to see if they are ready for college level Mathematics. They are rusty. They are out of shape. So, they are not ready in spite they have a high school diploma that somehow signifies they are ready to do something."

The responses from A6, B1, B2, B3, B4, B5, and B6 did not include any reference or any data that can inference K-12 and college alignment. These responses support the claim that the majority (83%) of the administrators with a strictly academic background believe a better alignment needs to be achieved to reduce the increasing need for developmental education.

DE - Change Community College’s Approach

When the question was asked regarding what is the cause for the increasing need for developmental education, four of the six administrators with a business background believe community colleges need to change their approach or educational delivery in order to reduce the need or streamline developmental education. The following responses were collected:

B1 Response:

"Why it takes so much politicking and so many people are so firmly dug in about how the Regents test have to stay the same and why the placement tests have to stay the same and this, that and the other thing. I do not get it, but that is a big reason for it. It also is true that community
colleges in particular, pride ourselves on the open door. We pride ourselves on the idea that anyone can constantly benefit can come. We bring students to campus who never thought they could go to college, who never took the right kind of course work, who never honed their skills on certain things, math in particular. ... I personally think we can do more and each of our campus can work on our own curriculum to be less math onerous. Not that we do not need math, ... I am very intrigued with studies that look at statistics being the most important piece of it. Why we are pushing the algebra so much, and not being an academic, I am careful not to get too involved in those conversations, but certainly we have work we can do to look at what we are really asking for from students when they are here in order to complete, if you want to be a nurse, trust me you have to do all the tough stuff. You want to be an engineer, you are going to have to do the hard stuff. But for many of the careers, I am not 100% positive, that all got it exactly right. The other piece that is certainly part of it is how few students get through a developmental chain. You see lots of things students have to get through three remediation courses before they can move into the college level work. So, what is their chance to get through course one, then get through course two, and then course three, and it is a tiny, tiny, tiny number of students that are going to make it through. That is just not right. We are setting up the expectations in students they can succeed. ... Make a shorter path [consolidate developmental courses] for students to make it to the college level courses.”

B2 Response:

“I think every student should start out with the same baseline Math, unless students are so accelerated... I think we should do a remedial course for every student entering... I think all of our students should take a baseline Writing, Reading, and Research course the day they start, and everyone goes through that class. To kind of get everyone on the same playing field. ... For the English, Reading, and Writing, I do not think it would hurt anyone to have a class in the basics.”

B3 Response:

“I think we miss the mark from the very way we just describe it, that we are developmentally educating. I think that is missing the target. I am totally, one hundred and seventy-five percent against having people of all ages, enter our walls and immediately test them and immediately talk about their deficiencies. For us to immediately tell them the efforts they need to put in for non-credit, just to be able to survive. I think all of that sends a huge negative message to the participants, who by their nature and circumstances are typically very scared about the journey they are embarking upon, whether that be a continuing adult learner, or whether that be a traditional student. I am for revamping that whole attack and I
am more for helping people along the way succeed by providing them the support that is necessary. Not only help them improve in areas that there is room for improvement but also pointing out the strengths that those people have and further develop those strengths and make them even stronger. I just think we do it wrong and I think it has a dramatic impact on that person’s ability to succeed. I think that once we feel we have tested them and told them they are deficient, that part of the job then is to just send them off to these developmental education classes for them to get better. So we can test them again. Then tell them how maybe less deficient, but they are still deficient. So I think the emphasis is on what is lacking, is such a negative emphasis. Our job should be to ensure their success. Our job should be to help them along the way, to help them over the obstacles. … We should be in business only if we can promise two things and I mean promise; a job at the end of the day for a student who comes here or a seamless transfer to an institution that he or she wants to secure.”

B5 Response:

“We see students coming to the college the same things, a lot of developmental needs. … I think it is real easy for everyone to point fingers at everybody else and say you failed, why didn’t you do this? I think the greater strides we are making is when we try to look at that seamless curriculum, of looking at the secondary and post secondary connections. How does the curriculum relate? When we begin looking at those developmental needs, particularly Reading, Writing, and Math, two things that we have done at least in my area of the college is, we created what is called an attained like. I will not call it an attained lab, but it is lab … where we got software, we had a computerized lab where students could go in, receive tutoring, and they began to help them attain those skills. The other thing that we did is our academic and workforce development center [that] is a licensed WorkKeys test site. … with our students, if they have developmental needs, in addition to working with our learning centers, writing centers, our math learning centers, et cetera. … a student can then through self paced, whether it is home or here, … can work on those developmental skills. We are finding that is becoming quite successful.”

The respondents with an academic background, B4 and B6 did not mention or refer to changing the approach or education of the community college. These responses support the claim that four out of six administrators
with a business background (67%) believe the community college should change their approach dealing with developmental education.

**DE - Lack of Parental Involvement**

When the question was asked regarding what is the cause for the increasing need for developmental education, three of the six administrators with a business background believe the increasing need for developmental education is related to lack of parental involvement. The following responses were collected:

**B2 Response:**

“I think it is very much tied to a different type of parental involvement. Parents want to be very involved with their children, in terms of what their children are entitled to in life. But I am not sure they are as involved as they were years ago academically. … There was an attention to sitting down with you and looking over your homework. Not doing it for you, but helping you, working with you and keeping tabs on what you were doing. If you as a child were meeting your responsibilities and it seems there is a shift now, where parents want to make sure the institution is meeting their responsibilities and I am not quite sure if they are in tuned into whether the children are meeting their responsibilities. … I see a lot of high school students walking the neighborhoods during the day, they live on text, I do not think there are relationships being built. I do not know if students are being mentored the way they were mentored ten or twenty or thirty years ago.”

**B4 Response:**

“That not necessarily the kids are not getting what they need in the school, I think sometimes the kids are not getting what they need at home. … I remember back when I was a kid, we did not have all the things kids have today. I look at my kids, they each have TVs in their rooms, they have games, they have all these things that take their interest away from the core of coming home and doing homework and learning. I think it is finally catching up to our schools and you are seeing a lot more developmental needs when they get to the college level when they finally figure out, I am paying for this and I need to start actually paying attention and doing something.”
B6 Response:

“A lot of people will blame the schools, like the elementary or K-12. My understanding is it is not the schools. Could the schools do better, sure. Could the colleges do better, of course. When it comes down to it, it’s the parents. The parents have to own up. The parents, first of all have a hard time staying together. There are a lot of single parents, or single parent families. My opinion, it is hard enough raising two children with a husband and wife. I find myself sleeping, taking naps on Saturday that is how tough it is. I cannot imagine running my house hold without my wife. Secondly, there needs to be follow up. Parents need to be actively involved in their kids’ scholastics as well as athletics. I do not see that. When I go to pickup my son from school, I am the only daddy that picks up their child. The others believe it or not, half are the mommies and the other half are sometimes both extended family members like grandmothers and grandfathers. That is a problem. … Single parents, obviously divorce rates have gone up, but the other problem stems from the economy. The days of the single working parent are over. … Today people can barely afford the rent/mortgage on two incomes. The times have changed and we still have an old style of thinking. … Hold parents accountable. If your kid does not show up to school three days in a row, should the parent be punished, no. But, there should be a warning, if your kid does not show up to school, then they will get expelled. … The first lesson in education is discipline. You have to be here on time, be presentable. … You cannot isolate it to the schools, it starts at home.”

The respondents with an academic background, B1, B3, and B5 did not mention or refer to parental involvement being an influence or cause of increasing developmental education. These responses support the claim that three out of six administrators with a business background (50%) believe the lack of parental involvement is an influence or cause of the increasing need of developmental education.

Sense of Entitlement

When student demands became the discussion focal point, three of the six administrators with a strictly academic background noted students today seem to have a sense of entitlement. The following responses were collected:
A1 Response:

“I think this is the biggest change in incoming students, during my career anyway, is a growing sense of entitlement. I tried hard, therefore I deserve an A, because, unfortunately that is what they have experienced for the last 12 years. … You are much more on your own now than you were the last 12 years. The environment is tough, it might mean something, what we are trying to prepare your for is what we know the real world is like. No matter what you decide to do after you leave us. Effort is a good thing… the world is inherently unfair. Welcome to the world. What really counts, is how bad to you really want it… some will decide… I am going to do whatever it takes.”

A3 Response:

“Today, folks who are struggling to be in the middle-class at all or stay in the middle-class, I mean is extraordinary, compared to my time when almost everyone was moving up. We have lots of folks moving down and people are just not prepared. The culture does not have the tools to deal with that. We had it all in our generation, so the next generation thinks they are going to have it all, and right now we do not have it all.”

A5 Response:

“We are seeing too many students, who have stretched too far across to many responsibilities and too many activities. For many of them, part of it is where society has evolved over time, it means instant gratification. That is, if I cannot get this turned around now and resolved, then I am not interested. Because I do not have the time or the energy to invest in something that is going to take longer to accomplish than I can see an end to it. … If you think about where American society has moved … [students feel a degree] is owed to me, I do not have to work for it.”

The respondents other than A1, A3, and A5 did not mention or refer to a student’s growing sense of entitlement. These responses support the claim that three out of six administrators with a strict academic background (50%) believe that students have a growing sense of entitlement.
Believe Students Are Not Making Time Commitment To Education

Issue inventory item 8 was referenced by administrators A1, A3, A4, A6, B1, and B2. The following are excerpts from the interviewees’ statements;

A1 Response:
“Effort is a good thing … the world is inherently unfair. Welcome to the world. What really counts is how bad do you really want it? … some will decide … I am going to do whatever it takes … those will be the successful ones.”

A3 Response:
“I think it is a, I do not know what the appropriate term is, there is a lethargy on the part of our culture, a feeling of privilege. … Our kids are not willing to study hard in Math and Science.”

A4 Response:
“I think we have more and more students that have tremendous challenges to face everyday. …a lot of students that have a lot of challenges they have to deal with. … you get into the classrooms with those types of issues, whether or not a student has had enough that day, whether they are worried about something that is going on in their life beyond their education.”

A6 Response:
“In Reading and Writing, people are doing less of it and less of it in large chunks that takes concentration and sustained efforts. So much of our writing, so much of our reading and writing online is in short communications and responses. … I think the habits of reflection, of sustained effort, exposure to the written word, to read it and write it has been reduced.”

B1 Response:
“We bring students to campus who never thought they could go to college, … who never honed their skills on certain things, math in particular.”
B2 Response:

“I am not sure they are as involved as they were years ago academically. … If you as a child were meeting your responsibilities and it seems there is a shift now, where parents want to make sure the institution is meeting their responsibilities and I am not quite sure if they are in tuned to whether the children are meeting their responsibilities. … I see a lot of high school students walking the neighborhoods during the day.”

The respondents A1, A3, A4, A6, B1, and B2 referenced students in some way not making a commitment to their education. More of the academic administrators believe students are lacking in commitment to their education compared to their business administrator counterparts.

Learning While Working Partnership Needs to be Incorporated

Issue inventory item 9 was referenced by administrators B3 and B5. These two business background administrators believe students should have some sort of learning while working partnership to be incorporated. The following are excerpts from the interviewees’ statements;

B3 Response:

“I would love to see an environment where work and education, lifelong learning were intertwined. … Because work and learning should exist side by side.”

B5 Response:

“We could provide more meaningful opportunities for them to have employment while they are also in college.”

The respondents B3 and B5 believe some sort of learning while working partnership needs to be incorporated. These two business administrators are
placing a certain value on work, which they seem to believe will enhance the student. These statements seem to imply that most students are lacking a real world perspective or at least a working perspective.

**Believes In/Supportive of Shared Governance**

Issue inventory item 12 was expressly stated by administrators A1, A2, A3, A4, A5, A6, B1, B2, and B4. All of the academic administrators believe in shared governance, while only half of the business background administrators seem to support shared governance. The following are excerpts from the interviewees' statements;

A1 Response:

“…in most colleges we have a normal shared governance system… college assembly, committee structure… The idea is to get as many voices as possible to make sure the college remains healthy, organizationally.”

A2 Response:

“I think it is good to have shared governance on a college campus.”

A3 Response:

“[Shared Governance] It is a double edged sword. In the bigger picture it is helpful, I think. Philosophically, I very much believe in shared governance. Quite frankly, even as president, I would be hypocritical if I did not believe that …“

A4 Response:

“I think there has to be, shared governance is something that I am personally supportive of as an idea. Colleges are built with very capable, very bright people that are experts in their areas. So, to build mechanisms where all those folks can contribute to the betterment of the institution, I think, is a valuable experience.”

A5 Response:

“So, it [shared governance] does require that investment of time and energy and people. … I think from that shared governance approach comes better decision making because you got more eyes and more brains that are looking at it, working on it. It allows us to avoid that
situation where maybe a person or a small group of people end up making decision based upon information that may or may not be complete and may or may not be accurate. So, it is not as tidy as perhaps people would like it to be. It is messier. It takes longer. But I think in the end it is a better process."

A6 Response:

"From the faculty perspective, it is enormously important because of the involvement and input. And the perspective faculty bring to discussions about matters that affect students and the future of the college. ... I can see the value of having committees, of having involvement, getting diverse view points, and for us with an assembly system to have a place once a month were, better or worse, we can come together and hear each other's views. ... I think it makes the administrative job so much easier to have governance, because then you have buy in on ideas. You also have the benefit of really good ideas from people, from your perspective you might not have seen, and coming from the faculty, I see sometimes I come up with an idea or have a reaction and one of my colleagues in administration will say oh, you are still a faculty member, you cannot take the faculty member out...but they are lucky I am at the table. You need that perspective and you never want to lose it. You want to make sure you are connected with students and the faculty. ... I think shared governance is very important."

B1 Response:

"Initially, I will be honest, I thought [shared governance] as a real hindrance to getting things done. ... I will say that over the years I have come to really value it because of the richness it brings to the decision making process, to have ways for different people to express their opinions, to try to diffuse this idea that all decisions are made at the top. Now, I cannot imagine working without a shared governance system."

B2 Response:

"We are very big on that [shared governance] here at my college. We are very big. We got cited for it on our Middle-States review, because we really did not have a lot of that in the past. So, about two years ago, three years ago, we had to put together a shared governance task force here at the college and I served on it. And we put together a college assembly, a council for operational issues, a council for academic issues, and a student assembly. I was very involved in putting that together with the rest of our steering committee. Personally, it is a lot of meetings for me, but I see the tremendous value in having it college wide. It really brings people together. ... I appreciate the fact that it happens."
B4 Response:

“I think the shared governance drives overall better decisions. I truly believe that the more minds you put to it, the better your decisions are going to be.”

One hundred percent of the academic administrators (A1, A2, A3, A4, A5, and A6) compared to only fifty percent of the business administrators (B1, B2, and B4) identified this cognitive content and professed this issue. The larger number of the academic administrators over the business administrators reveals a divergence in support of shared governance.

Perceives Frustration with Shared Governance

When discussing shared governance, four of the six administrators with a business background noted frustration with shared governance. The following responses were collected:

B2 Response:

“We are very big on that [shared governance] here at my college. We are very big. We got cited for it on our Middle-States review, because we really did not have a lot of that in the past. So, about two years ago, three years ago, we had to put together a shared governance task force here at the college and I served on it. And we put together a college assembly, a council for operational issues, a council for academic issues, and a student assembly. I was very involved in putting that together with the rest of our steering committee. Personally, it is a lot of meetings for me, but I see the tremendous value in having it college wide. It really brings people together. … Because I did come from a private sector background … I like to do things fast and accomplish things fast. And I am not real good with shared governance. It is not a strong suit, I like to make my own decisions and move quickly but I see how it fits into the academic model. I appreciate the fact that it happens. But, man, it kills me that we have been going since September and still writing By-Laws. That kind of thing they like, I struggle with that.”
B3 Response:

“In my experience, collective responsibility often led to that fact that things did not get done properly. In other words, people need to know what they are in charge of. … What is it that each party is responsible for. … How do we work together in knowing we each have those responsibilities in way that keeps all parties involved in the process? From that extent, I think it is a nice concept, as long as it does not hinder those parties responsible from making timely decisions. Because I think time is important to do things. I think the model works. I think it is yet to serve itself. The jury is still out as to whether it is anything other than some words to make people feel better.”

B5 Response:

“We have different assemblies, one for the faculty, one for the administrators, and then one for the ones unionized. … I think, for example, we at the time debating to become a smoke-free campus. I inherited that concern from two chairs prior to me to tell you how long that took. So, we are on probably our fourth year debating whether to become a smoke-free campus and every meeting we would come. What I find, some ideas are just ahead of its time or the culture of the campus is not ready. For us, it was a matter of people really just did not want to have a smoke-free campus. So, we have faculty that say they have a five minute break between my classes and I am going to smoke where I want to smoke and then the bigger issue became how do you enforce these policies. Long story short, we just went smoke-free last semester. If I look, it probably took ten years to get to the point where the campus community was ready to do that. …. I think the hardest part in the governance is to realize when your climate is ready to hear why people do not want something and then to begin looking at the data. … Understand why they do not want something and then what would it take to change their mind and what would they need to move something forward. …. It just takes time. …. You cannot just put a sign, don’t smoke within fifty feet of a building. So, it was more realizing it is a slower process, culturally, to get buy in even in our governing system. Compared to what I do in the work force, decisions are made far more quickly. … Change is slow, organizationally, it is more comfortable to stay the way we are, than to [change], because that involves risk.”

B6 Response:

“I do not think it [shared governance] is working good at all. I think it is something that could work. … It involves a lot of people … I find that people use these committees to promote their personal agendas, to stand out, to make themselves look useful. In committees, I feel there is always a personal agenda. There are a lot of administrators that feel these committees, when all is said and done, all of the personal agendas get filtered out. Maybe that works in a search committee, but it does not work
in these governance committees. I think that we really have not seen any of these governance committees really do anything useful. … I think it can be more efficiently by fewer people. I think some of the people in there tend to promote their personal agenda. I think that a meeting should not involve politics outside of the college. … I find that committees are great when they are small and they involve the right people. With the meetings there should be notes, there should be minutes, there should be an agenda, and there should be a certain demeanor in those meetings, like Robert’s Rules.”

The respondents B2, B3, B5, and B6 demonstrated frustration with shared governance. These responses support the claim that four out of six administrators with a business background (67%) express frustration with shared governance.

**Preservation of Institutional Memories and Knowledge**

When discussing aging faculty, four administrators with a strictly academic background and only one administrator with a business background noted concerns with loss of institutional memories and knowledge with loss of aging faculty. The following responses were collected:

A1 Response:

“For the most part, retiring faculty take with them institutional memory that no one else has, by the way that is not just college, that is everyone, all organizations on the planet go through that.”

A4 Response:

“If you have been a successful institution, I think it [retiring senior faculty] puts your institution at risk of diminishing some of the, at least short term, quality that maybe you enjoyed. Your institutional memory is very important and I think there are a lot of community colleges, to some degree, that have been in exactly that situation because of the timing of when most of the SUNY community colleges opened. Because of how some of the recruiting of faculty in those institutions was done, we are at a point where the aging out of long term faculty. … I think you need to be very careful about succession planning and being sure you have some mechanisms in place where you can, as much as possible, create mentor
– mentee relationships. And try to pass on some of the institutional knowledge. … I think you have to do the best you can to preserve those things that were successful.”

A5 Response:
“Most faculty members have spent their lives in academia and they understand what it means to be organized around the academic calendar, the courses and credits, and those kinds of things. … [With retiring faculty] Certainly that sense of history and institutional capacity, we lose that. For many faculty going out the door will continue to teach for us as adjunct faculty members. Because for many of them who retire, it is not retire and gone, playing golf for the rest of my life and move to Florida and I never want to hear from you again. In many cases we continue to have the benefit of their years of experience. Although, because they are not in that fulltime position they no longer handle responsibility for shared governance and all of those things.”

A6 Response:
“But I think the history and culture of an institution is important to preserve. … you lose a lot all at once of that commitment, history, cultural memory, et cetera. So how you turn it into a more positive and this is something I think we can do better at, is to not just wave goodbye to the retirement people, but to engage them and ask them to be involved in mentoring new faculty and serving on some committees, helping with special projects. … So many of them will be willing and they love this place and that is true at any institution. I think we need to not let them leave entirely and ask them if they will continue and stay involved and find ways to keep them involved.”

B4 Response:
“You always see from the financial side, opportunities at cost savings. But that cost savings comes at a huge loss to the institution, about institutional knowledge, institutional experience. That person that has seen how things work and able to show the younger faculty how things work. The other plus to that you do have fresh ideas coming in that could be good or it could be bad. Depending on how the ideas are, again, we are in the process of shared governance, if you got ten ideas, it is good to have senior faculty that can say let’s try to run with this one, but hold off on these other nine. Until this one gets through the process, because they understand it. Unless you have a strong mentoring program, on your overall institution it is probably going to be a negative to lose all those people.”
The respondents A1, A4, A5, A6, and B4 noted the possibility of institutional memory and knowledge loss with retiring senior faculty members. These responses support the claim that four out of six administrators with a strictly academic background against one out of six administrators with a business background believe institutional memories and knowledge needs to be preserved.

**Maintain Positive Cultural Influences**

Three administrators with a strictly academic background believe that the institution needs to maintain the positive cultural influences that exist in the college that have made the college successful. The following responses were collected:

**A1 Response:**

“The real advantage is that the culture of the college changes. And it should change, if you go over to the bio department, those faculty will tell you, you change or die. For them it is very simple. The same is true for us, we have to change, if we don’t the consequences are dismal. I think the trick is to keep those elements of the culture of the college that are really important intact forever. One here, of course, is academic rigor and I do not care who you are or where you are in your career, it is an import, high level of caring.”

**A4 Response:**

“I think you need to be very careful about succession planning and being sure you have some mechanisms in place were you can, as much as possible, create mentor – mentee relationships. And try to pass on some of the institutional knowledge. … I think you have to do the best you can to preserve those things that were successful.”

**A6 Response:**

“I would see it as something that could be made into a positive, even if it weren’t and I am not saying it isn’t a positive. By all means you need people to move on so there are positions for younger folk who are bring new ideas into the classroom. But I think the history and culture of an institution is important to preserve.”
The respondents A1, A4, and A6 noted the positive cultures of an institution need to be preserved to continue success of the college. These responses support the claim that three out of six administrators with a strictly academic background believe positive institutional cultures need to be maintained and preserved.

Concerns Over Senior Faculty Retiring

Two academic administrators compared to four business background administrators have concerns over senior faculty members retiring that possess significant subject knowledge. The following responses were collected:

A3 Response:
   “Some of our senior faculty ... are terrific and would hate to see them go ... You lose really good ones that have excellent influence on the culture.”

A5 Response:
   “Certainly that sense of history and institutional capacity, we lose that. For many faculty going out the door will continue to teach for us as adjunct faculty members ... Although, because they are not in that fulltime position they no longer handle responsibilities for shared governance and all of those things...”

B1 Response:
   “We have an incentive for faculty to retire at age 55. I hate it because it encourages our most senior people to leave. These are the people who are great teachers and provide significant campus service.”

B3 Response:
   “…the value of experience. There is no credential, there is no degree, that replaces the value of experience that people go through life. ... An older faculty member with more experience has an awful lot to bring to the table. Not only to those entering, but also to those in the middle tear. ... There is still the risk that great breadth of experience in the classroom or maybe writing papers, or doing other things, we are going to be missing.”
B4 Response:
“That person that has seen how things work and able to show the younger faculty how things work. … Unless you have a strong mentoring program, on your overall institution it is probably going to be a negative to lose all those people.”

B5 Response:
“Figures indicate that in the next five years, twenty nine percent of all of our faculty in higher ed are going to retire. … We may not have enough faculty who are in there with the skills and expertise to advance into those positions.”

A larger number of business administrators seem to be concerned over senior faculty members retiring that possess significant subject knowledge than academic administrators. This finding is in alignment with the first study that revealed a negative relationship regarding the topic of senior faculty that may retire noted in Figure 7 & 8. Recalling in the first study, business administrators placed more importance on this concern than their academic counterparts.

Seek Business/Entrepreneurial Individuals

Three academic leaders (A1, A2, and A5) seem to believe they should seek out and include business/entrepreneurial individuals as informants to their decision making. The following responses were collected:

A1 Response:
“I have consciously gone out [to business] and learned, asked questions, how do you do this. … So I am constantly looking for efficiency measures and business folks tend to be pretty good at that. I also seek out, the other category is entrepreneurs…”

A2 Response:
“There is a sense of the money will come from somewhere verses that sort of entrepreneurial spirit that we have got to figure out ways to generate revenue. … When you see someone with a business background and you see someone with a pure academic background, … it is just different perspectives, seeing things differently.”
A5 Response:

“Their [business administrators] perspective is important for good decision-making. … Their focus on bottom-line results and their thinking toward that end. … Their knowledge of business practices outside of academe.”

Half of the academic administrators (A1, A2, and A5) tend to believe a business perspective is different and many times need as an input into their decision-making process. It would seem the academic administrators desire that business input, while the business administrator may believe they already possess that business knowledge and to not need any more business input.

**Recognize Rapid Pace Decision Making in Private Sector Business**

Four administrators with a business background believe that the decision-making process in the private sector occurs at a rapid pace. This rapid pace decision-making is considered slow within academia by those with a business background. This was also noted by one academic administrator whose wife was a business woman. The following responses were collected:

A3 Response:

“My wife is a business woman, she has her own business. It is a very different world. Things are not done by committee. Business decisions are made at a rapid pace, daily. There are no thoughts given to well let the committee answer that question. … Ninety-nine percent of key decisions are made by management and they are made at a rapid pace … they could not begin to image doing business the way we do business.”

B2 Response:

“They have probably worked in the business sector, and they know what responsiveness means … especially if they want to get paid. But here [in the community college], if you are in an environment and could stay employed, and have tenure and still stay employed, without being responsive. Maybe you won’t have to be responsive and you can postpone your lack of responsiveness impact you… nothing is going to
happen as imminently as in the private sector. If you say to your guys [in the private sector] I need it tomorrow and this happens enough, you won’t get contracts and you won’t need those people anymore because the business will not be successful. But in the public sector, people could work for years.”

B3 Response:

“My first reaction is that the length of time to make a decision [in academia] seems, to a person with my experience, like centuries. So, the notion of time, the importance of time, to me is somewhat ignored within institution. It is almost as if time is not a factor that influences anything, which is quite different in the business world. Time sometimes can be everything. Whether it be time to market, time to get your product delivered, et cetera.”

B4 Response:

“I think it moves a little slower in academia than it does in private business. That is kind of the way of this market. This market is not quite as fast as the business market.”

B5 Response:

“So, speed to market is an issue, where I find, we are constantly, hear that one of the concerns business industry says about academia is we are very slow in turning around products and services and we are. If you look at the approval process it takes to incubate a new program internally. It goes through our internally governance process and approval process, then goes run it through State Ed and SUNY. That by the time, sometimes, we get the program approved, the need has past. So that speed to market is one area that I see a big difference. … [Example] We were in a community strategic meeting and we have business leaders there and one of the questions was; “How do we know we are meeting business and industry needs?” A faculty member spoke up and said; “Well, I know one way we can do that. We could conduct a ten year longitudinal study and we would track all of our incoming students for ten years to measure what happens to them and where they end up attaining employment.” Well, a longitudinal study maybe great, but when an employer is out there right now and says I cannot fill the positions I have … bottom line that they want to know is are we and our other colleges producing graduates who have the competency skills to go immediately into employment and be successful. They are not going to wait ten years, by then the needs will have changed three times. … The point is, the employer’s immediate demand is I am looking for graduates to fill my employment needs so I can make money or do business.”
The respondents A3, B2, B3, B4, and B5 noted that the decision-making within academia is paced slower than that to the private business environment. These responses support the claim that four out of six administrators with a business background versus only one out of six administrators with a strictly academic background noted the rapid pace decision-making in the private sector. It also should be noted that the one academic background person was referring to a spouse that was a business person. This supports a perception that the decision-making within academia is slower paced than the decision-making within the private business sector.

**Frustration with Bureaucracy**

Three administrators with a business background acknowledged or described a certain level of frustration toward the bureaucracy they faced within the community college. The following responses were collected:

**B2 Response:**
"My first thought was I cannot believe I have to call everybody before I can even setup a meeting. I cannot believe I have to call a meeting to have a meeting. … That was a shock to me. It happened the first or second week I was here. I called a meeting of people together and said please come, we are meeting on such and such, … if you cannot come please send a designee. And somebody called my boss and said who does she think she is calling a meeting. … I am like, what, how does this work? And my boss said, oh you have to query everyone first to see when everyone is available and then put a meeting together from that. And, I am, like, you have got to be kidding me. … The other thing that hit me the same time is, am I ever going to be able to cope with the bureaucracy? Am I ever going to cope with all of these forms, all of these things I have to do to make one little thing happen."

**B3 Response:**
"I think the biggest thing that sticks out in my mind, I do not remember the specifics, but this is a general statement that I can make. I remember often when dealing with, I will not necessarily call it a problem
or issue, but when dealing with a question that needed a response. People would be so nonchalant about saying, can you get together next Friday, let us get together next Friday, why don’t we get together next Friday, and to discuss that. … The questions are important questions that cannot wait. Seven days to have a conversation about it and I was just wowed by how often lets meet and talk about that and not I understand and let me see if I can get an answer for you. I am not use, I was not use to that, in any private sector dealings because usually the questions you are asking, are important enough to get answers to. So, I found that pretty interesting to me, a wow factor. … Budgets to me are statements in time, what one thinks the performance. It is there for one to measure performance and obviously actions to make. By moving line items, and thereby covering the fact that hey I needed a thousand dollars more in line item x than y. Now once I move and adjust that budget, no one will really know I needed another thousand dollars more. It defeats the purpose that the budget was set on. So I like to run budgets in the red and at the end of the year … balance it. But we learn a lot more when we say to ourselves why didn’t we understand how to budget this line item at the beginning of the year. … This movement of budget money from one place to another did not occur in the private world. You had budget variance, which you had to discuss all the time. So I find it interesting in the public sector we just move it around because you are supposed to balance it. My take here is let us balance it at the end and learn what happened in the middle.”

B5 Response:

“Oh well, there is frustration everyday in the sense of speed to market issues. … I see here, if you are around long enough, you are going to see the same patterns repeat themselves. … My daughter-in law works for a company and has over two hundred and fifty employees all over the world. I have often asked her how do you manage and get business done when, one you have to fly to all of these countries and you rarely face to face ever see your employees? How do you evaluate their work? She said, you use technology, written reports, oral communications, Skype, and all this other stuff. But the thing she pointed out in her company, different than what I see here, is this merit based system, where every year she was required to … find ten percent of what they called their the bottom performers and during that time all of their cost of living increase, their benefit increase, et cetera, were frozen. Then that ten percent of revenue was used to reward the top ten percent in the organization, because they are the movers and shakers. I look here, where we have a across the board cost of living increase. It does not matter what you do, what you produce, everybody gets the same increase. I look at the difference between how that [business] operates and how we [community colleges] operate and how from a business perspective, if you look at quality, measuring outcomes, knowing who your
top performers are, and what we have said is many times it ends up and works the reverse. Because people say you can come in here and do up and beyond and you are going to get the same salary and cost of living increase. … We struggle here when we have an employee that moves to another building or off campus. We are saying now there is mileage, now there is extra time, I don’t know how I am going to supervise this person. And yet, I look at my daughter-in-law and she is traveling to China and Israel and Mexico and Canada and she is supervising two hundred and fifty people, and doing it quite well. We are struggling with I do not know how I am going to supervise someone unless their office is right next to mine.”

The respondents B2, B3, and B5 stated or described some level of frustration with bureaucracy within the community college. These responses support the claim that three out of six administrators with a business background stated or described a frustration with community college bureaucracy. This supports a claim that the bureaucracy within community colleges, based upon 50% of those with a strictly business background, exists beyond that what is present within the private sector business.

Lack of Responsiveness

Two administrators with a business background believe that academia is lacking responsiveness. The following responses were collected:

B2 Response:
“But here, if you are in an environment and could stay employed, and have tenure and still stay employed, without being responsive. Maybe you won’t have to be responsive and you can postpone your lack of responsiveness impact you… nothing is going to happen as imminently as in the private sector.”

B3 Response:
“I remember often when dealing with, I will not necessarily call it a problem or issue, but when dealing with a question that needed a response. People would be so nonchalant about saying, can you get together next Friday, let us get together next Friday, why don’t we get
together next Friday, and to discuss that. … The questions are important questions that cannot wait.”

The respondents B2 and B3 noted lack of responsiveness within academia. This lack of responsiveness seems to be unimaginable by these two business administrators. It would seem their business mentality or nature drives them to be responsive, more so than the other administrators.

**Urgency in Decision-Making is Limited or Non-Existent**

Four administrators with a business background believe that the immediacy of decision-making within community colleges is limited or non-existent compared to the academic background administrators. The following responses were collected:

B2 Response:

“But here, if you are in an environment and could stay employed, and have tenure and still stay employed, without being responsive. Maybe you won’t have to be responsive and you can postpone your lack of responsiveness impact you… nothing is going to happen as imminently as in the private sector. If you say to your guys [in the private sector] I need it tomorrow and this happens enough, you won’t get contracts and you won’t need those people anymore because the business will not be successful. But in the public sector, people could work for years.”

B3 Response:

“My first reaction is that the length of time to make a decision [in academia] seems, to a person with my experience, like centuries. So, the notion of time, the importance of time, to me is somewhat ignored within institution. It is almost as if time is not a factor that influences anything, which is quite different in the business world. Time sometimes can be everything.”

B4 Response:

“I think I was overly sensitive to the point where after nine years [in business] I was kind of a okay let us make a decision, let us get things done. So I had to morph my style into more of the okay it is not going to be you have an issue and tomorrow we are going to fix it. It is okay you
have an issue, let us discuss it, let us find out the best path to go down, and then let us make a decision. So I had to step back and really look at that. I still remember the first week I was here. … My boss told me I need something. That was in the morning and I came to her in the afternoon with it and she was like oh, I did not need that for three weeks. It was kind of one of those things, where you were just use to, the deadline was not until three weeks, it was in three hours. … My supervisor, at that point in time, got more accustom to how I do things, to wait on things and not tell me until later or I would just get them done for her and she would have them a long time in advance. … Deadlines are not always met and if deadlines are not met there is really not a lot of consequence to them. Deadlines seem to be rolling. They are a little more rolling than in private business… Deadlines are more like guidelines. … I worked in a very fast paced, very transaction based organization… decisions needed to be made. Snap decisions needed to be made and how to figure things out.

B5 Response:

“So, speed to market is an issue, where I find, we are constantly, here that one of the concerns business industry says about academia is we are very slow in turning around products and services and we are. If you look at the approval process it takes to incubate a new program internally. It goes through our internally governance process and approval process, then goes run it through State Ed and SUNY. That by the time, sometimes, we get the program approved, the need has past. So that speed to market is one area that I see a big difference. I think we are getting better. … [Example] We were in a community strategic meeting and we have business leaders there and one of the questions was; “How do we know we are meeting business and industry needs?” A faculty member spoke up and said; “Well, I know one way we can do that. We could conduct a ten year longitudinal study and we would track all of our incoming students for ten years to measure what happens to them and where they end up attaining employment.” Well, a longitudinal study maybe great, but when an employer is out there right now and says I cannot fill the positions I have … bottom line that they want to know is are we and our other colleges producing graduates who have the competency skills to go immediately into employment and be successful. They are not going to wait ten years, by then the needs will have changed three times. … The point is, the employer’s immediate demand is I am looking for graduates to fill my employment needs so I can make money or do business. … Oh well, there is frustration everyday in the sense of speed to market issues.”

The respondents B2, B3, B4, and B5 stated or described a lack of immediacy in decision-making within the community college. These responses
support the claim that four out of six administrators with a business background believe decision-making within the community college is limited. This supports a claim that the lack of immediacy in decision-making within community colleges is limited based upon 67% of those with a strictly business background.

**Deadlines Have No Consequences**

Similar to Lack of Responsiveness, two administrators with a business background (B4 and B6) believe that academia holds no consequences to failing to perform one’s duties. The following responses were collected:

**B4 Response:**

“Deadlines are not always met and if deadlines are not met there is really not a lot of consequences to them. Deadlines seem to be rolling. They are a little more than in private business. … Deadlines are more like guidelines.”

**B6 Response:**

“Coming into academia, where it is more discussion based, compromising. … Basically it was get it done, get it done now, no excuses. Here it is, well it is okay if it does not get done on time. It’s okay. [In business] there are consequences to your actions. You have to work a certain way. Not only do your job, you have to act accordingly. They do not act accordingly here.”

The respondents B4 and B6 noted that deadlines do not have consequences associated to them. Deadlines within academia seem to be more of guidelines or suggestions. This lack of consequences, similar to lack of responsiveness, seems to be unimaginable by these two business administrators. Again, it would seem their business mentality or nature drives them to maintain a business approach, more so than the other administrators.
Going Into Academia Might Have Been A Mistake

Two business administrators (B2 and B6) noted that after accepting their appointment to a community college, they rethought their decision and questioned if they had chosen the best path for their career. The following responses were collected:

B2 Response:
“When I came here, I found out I have to call five different people and fill out three different forms with each person to make it happen. … That was extremely hard. … I was scared. I thought maybe I made a mistake coming into this field. I though am I going to be able to do this.”

B6 Response:
“In the first few weeks I came here, there were a lot of times that I said what the heck did I get myself into? Can I still go back to [business name omitted]?”

The respondents B2 and B6 noted that when they first entered the community college, they had doubts about their decision. The cultures and practices were so foreign to them that they initially thought they had made a mistake coming into academia.

Discussion of Issue Inventory Items

The issue inventory data has twenty (20) topics of divergence, five (5) topics of convergence, and six (6) topics that could be converging but are indiscernible. This would tend to suggest that the presence of almost 70% more of the mental content diverging is indicative of a non-shared perception on these particular areas. This presents data suggesting that there is a selective perception occurring on several issues. This significant amount of divergence
did not present itself in the first study. The first study failed to attain a data set demonstrating selective perception clearly. The second study presents a very strong data set supporting the claim that selective perception is supervening. The two main rationales for the first study not demonstrating selective perception were most likely caused by either a faulty instrument or the fact that selective perception is not occurring. However, the first study did demonstrate a weak position on selective perception and the second study provided a very strong expression of selective perception. This would lead to the conclusion that the instrument utilized in the first study failed to attain supporting documentation that selective perception is occurring. However, the first study instrument successfully identified issues that were supported by evidence in the second study.

Furthermore, the second study identified specific diverging mental content. This diverging mental content seems to be in alignment with Walsh’s belief structures argument. However, the data also tends to suggest something is occurring beyond what belief structures would account for.

A belief structure is defined by Fiske and Taylor as a “cognitive structure that represents organized knowledge about a given concept… It contains both the attributes of the concept and the relationships among the attributes.” Fiske, et al., 140. A belief structure can be defined as a subset to a larger concept, which is a mental model. A mental model is arguably a term that is too broad and
encompassing.\textsuperscript{142} Notwithstanding, mental models are used herein to refer to a larger concept that extends Walsh’s belief structures to include how an individual will adopt rolls and actions based upon their belief structures.

Chapter VI

Mental Models

Administrators have deep seated internal views of how the world works.143 These deep seated internal views are referred to as mental models. Mental models are tacit simplifications occurring below the level of awareness.144 Administrators do not consciously recognize their own mental models. Subconsciously, their mental models determine how they make sense of the world and how action is taken.145

Mental models affect what an administrator perceives.146 Since mental models affect perception, it would also seem prudent to test variance in mental models based upon the administrator’s background to attain further supporting evidence that selective perception is occurring.

It can also be noted that mental models limit administrators to their familiar way of thinking and acting.147 Therefore, if specific mental models can be identified that are tied to administrators with a comparable background, then those models can be reviewed to determine any divergences. If their mental

144 ibid., 176.
145 ibid., 175.
146 ibid., 175.
147 ibid., 174.
models are diverging, then selective perception is also occurring with respects to mental models found within this data set.

**Mental Models: Individualism vs. Inclusivism**

Within the transcribed interview dataset, several mental models became evident. These mental models seem to have some disparity based upon the administrative grouping. Therefore, the existence of a seeming disparity needs to be tested to determine if the superficial appearance of disparity is supported by evidence.

The first variance in mental models that became evident based upon the administrator’s background was the utilization of the word “I”. It became evident while transcribing the interviews for the question regarding business, that the word “I” seemed to be utilized significantly more so by the administrators with a business background than those with an academic background.

The electronic document search feature aided in acquiring the utilization frequency of “I”. The result of this search made it evident that a recurring theme of business administrators utilizing “I” is drastically more prevalent than academic administrators. The academic administrators utilized “I” 24 times while the business administrators utilized “I” 136 times.

As a side note, the word utilization of “I” led to a detailed study of word utilization that is provided in the Appendix. A similar analysis to that of the Issue Inventory was performed on words creating the Word Utilization Inventory. There is a limitation on the word analysis such that it is indeterminable if the word utilization is locality based or associated to professional background. The
analysis of the words does not seem to have any significant value added to the study, thusly placed in the Appendix for additional reference.

Returning to the “I” word finding raised the question as to why the frequency utilization of “I” is significantly higher among those with a business background. Upon further investigation a sense of self or individualism emerged from those participants with a business background. There appears to be an assuming of responsibility to self instead of to the organization.

The preponderance of self was revealed by an “I” utilization inventory.

The creation of Table 10 was from the last interview question:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>“I” Utilization Inventory</th>
<th>Administrators with an Academic Background</th>
<th>Administrators with a Business Background</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A1</td>
<td>A2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1  I Am</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2  I Can</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3  I Do/Did</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4  I Find/Found</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5  I Have/Had</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6  I Need</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7  I Think/Thought</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8  I Want</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9  I Was</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 I Will/Would</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 10 – “I” Utilization Inventory**

**Note:** X represents unsolicited mention of “I”  - represents no mention of “I”

Except for the “I” utilization inventory item 5, all other inventory items demonstrate the business administrators utilize the “I” phrase 50% or more than the academic administrators. This seems to demonstrate a greater sense of individual influence than among the academic administrators.

Several excerpts of the transcript below demonstrate a sense of individualism among the administrators with a business background:
B1 Response:

“I think part of it is that he was an academic and I am not. So, his choices of where to focus and what he spent time on as president are different than where I spend my time.”

B2 Response:

“I called a meeting of people together and said please come, we are meeting on such and such, … if you cannot come please send a designee. And somebody called my boss and said who does she think she is calling a meeting. …When I worked at [organization omitted], if I wanted to do a community event or community meeting, I would make one call and I had a room, a room setup, food, parking. Everything was done with one phone call. When I came here, I found out I had to call five different people and fill out three different forms with each person to make it happen.”

B3 Response:

“I think the biggest thing that sticks out in my mind, I do not remember the specifics, but this is a general statement that I can make. I remember often when dealing with, I will not necessarily call it a problem or issue, but when dealing with a question that needed a response. People would be so nonchalant about saying, can you get together next Friday, let us get together next Friday, why don’t we get together next Friday, and to discuss that. … The questions are important questions that cannot wait. Seven days to have a conversation about it and I was just wowed by how often lets meet and talk about that and not I understand and let me see if I can get an answer for you.”

B4 Response:

“For me, … the first things I saw was that the decision making was a lot more democratic. Coming from private business where a decision was made and told to you. You follow this versus having input into what those decisions are, was a little different for me.”

B5 Response:

“But the thing she pointed out in her company, different than what I see here, is this merit based system, where every year she was required to … find ten percent of what they called their the bottom performers and during that time all of their cost of living increase, their benefit increase, et cetera, were frozen. Then that ten percent of revenue was used to reward the top ten percent in the organization, because they are the movers and shakers. I look here, where we have a across the board cost of living increase. It does not matter what you do, what you produce, everybody gets the same increase. I look at the difference between how that [business] operates and how we [community colleges] operate and how from a business perspective, if you look at quality, measuring outcomes,
knowing who your top performers are, and what we have said is many times it ends up and works the reverse.”

B6 Response:

“I knew coming from not only a fortune five hundred company but being there for ten years, I knew that rule number one was to keep an open mindset as well as focus on adapting to academia culture. Which I knew would be very challenging for me, because I am an extreme go getter type style of managing. Where not only do I manage the people, but I lead by example. I want to do the work that the people who report to me do as well as lead the team and that has always worked for me.”

This mental model of individualism did not emerge as much among those with an academic background. The administrators with an academic background seem to have a mental model of belonging to a larger group or inclusiveness.

The excerpts below demonstrate a inclusivism focus.

A1 Response:

“So that I have a sense that we are running the college as efficiently and effectively as we can, it is a business. We have customers. We owe a lot of accountability to the people of New York who give us a lot of their tax money to run the college.”

A2 Response:

“We hire them [faculty] to be focused. … One of my favorite sayings that a lady from … [community college name], she helped us with finances, she would always remind us. We hire poets, because they understand poetry at a level that many of us would never understand, and that is what they teach, and that is their love, and that is their passion. Then they become a department chair and we get mad because they do not understand administration and budgeting.”

A3 Response:

“That we cannot make an academic program work the way they would like it. Because the faculty just cannot see themselves stretching their academic paradigm that far to do what the business wants.”

A4 Response:

“In a private sector, somebody might come in and say here is the situation, this is what we are going to do, you will be on board or you will be looking for another way to spend your days. That does not happen that
way in higher ed. You have to work with people that were part of the process to make sure they understood.”

A5 Response:
“The challenge is to find the balance between process and results that allows for good, timely decisions, which are responsive to the needs, challenges, and opportunities of the college.”

A6 Response:
“Like, one of the initiatives we have … is better lighting on the streets. So sitting at the table is a guy from … [the electric company] and said well I will walk the streets with you. Let’s see what lights are out. So they walked the streets and they found sixty-five street lamps that were out. Because people do not report them, because they do not know, if you do not report them, they will not get fixed. …Then we will assess if we need more lighting. It may be we don’t even need more lighting. But he was able to make that happen. Because he just said okay crews, meet me here and they went up and down the street and they inventoried all the lights. It was done. Of course there wasn’t a committee and you know…”

The last excerpt is a great demonstration. The academic administrator without cognitively stating a dichotomy of mental models eloquently outlines two mental models within the response. The “guy” from the electric company assumes responsibility. The “guy” said “I will walk the streets with you.” He assumed responsibility and acted as an individual (arguably for the electric company as he works for the electric company and it is most likely his job). However, he did not redirect the task or assign the task to someone else. He assumed the responsibility and took action. This is an action of individualism. Whereas in the same response, the academic administrator A6 references the inclusivism system when stating “of course there wasn’t a committee and you know…”

The academic administrators refer to “we”, the college, or community. The academic administrator’s responses yield a sense of belonging to a greater
entity, being part of the college, belonging to the inclusivism system. This is a mental model of inclusiveness, where belonging to a greater whole is the way to perform your tasks.

This is demonstrated in some of the academic administrators’ responses such as A1’s response “So that I have a sense that we are running the college as efficiently and effectively as we can.” The utilization “I” occurs in the same sentence as “we” where the use of “I” is to identify unity with “we”. The response of interviewee A2 uses “we” to refer the college as a whole. “We hire them.” Even when discussing process, the response of interviewee A4 states “You have to work with people that we’re part of the process to make sure they understood.” or A5’s response “The challenge is to find the balance between process and results that allows for good, timely decisions, which are responsive to the needs, challenges, and opportunities of the college.” These all demonstrate an inclusivism view.

These two mental models have a divergence in overall view of what self is with respect to the organization. The individualism seems to assume responsibility where the inclusivism assumes belonging to the organization that assumes responsibility.

**Mental Model Roles: Fixer vs. Facilitator**

With a divergence in the mental models of administrators based upon their backgrounds, it would make sense that there must also be a divergence in how they construct their own personal role within the bounds of their respective mental model. The construct of each role becomes tethered to their adopted
mental model. Since the business background mental model seems to be one of individualism and assumption of responsibility, what role do participants with business background assume within the bounds of their mental model?

Business administrator B1 stated “Frankly, this is the business side of me, I truly do not understand why this is so hard to fix. Why it takes so much politicking and so many people are so firmly dug in … and this, that and the other thing. I do not get it.” Business administrator B4 stated “So I had to morph my style into more of the okay it is not going to be you have an issue and tomorrow we are going to fix it.” Business administrator B6 stated “Because we need to get things done around here and it is frustrating when it doesn’t work and people are just standing around talking about it.” These statements demonstrate a desire to “fix” the issue at hand. This “fixer” role of the individual mental model was demonstrated with responses to developmental education.

B1 Response:

“I personally think we can do more and each of our campus can work on our own curriculum to be less math onerous. Not that we do not need math, … I am very intrigued with studies that look at statistics being the most important piece of it. Why we are pushing the algebra so much, and not being an academic, I am careful not to get too involved in those conversations, but certainly we have work we can do to look at what we are really asking for from students when they are here in order to complete…”

B2 Response:

“I think there are a lot of students with developmental disabilities mainstreamed in classrooms with students that do not have these disabilities and … many teachers express that has bogged them down in the classroom. … I think every student should start out with the same baseline Math, unless students are so accelerated… I think we should do a remedial course for every student entering… I think all of our students should take a baseline Writing, Reading, and Research course the day they start, and everyone goes through that class. To kind of get everyone on the same playing field.”
B3 Response:

“I am for revamping that whole attack and I am more for helping people along the way succeed by providing them the support that is necessary. Not only help them improve in areas that there is room for improvement but also pointing out the strengths that those people have and further develop those strengths and make them even stronger. I just think we do it wrong and I think it has a dramatic impact on that person’s ability to succeed. I think that once we feel we have tested them and told them they are deficient, that part of the job then is to just send them off to these developmental education classes for them to get better. So we can test them again. Then tell them how maybe less deficient, but they are still deficient. So I think the emphasis is on what is lacking, is such a negative emphasis. Our job should be to ensure their success. Our job should be to help them along the way, to help them over the obstacles. … We should be in business only if we can promise two things and I mean promise; A job at the end of the day for a student who comes here or a seamless transfer to an institution that he or she wants to secure.”

B4 Response:

“I remember back when I was a kid, we did not have all the things kids have today. I look at my kids, they each have TVs in their rooms, they have games, they have all these things that take their interest away from the core of coming home and doing homework and learning. I think it is finally catching up to our schools and you are seeing a lot more developmental needs when they get to the college level when they finally figure out, I am paying for this and I need to start actually paying attention and doing something.”

B5 Response:

“When we begin looking at those developmental needs, particularly Reading, Writing, and Math, two things that we have done at least in my area of the college is, we created what is called an attained like. … with our students, if they have developmental needs, in addition to working with our learning centers, writing centers, our math learning centers, et cetera. … a student can then through self paced, whether it is home or here, … can work on those developmental skills.”

These statements demonstrate a theme of needing to “fix” some element to correct the increasing need of developmental education. The “fix” could be as simple as stated by interviewee B4; “I need to start actually paying attention and doing something” or more comprehensive such as changing curriculums as
stated by interviewee B1; “I personally think we can do more and each of our campuses can work on our own curriculum to be less math onerous.”

While those with a business background seem to be assuming a “fixer” role, those with an academic background do not seem to assume this “fixer” role. Those with an academic background seem to assume a “facilitator” role. One academic administrator (A1) stated, “My only role is to facilitate … I, as president, stay in the background and facilitate. That is all.” Another academic administrator (A2) stated, “I like to do what I can to create, foster a collaborative environment where we are all working together on similar purposes.”

The following are excerpts of interviews;

A1 Response:
“So what happens is that, what we expect incoming freshmen to know and be able to do, it is not that the kids are not bright or the teachers aren’t, they are as bright as they always were. The public schools are teaching on this track and we expect them to be on this one. They are teaching on that track because they are forced to do it, and they will tell you, we are teaching for the test. Which has been in New York as well as elsewhere, so watered down, there is now a rule that says every graduating student in New York will receive a Regent’s diploma. … We have two or three pilots going on now… We engage the kids when they are juniors in high school. We administer, this is all free to them, we administer our academic placement test, score it, and then in their junior and senior year, we intervene, their teachers intervene, and things. We have reduced in our pilots, you remember that 65%, they went down to 9. Because, they now know what we expect, it has nothing to do with Regents… and they have a concentrated here is what we expect in terms of writing, they have two years to figure it out, we will work on it. They come back, they take our assessment again and they place in college freshmen level stuff. … It has increased [college in the high school] … educational partnership.”

A2 Response:
“We are starting to do some things with the school districts and I think that is the approach we need to take. I do not think we can start pointing fingers, I think we have to work together. We are going to this year, and I know a lot of other community colleges are trying this as well,
… in the junior year [of high school], we are working with the districts and they are going to administer our compass test, which is our placement test… and see how many are college ready and how many are not. That will give them the senior year to provide some addition instruction where they are weak to see if we can, at least close that gap for some of the students that we will be seeing.”

A3 Response:

“So, I think the culture of the U.S. having done so well, for so long, you can parallel it with GM, … you can parallel it with IBM in the eighties, our culture is a victim of its own success, in a very substantial way. … We did not have enough time we typically have had to make these economical and cultural adjustments. … [To combat developmental education, we need to] work more closely with the [K-12] schools. That brings challenges unto itself because the schools are such silos and are so tradition and rule bound. It is even harder for them to get past their traditions and rules, than it is for us as public colleges. … We need to get more involved with in the cradle to 12 and we are. We are in a big way … We need to do more with K-12.”

A4 Response:

“I do not know that the curriculums between K-12 and higher ed. are as well aligned as you would like to see them to be and starting to really prepare students for the differences in college versus their K-12 experience of what they are going to need to do in college to be successful. I think some of the things we can do and trying to do is to reach back into the K-12 environment. Have our faculty talking to faculty from the area school districts and to look at what types of programs and services that we can partner on to provide, so that students start to understand what they are going to have to do to be successful when they get to college. Really starting to plant the seed that life long learning is something they should inspire to. You are never done. You continue to improve on your knowledge base and continue to be proactive on your education.”

A5 Response:

“Certainly, one of them is the alignment, or lack thereof, between what a high school graduate is ready to do and the expectation that a new college student should be ready to do as well. Some of it is how those high school graduation requirements are locked down. … The other piece tied to it is the emphasis that our K-12 colleagues have had placed upon them. They end up fundamentally teaching to the test, because their own performance is, either as individuals or schools or as school districts, based upon achievement on those nationally normed instruments. Are those the right instruments to give us a real look and a real understanding of their own student learning outcomes or is this because it is being driven
externally through Albany or Washington? … You teach to the test. That is good, but do you accomplish the learning goals that we want our students to have as they move from high school to college. … One way that we are finding here … is by having our Math faculty members meet with their high school counterparts so they can learn from one another exactly what the challenges are that they face. They have a greater understanding of who is doing what and ultimately talk about curriculum alignment. … We give them the Math placement test in their junior year so they have time in their high school career to get started with the remediation that needs to take place. Do we just leave that up to the high school to figure it out? Do we put together a collaborative program with them, jointly between the high school and the college toward that mutual end? … We also want them to be ready to enter college, ready for college level work.”

These statements made by academic administrators all demonstrate their mental model of inclusivism as well as assuming a role as “facilitator”. These academic administrators are not gearing up to determine a “fix” or corrective action within their institution. They are facilitating an approach to decrease educational development needs by working with the K-12 school.

**Mental Model Action: Adjust Academe vs. Perpetuate Academe**

With a divergence of mental models and the roles assumed based upon those mental models, it would also seem to make sense that their action based upon their roles would also diverge. Considering these following excerpts;

**B1 Response:**

“I personally think we can do more and each of our campus can work on our own curriculum to be less math onerous. Not that we do not need math, … I am very intrigued with studies that look at statistics being the most important piece of it. Why we are pushing the algebra so much, and not being an academic, I am careful not to get too involved in those conversations, but certainly we have work we can do to look at what we are really asking for from students when they are here in order to complete, if you want to be a nurse, trust me you have to do all the tough stuff. You want to be an engineer, you are going to have to do the hard stuff. But for many of the careers, I am not 100% positive, that all got it
exactly right. … Make a shorter path [consolidate developmental courses] for students to make it to the college level courses."

B2 Response:

“I think every student should start out with the same baseline Math, unless students are so accelerated… I think we should do a remedial course for every student entering… I think all of our students should take a baseline Writing, Reading, and Research course the day they start, and everyone goes through that class. To kind of get everyone on the same playing field. … For the English, Reading, and Writing, I do not think it would hurt anyone to have a class in the basics.”

B3 Response:

“I am for revamping that whole attack and I am more for helping people along the way succeed by providing them the support that is necessary. Not only help them improve in areas that there is room for improvement but also pointing out the strengths that those people have and further develop those strengths and make them even stronger. … Our job should be to ensure their success. Our job should be to help them along the way, to help them over the obstacles.”

Three of the administrators with a business background supported adjusting the community college education. The notion of changing the community college or the curriculum makes sense through the application of a mental model of individualism that is assuming the role of “fixer”, the idea that a problem exists or is given to us, and we have to move forward to solve or correct that problem. Logically, it does make sense that since the community college controls curriculum, the community college can change the curriculum. Admittedly, there is a problem with regards to developmental education and the increasing needs of this population. Should that solution entail adjusting the college level courses to be less rigorous? Is the problem at the community college level?
The problem ultimately comes down to the issue that entering students are not adequately prepared for college level courses, thus needing developmental education. One could argue the student base has changed so much that the community college must change with the times. However, one could raise the argument that there is no problem with the community college. The problem exists prior to the student coming to the community college. The entering students are ill equipped to be successful within the academe of the community college.

This seems to be the feeling of the majority of academic administrators. The following excerpts have been taken from the interviews of academic administrators;

A1 Response:

“We have two or three pilots going on now… We engage the kids when they are juniors in high school. We administer, this is all free to them, we administer our academic placement test, score it, and then in their junior and senior year, we intervene, their teachers intervene, and things. We have reduced in our pilots, you remember that 65%, they went down to 9. Because, they now know what we expect, it has nothing to do with Regents… and they have a concentrated here is what we expect in terms of writing, they have two years to figure it out, we will work on it. They come back, they take our assessment again and they place in college freshmen level stuff.”

A2 Response:

“We are starting to do some things with the school districts and I think that is the approach we need to take. I do not think we can start pointing fingers, I think we have to work together. We are going to this year, and I know a lot of other community colleges are trying this as well, … in the junior year [of high school], we are working with the districts and they are going to administer our compass test, which is our placement test… and see how many are college ready and how many are not. That will give them the senior year to provide some addition instruction where they are weak to see if we can, at least close that gap for some of the students that we will be seeing.”
A3 Response:

“[To combat developmental education, we need to] work more closely with the [K-12] schools. That brings challenges unto itself because the schools are such silos and are so tradition and rule bound. It is even harder for them to get past their traditions and rules, than it is for us as public colleges. … We need to get more involved with in the cradle to 12 and we are. We are in a big way … We need to do more with K-12. … I think No Child Left Behind has done some very good things, overall I do not think it was the best federal policy. … the focus on the test, the teaching to the test and all that … that is the really bad part of No Child Left Behind and that is not good for preparing kids for college, where we do not do a lot of multiple choice tests. … There is not a ton of route memorization in college, it is more critical thinking. And that is the problem with No Child Left Behind is it mitigates the pedagogy toward critical thinking, problem solving, and creativity and pushes toward a very finite these are the answers for the test. So, I think that is bad. That was just an awful part of No Child Left Behind and we are certainly paying a price for that.”

A4 Response:

“I do not know that the curriculums between K-12 and higher ed. are as well aligned as you would like to see them to be and starting to really prepare students for the differences in college versus their K-12 experience of what they are going to need to do in college to be successful. I think some of the things we can do and trying to do is to reach back into the K-12 environment. Have our faculty talking to faculty from the area school districts and to look at what types of programs and services that we can partner on to provide, so that students start to understand what they are going to have to do to be successful when they get to college. Really starting to plant the seed that life long learning is something they should inspire to.”

A5 Response:

“The other piece tied to it is the emphasis that our K-12 colleagues have had placed upon them. They end up fundamentally teaching to the test, because their own performance is, either as individuals or schools or as school districts, based upon achievement on those nationally normed instruments. Are those the right instruments to give us a real look and a real understanding of their own student learning outcomes or is this because it is being driven externally through Albany or Washington? … You teach to the test. That is good, but do you accomplish the learning goals that we want our students to have as they move from high school to college. … One way that we are finding here … is by having our Math faculty members meet with their high school counter parts so they can learn from one another exactly what the challenges are that they face.
They have a greater understanding of who is doing what and ultimately talk about curriculum alignment. ... We give them the Math placement test in their junior year so they have time in their high school career to get started with the remediation that needs to take place.”

These statements demonstrate that five out of six academic administrators believe the community colleges need to reach back into the K-12 and assist K-12 education to align the development of their students’ ability with what is expected of them at the college level. These administrators place some portion of blame upon legislation not upon K-12. Looking at the K-12 component of education through the inclusivism mental model, K-12 is a part of the inclusive system that is not adequately preparing students for entry into the community college. The academic administrators through their mental model role as “facilitator” want to assist K-12 to improve alignment between what the students are prepared to do and what the college expects the student to be able to do.

**Emerging Mental Models**

The academic administrators through their inclusivism mental model view the educational system as a whole. The subsystem being the community college does not seem to be the problem, so why would the community college change. From that perspective, one can argue the academic administrators are perpetuating the academe while the business administrators are open to change. One academic administrator (A1) stated, “I think the trick is to keep those elements of the culture of the college that are really important intact forever.” Another academic administrator (A4) stated, “You know the answer certainly is not in adjusting the curriculum to be less rigorous. That is of no value to the
students. ... I think you have to do the best you can to preserve those things that were successful.” These two statements demonstrate a desire to perpetuate the academe as it is. Using an analogy of a clock, the inclusivism mental model must work together as a whole. If a cog is broken, the gear does not move, if the gear does not move, there is no force on the pendulum to continue swinging. The clock stops. The cog that is broken seems to be the K-12 system, so through the inclusivism mental model, that is what needs to be corrected.

The individual mental model sees this problem space differently however. The business administrators seem to feel that the academe needs to change because the incoming student has changed. The individualism mental model seems analogous to a waterfall; when the water falls, it makes it to the bottom regardless of impediments. The individualism mental model sees the incoming student as the head of the waterfall. They do not believe that they can change the head of the waterfall; they can only allow the water to fall where it wills.

One business administrator (B5) stated, “In private industry we would say some days we need to blow up the company. ... The things that are important will come to the top and those that are not will go away.” This is an idea of changing the organization as the environment around changes. This is an ideology of flexibility of the organization to the surrounding environment, whereas community colleges do not seem to be so flexible. There seems to be more resistance to change. As this same business administrator stated, “A lot of those principles have not found their way into education for a reason. The reason is to perpetuate what is. That has a lot of value for stakeholders that are currently
within the education realm.” Another business administrator (B5) stated, “Change is slow, organizationally, it is more comfortable to stay the way we are, than to [change], because that involves risk.”

The desire to change the curriculum of community colleges or not seems to fall in line with the respective mental models with how those mental models create the bounds to which their respective roles are constructed. Ultimately those roles control the respective actions of the administrators. This divergence in mental models, roles, and actions support a variance in perception based upon the administrator’s background.

Further exploration yields more mental models. The following mental models are very similar to individualism and inclusivism. The same terms could be utilized, however, these terms did not seem to capture or make a distinction in terms of authority. The respective mental models seem to have a divergence in where the participants place authority.

**Mental Models: Hierarchal vs. Collegiality**

One business administrator (B4) stated “Coming from private business where a decision was made and told to you. You follow this versus having input into what those decisions are.” This demonstrates a mental model of top down authority where the business administrators seem to assume an authority that is dominated by their hierarchical position, similar to French and Raven’s legitimate power. Their hierarchical position seems to define the bounds of their authority in a downward nature. Another business administrator (B6) subtly

---

defines their position within the hierarchy of the organization with the statement, “I want to do the work that the people who report to me do as well as lead the team...” This demonstrates the desire to work as a team, showing I am one of you by doing what I ask of you, while maintaining superiority over the team by specifically defining the team as “people who report to me.” This is an example of subtle acceptance of hierarchy dominance that defines the mental model of top down authority, and is very similar to the individualism mental model where the waterfall is a good analogy and can be related to the hierarchical mental model. The water starts at the head and goes downward. The water accepts its place in the water fall and continues to the base. The imagery is indicative of a top down authority that defines this mental model.

Those with a pure academic background do not seem to assume a similar top down authority dominated by the hierarchy of the organization. There is more of a sharing of authority more so than dominance. One academic administrator (A1) stated:

“I am not the brightest person on the planet, so I seek all of the help I can get in making critical decisions. And that is both internal and external. I tend to cultivate advisory group types of, depends upon issues of course. ... A panel of experts about, and interested in, the project... get the people that are knowledgeable and interested in. ... keep them informed. Politicians, faculty, students, stand up and speak and film all of that. ... My only role is to facilitate, I do not take bows. ... I, as president, stay in the background and facilitate. That is all. In the end, I have to make decisions.”

This demonstrates an authority that the president has given various stakeholders control in the decision-making process. This is more of a collegiality mental model where all need to work together to achieve the final
outcome. The usage of collegiality herein refers to a system of centralization. With regards to collegiality, it is not to say there is not a top down authority in place as their obviously is. As stated by one academic administrator (A2), “But, I also have to tell you, I am the president and at some point a decision might have to be made and I think the folks know at that time, I am going to make it…”

The hierarchy within this mental model is one of respect more than one of dominance. Two different presidents from the group with academic background stated (A1), “I am not the brightest person on the planet.” and (A2), “Recognizing that there are a lot of smart people on campus that have a lot of good ideas…” These statements demonstrate respect for faculty members that are several levels below the president on the organizational chart. This respect of each other without bounds of position within the organization exists while the hierarchical structure continues to operate top down on an organizational chart.

The president is the person reporting to the Board of Trustees.

“They are, in fact legally, the Board of Trustees is the college, they govern, they decide policy, vision, they do not however, the line that exists between the board and me is administration. They do not get involved with things. They approve policy at the end of each policy regardless what it is there is a brief statement that says, the president will now implement procedures… They also have all fiduciary responsibilities of the college, the budget, finance and audit committee that is very active and it is oversight. That is governance. … Internally we have shared governance. … in most colleges we have a normal shared governance system… college assembly, committee structure… The idea is to get as many voices as possible to make sure the college remains healthy, organizationally. … Shared governance is advisory in nature as a board to me or any president.”

This statement was made by interviewee A1 who is an administrator with an academic background which demonstrates a mental model where the
hierarchy is respected but does not necessarily dominate the authority. There is 
a clear top down hierarchy structure of the organization. The Board of Trustees 
and the president without question have governing authority over the college. 
However, the nature in how the pure academics exercise their authority seems to 
be more of French and Raven’s referent power. \footnote{French, et al.} Within this mental model the 
administrator assumes more power by giving their power away to those around 
them.

“There is a culture of equals on the college campus. So, it requires you to 
think in more of committees more in terms of shared governance and 
responsibility for the institution.” This was a statement of one academic 
administrator that eloquently demonstrates the collegiality mental model.

The collegiality mental model is very similar to the inclusivism mental 
model and the analogy of a clock is apropos. The clock imagery is used to 
exhibit the contrast of the hierarchical mental model imagery of a waterfall.
Again, when referring to a clock, the pendulum controls the overall motion of the 
clock. The gears of the clock support the movement of the pendulum and keep 
the clock running. The pendulum is a harmonic oscillator that keeps perfect time 
based upon the length of the pendulum. The pendulum alone has authority over 
speed based upon length. However, the length of the pendulum must be 
appropriate to the gearing ratio of the clock to maintain time. There is also a 
spring that has authority over maintaining the perpetual motion of the pendulum. 
There is another spring that has authority over the chimes that is controlled by a 
gear in the clock. There are several authority mechanisms within a clock that
must work together, sharing authority to maintain authority. So a clock is emblematical of the community college within this mental model where the president controls the overall movement and is supported by all faculty and staff working in harmony.

**Mental Model Roles: Dominated Hierarchy vs. Shared Governance**

Those adopting the hierarchical mental model seem to assume a role of being dominated from above as well as being the dominator to those below them based upon the hierarchical structure of the organization. Their decision ownership belongs to their position. Whereas those that have adopted a collegiality mental model assume the decision making ownership belongs to the group or collegial system.

The business background administrators do not directly state or discuss decision ownership but imply it through the negativism toward shared governance that is seemingly thrust upon them. One business administrator (B6) stated, “I do not think it [shared governance] is working good at all. ... I think that we really have not seen any of these governance committees really do anything useful.” Another business administrator (B3) stated, “In my experience, collective responsibility often led to the fact that things did not get done properly.” These statements imply a better model would be one of dominate ownership to make the decisions and control those decisions. This of course seems logical within the bounds of their hierarchical mental model.

Those with an academic background seem much more supportive of sharing their ownership of decisions. The mental model of collegiality embraces
shared governance and each member has a role belonging to a larger entity similar to the inclusivism mental model. The shared governance role permeates academe seemingly at all levels where academic administrators do not seem to group based upon hierarchical position but upon knowledge base. As one academic administrator (A1) stated, “I tend to cultivate advisory group types … A panel of experts … get the people that are knowledgeable and interesting in.” Another academic administrator (A2) stated, “I like to do what I can to create, foster a collaborative environment where we are all working together on similar purposes.” These statements demonstrate the desire to be collegial without regard to hierarchical position.

**Mental Model Actions: “Jump In Feet First” vs. “Look Before You Leap”**

Those adopting the hierarchical mental model seem to assume a role of subservience to their supervisors and dominance to those below them in the hierarchy of the organization. The following statements were made by both academics and business background administrators;

A3 Response:

“My wife is a business woman, she has her own business. It is a very different world. Things are not done by committee. Business decisions are made at a rapid pace, daily. There are no thoughts given to well let the committee answer that question. … Ninety-nine percent of key decisions are made by management and they are made at a rapid pace.”

A4 Response:

“And they [business background] would talk about things like speed of decisions, which is somewhat, probably legitimate, probably more the authority or autonomy to make those decisions. I am not sure if it is really the truth.”
A6 Response:
“The other thing about having business people at the table is that they can get things done like that [snap of the fingers]. Like, one of the initiatives we have … is better lighting on the streets. So sitting at the table is a guy from … [the electric company] and said well I will walk the streets with you. Let’s see what lights are out. So they walked the streets and they found sixty-five street lamps that were out. Because people do not report them, because they do not know, if you do not report them, they will not get fixed. So they are fixing all of those lights and without spending a dime, the community is going to have brighter streets. Then we will assess if we need more lighting. It maybe we don't even need more lighting. But he was able to make that happen. Because he just said okay crews, meet me here and they went up and down the street and they inventoried all the lights. It was done.”

B1 Response:
“this whole [community college] world of shared governance was tough for me to get, to really understand it, to figure out how to work in it. It is such a contrary thing to the business world. It just kind of smacks you upside your face about how does this [shared governance] thing works.”

B2 Response:
“Because I did come from a private sector background … I like to do things fast and accomplish things fast. And I am not real good with shared governance. It is not a strong suit, I like to make my own decisions and move quickly…”

B3 Response:
“In my experience, collective responsibility often led to that fact that things did not get done properly. In other words, people need to know what they are in charge of. … What is it that each party is responsible for. … How do we work together in knowing we each have those responsibilities in way that keeps all parties involved in the process?”

B4 Response:
“Coming from private business where a decision was made and told to you. You follow this versus having input into what those decisions are …”

These statements demonstrate the action that the hierarchical mental model tends to deploy. An action of “decision was made and told to you” and you had to “do things fast and accomplish things fast.” This is more of a “jump in
“feet first” mentality where everything is fact based, similar to a militaristic action to obedience: “when I say jump, you jump, and then ask how high,” a conditioning of action response to those in authority, similar to the action “jump in feet first.” This action seems to be the action for those that have adopted the hierarchical mental model and the top down role of authority.

Those that have adopted the collegiality mental model seem to collect information, more of a “truth seeker” utilizing and embracing shared governance to discover facts and what Peter Senge calls co-creating based upon a shared vision. This shared vision is created by a “meeting of the minds” mentality.

This “meeting of the minds” is demonstrated with the following excerpts from the interview transcript;

A1 Response:
“I am not the brightest person on the planet, so I seek all of the help I can get in making critical decisions. And that is both internal and external. I tend to cultivate advisory group types of, depends upon issues of course. ... A panel of experts about, and interested in, the project... get the people that are knowledgeable and interested in. ... keep them [constituents] informed. ... Internally we have shared governance. ... in most colleges we have a normal shared governance system... college assembly, committee structure... The idea is to get as many voices as possible to make sure the college remains healthy, organizationally.”

A2 Response:
“There is a culture of equals on the college campus. So, it requires you to think in more of committees more in turns of shared governance and responsibility for the institution. So, you need to approach it that manner. ... But, I also have to tell you, I am the president and at some point a decision might have to be made and I think the folks know at that time, I am going to make it and we are going to move on. ... I think that is respected, I really do. Because, it is not done in a dictatorial fashion, it is done an okay, we have discussed this, we have discussed and now it is time to move and this is what we are going to do. I think if you treat

---

people fairly and treat people as equals, [when] that happens, they are happy you made a decision. They may not be happy with every decision, but they recognize and respect that you can and you move on.

A4 Response:
"Internally, I like to do what I can to create, foster a collaborative environment where we are all working together on similar purposes. Externally, a lot of it is spending time keeping people aware of the institution and the impact the institution has, not only locally, but throughout the region we support. Make sure they are comfortable with what we are doing. … You have to work with people that were part of the process to make sure they understood."

A5 Response:
"… as you know with faculty members we do not just tell them this is what we are doing, go get it done. They want to know why. They want to know are there more options. What have we looked at? What is the process? What kind of input? What kind of discussion has there been? … whatever it is, that there has been participation throughout the institution. In consideration of whatever it is being proposed you will have the opportunity to weigh in. I think from that shared governance approach comes better decision making because you got more eyes and more brains that are looking at it, working on it. It allows us to avoid that situation where maybe a person or a small group of people end up making decision based upon information that may or may not be complete and may or may not be accurate."

A6 Response:
"From the faculty perspective, it is enormously important because of the involvement and input. And the perspective faculty bring to discussions about matters that effect students and the future of the college. … I can see the value of having committees, of having involvement, getting diverse views, and for us with an assembly system to have a place once a month were, better or worse, we can come together and hear each other’s views. From an administrative perspective, … I think it makes the administrative job so much easier to have governance, because then you have buy in on ideas. You also have the benefit of really good ideas from people, from your perspective you might not have seen, and coming from the faculty, I see sometimes I come up with an idea or have a reaction and one of my colleagues in administration will say oh, you are still a faculty member, you cannot take the faculty member out…but they are lucky I am at the table. You need that perspective and you never want to lose it. You want to make sure you are connected with students and the faculty."
These excerpts demonstrate a desire to have a meeting of the minds, an embracement of shared governance, not in theory, but in practice. This meeting of the minds conceptualization provides a different action approach than the one applied by those that have adopted the hierarchical mental model.

Academics support shared decision-making and rely upon the “systemness”\textsuperscript{151} of the community college. Returning to an old gear based clock, where the pendulum, being the focal movement of the clock between the forces of gravity and the gears that must continue to move keeping the clock running, as the president of the community college keeps the college running, the gears can be symbolic of the faculty and staff. The springs, symbolic of political powers driving the gears and pendulum, complete the working of the clock. Note that being a part of the whole, if one cog breaks, the gear does not work correctly, and subsequently the clock fails to run. The decision-making process requires going throughout the entire collegial process. Again, similar to a clock running, the hands that show time cannot be moved forward without all of the gears moving simultaneously. This is emblematical of the decision-making process in a shared governance system.

The business administrators on the other hand seem to present more of a top down approach such as a waterfall. Once the water begins cascading over the fall, it will continue down regardless of what impediment is in its way. The water will find the lowest point. This is emblematical of a top-down decision-making business, where the CEO makes a decision that is carried down and enforced at each level throughout the organization.

\textsuperscript{151} Nancy Zimpher, \textit{Faculty Council of Community Colleges Address}, Spring 2012 Plenary.
The evidence provided herein supports a conclusion that there is a divergence between mental models, roles, and actions based upon an administrator's background. Peter Senge concludes, "mental models explain why two people can observe the same event and describe it differently." In addition, Senge concludes that the mental model that an administrator adopts will affect their perception. Therefore, it would stand to reason that differences in mental models would directly relate to differences in perception. Thus, one can conclude that there is a significant difference between administrators that are pure academics and those that have a business background. Therefore, providing strong supporting evidence that selective perception is occurring.

152 Senge, et al., 236.
153 Senge, 143.
Chapter VII

Conclusion

A Case Example

The topicality of my research was brought home to me through a case that unfolded as I was doing my research.

Approximately four years ago a community college appointed a president that had seventeen years community college experience who also had a business background. The president was appointed based upon his demonstrated leadership. The president had made a short statement upon appointment that included the statement, “I look forward to building upon Nassau Community College’s first 50 years of progress with a vision that will meet the 21st Century needs of our students and our community in ways that will foster justice, compassion, and productivity.” This president was also reported to believe in a “top-down” leadership.

This leadership style has caused problems at Nassau Community College, which has received accolades in the past for their shared governance and

\footnotesize
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leadership. The data show that those with a business background tend not to truly support shared governance as it does not fall within their mental model. This president made a decision without seemingly utilizing shared governance.\textsuperscript{157} His decision resulted in receiving two votes of no confidence.\textsuperscript{158} The outcome of this president’s actions is an example of the clash between the collegiality and hierarchical mental models. The hierarchical mental model did not allow for communication and acceptance of shared governance.

It is possible that this unfortunate breakdown in communications could have been lessened or corrected if the parties involved understood each other’s mental models. It seems as though the significant variances in the mental models fostered the communications breakdown. Application of, and understanding of these mental models, could assist administrators in their leadership to hasten the paradigmatic shifts between the two diverging mental models in an attempt to gain common perceptions.

\textbf{Professional Background Influences Perception}

The research question if professional background differences change problem perception is now answered. Yes, professional background among community college leaders does change problem perception. The example of Nassau Community College demonstrates how these differences may materialize into significant problems. The data show that issue perception is influenced by functional background. The functional background could be the direct influence to the administrator’s mental models. The variances in mental


\textsuperscript{158} “Nassau Community Clash Must End,” \textit{Newsday}, Sept. 11, 2011.
models based upon functional background demonstrate selective perception is occurring. The evidence supporting the conclusion that mental models influence selective perception yields support for Walsh’s belief structures.

Their personal experiences have created the mental models which they utilize to perceive their surroundings. The evidence herein demonstrates a divergence in personal experiences and mental models. Therefore, the academic administrators do selectively perceive differently than their business background counterparts as demonstrated within the collected data.

This conclusion also suggests that a direct influence between functional background and selective perception prevails. This supports Dearborn et al.’s conclusion that selective perception is influenced by an individual’s functional background.

The first study did identify the issues that were utilized in the second study that did provide supporting evidence that selective perception is occurring.

The second study not only demonstrated that selective perception is occurring. It also shed light on the complexities of selective perception within this data set. Selective perception is not as simple as Dearborn et al. had predicted. Dearborn et al. concluded that functional background is a direct influence to selective perception. Walsh concluded that belief structures are the direct influence on selective perception. This research demonstrates that both theories are partially correct.

---
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Recommendations for Policy and Practice

Based upon the supporting evidence it is observable within this data set that selective perception is occurring. This conclusion leads us to the ultimate question, so what does the occurrence of selective perception mean? Based upon this research, I would conclude that selection of an administrator from within or outside of academia would have significance on the perception of and action on most issues.

Because the evidence does tend to suggest that selective perception is occurring, I conclude that it is significant enough to expect differences in leadership and priorities. Thus, I would conclude that these findings would have significant impact on hiring practices.

If the community college has specific issues surrounding one or more of the topics that are an area of divergence between the two groups, then hiring one from a specific group could be considered. Hiring an individual with a specific background might be better suited for the institution in a given situation.

This research has practical applications for community college administrators. Senior academic administrators could utilize this information to include others with specific educational background and work histories (e.g. functional background) with various influences (e.g. included perceptions) into the decision-making process. Academic administrators could be more cognizant that other administrators outside of academia do have different perspectives and
mental models. Thus, academic administrators may learn how and when to include the appropriate individuals for a specific decision-making issue.

While the community college mission varies slightly from institution to institution, for the most part they have three main purposes. Community colleges provide academic preparation for transfer to four-year institutions. They also provide preparation for career entry, commonly referred to as terminal degrees. Community colleges also provide lifelong learning opportunities. The lifelong learning opportunities include providing students courses and degrees for career changes, retraining, and personal desires. Student demographics show that a small number of entering community college students have already attained a Bachelor's degree or higher. These three purposes of the community college combined with the lower costs of a community college all lead to a major impact, which is increasing enrollment and student demand. The data show that administrators with different backgrounds perceive these very important mission critical problems differently.

It is also extremely important to note that “successful” community colleges are blessed with the proper leaders. “Proper leaders” according to Cohen and Brawer are those that know how to “guide their colleagues, stimulating each other to put forth maximum effort toward attaining the proper goals.” This suggests a successful community college leader is one that can align the mental

---
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models within the community college toward a common goal. The question then becomes, which community college leader causes success?

**Practical Application for Community College Board of Trustees**

The top most set of leaders of a community college is the board of trustees. A community college board of trustees is to be a bridge between the college and the community.¹⁶⁵ The board of trustees is responsible for “care, custody, control and management of the lands, grounds, buildings, facilities and equipment... have power to protect, preserve and improve...”¹⁶⁶

The board, in assuming these obligatory roles, should consider the findings of this study when performing their duties. The board of trustees also has the responsibility to “appoint a president for the college, subject to approval by the state university trustees, and it shall appoint or delegate to the president the appointment of other members of the staff.”¹⁶⁷

Considering the mental models, roles, and actions discovered herein, the board of trustees can view the selection of their president from at least two approaches. One approach being what the board of trustees want their president to accomplish that is in alignment with the dominant mental models of the college. The second being what the board of trustees want their president to change that is not in alignment with the dominant mental models of the college. Either of these strategies would require the board of trustees to have some knowledge of what the dominate mental models are that the employees of the

---

¹⁶⁵ Cohen et al., 124.
¹⁶⁶ New York State Education Department, New York State Education Code, Title VII, Article 126, Section 6306, Subsection 5, July 1, 1948.
¹⁶⁷ New York State Education Department, Subsection 2.
college have adopted. Therefore, I would strongly suggest that the board of trustees to exercise caution on making decisions of hiring a president for the second approach for change that is not in alignment with the existing dominate mental model of the college employees. It is my belief that the second approach will require a president that has a similar mental model to guide change that is understandable or within the bounds of accepted dominate mental model.

Since the application of the knowledge herein becomes situational based, the board of trustees must determine what type of mental model is best suited for alignment and achievement of their goals. For example, if the board of trustees desires a top down driven administration, they might select a president that has adopted a hierarchical mental model, if the dominate mental model of the college employees is susceptible to the hierarchical mental model actions. However, if the dominate mental model of the college employees is not susceptible and has a dominate collegiality mental model, I would expect several issues to arise. Consider the outcomes noted at Nassau Community College.

**Practical Application for Community College Presidents**

The community college president must be responsive to the board of trustees, faculty, students, alumni, and the community. An attempt to be responsive to all of these constituents could undermine the president’s authority and effectiveness. I would argue that a significantly misaligned mental model between the president and the dominate mental model of the college could add

---

even more complexities to the inevitable detriment to the presidency. This could lead to the loss of presidential support from the board of trustees, persuading the president to look for an exit strategy.\textsuperscript{170}

While the president does not necessarily need to be of the same mental model of the dominate mental model of the college, the president must be able to understand the dominate mental model. This becomes necessary more so as the president becomes closer with the faculty, staff, and students. It should be noted that most presidents do not feel controlled by hierarchical structure.\textsuperscript{171}

However, there can be a more of a hierarchical mental model between the board of trustees and the president. To be an effective president, he or she must make a clear delineation between board responsibilities and presidential responsibilities.\textsuperscript{172} This delineation is well in line with the hierarchical mental model. This is not to say the same delineation could not be achieved by an individual with a collegiality mental model. I would conclude it would be best for the college to have a president that could easily understand and work within the bounds of both a hierarchical and collegiality mental models.

**Practical Application for Community College Vice Presidents**

The community college vice presidents are responsible for business affairs, student personnel, academic instruction, and technical education.\textsuperscript{173} These administrators determine allocation of resources that directly control
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faculty composition.\textsuperscript{174} This control is produced by the administrators capacity in determining what faculty positions will be funded. In addition, administration determines which curriculum will be funded based upon available resources.\textsuperscript{175}

Considering these responsibilities of the vice presidents, they are receiving instruction from the president and providing leadership to those below them on the organizational chart. Thus, it would seem appropriate that the vice presidents share a mental model with those that report to them. The vice president will have enough controversy regarding funding various educational needs without needlessly complicating the controversy with misaligned mental models. This alignment of mental models between the vice president level and faculty seems necessary (with the exception of the vice president of finance and perhaps the vice president of institutional advancement as faculty members typically do not report to these vice presidents).

Within the community college, if the faculty determine their voice is not being heard they will escalate to the president or directly to the board of trustees.\textsuperscript{176} Thus to maintain an alignment at the vice president level and below, I would expect the best resolve would be to maintain vice presidents with an appropriately aligned mental model.

\textbf{Further Research: The Impact Of ‘On The Job’ Learning}

An unanticipated finding of this research is that ‘on the job learning’ may influence administrators with an academic background different than
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administrators with a business background. The administrators seem to be aware that there are some variances between administrators from academia and those from business. Based upon some of the responses of academic administrators, they seem to have a respect for those in the business world. One community college administrator (A1) stated “I have very consciously gone out [to business] and learned, asked questions, how do you do this. …I learn from them [business people] everyday." Another (A5) stated “Their [business administrators] perspective is important for good decision-making. … Their focus on bottom-line results and their thinking toward that end.”

These statements seem to not only show respect for business but a desire to learn from the business world. In addition, those administrators with a business background seem to recognize that it is different working in academia as compared to working in business. While the business administrators do not necessarily demonstrate respect and desire to learn from the pure academics, they tend to exhibit a need to adapt the ways of academia as demonstrated in the statement by one business leader (B1) “So I had to morph my style into more of the okay it is not going to be you have an issue and tomorrow we are going to fix it. It is okay you have an issue, let us discuss it, let us find out the best path to go down, and then let us make a decision.” Another business leader (B6) stated “very hard to adjust to, … I need to adjust to the college and the culture…”

Both of these groups seem to demonstrate an understanding, an almost "on the job" training on each other's mental models, roles, and actions. Academic administrators learn business and business administrators adapt to
academe. Both groups are, to some extent, changing toward a common view of how the community college should be administered. However, while the academic administrators learn business, the data show persistent differences in problem perception. In addition, the data show the business administrators are not attaining that academic collegiality of the community college while their business instinct is most likely maintained within them.

While this data set did not capture a means to determine how much business the academics tend to learn and how much academe the business administrators tend to adopt, it suggests that different patterns exist. The Questions remains, how much did the academic administrators move toward the business views and how much did the business administrators move toward the academic views? Are they finding a convergent point within the paradigm or are academics adopting business thinking more than business people adopt academic thinking? These are questions for future research that may provide insight to where on the paradigm the two groups are headed.
Appendix

Instruments

Initial Contact

To:  \textit{Respondent's name}

Date:

Allow me to introduce myself, I am Thomas Giorgianni, a Ph.D. candidate at SUNY Albany. I am conducting research on community college employees and you are invited to participate in my research. Your assistance is extremely important to my research and I hope you would be able to assist me in my Ph.D. pursuit. I am studying Community College employee's decision-making.

I will be providing you with access to my aggregate data and conclusions upon completion of my analysis. Specific information such as your name, institution, and personal information will not be disclosed. Your name will not even be coded into the data. You will be assigned a Respondent ID, which will be used throughout my research to ensure security of your identity and personal information.

Your role will consist of two activities;
1. reporting your educational background and work history
2. responding to a survey (approximately one hour)

Again, thank you in advance.
Thomas Giorgianni, Ph.D. candidate State University at Albany.
Activity I

Educational Background

**Undergraduate degrees**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Degree conferred</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Major</th>
<th>Minor (if any)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Graduate degrees**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Degree conferred</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Major</th>
<th>Minor (if any)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Certifications**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Certificate</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Continuing Education**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Work History (paid and non-paid)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College/Business</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Hours per week</th>
<th>Years Beginning - End</th>
<th>Duties/Responsibilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Consent Form

Thomas Giorgianni, Ph.d. candidate at SUNY Albany
Educational Administration and Policy Studies at SUNY Albany
(845) 341-4487
thomas.giorgianni@sunyorange.edu

Faculty Advisor at SUNY Albany
Dr. Heinz Dieter Meyer
(518) 442-3662
hmeyer@albany.edu

IRB Contact Information and Human Rights Statement:
If you have any questions concerning your rights as a research participant that have not been answered by the investigator or if you wish to report any concerns about the study, you may contact the University at Albany’s Office of Regulatory Research Compliance by email orrc@uamail.albany.edu or by phone at 518-442-9050 or toll-free 1-800-365-9139.

Voluntary Participation Statement:
Your participation in this research is voluntary. Even after agreement to participate in the research or signing of the informed consent, you may decide to leave the study at any time without penalty or loss of benefits to which you may otherwise have been entitled. You may also choose not to answer any questions and my refuse to complete any portions of the research you do not wish to for any reason.

Research Inclusion Statement:
If you choose not to answer or refuse to complete any portions of the research, your previous responses might not be sufficient and no longer suitable to include into the research. Therefore, might not be included into the research. Thus, please be sure to complete and be as thorough as possible with the background history of education and work experience as required. Failing to do so might result in the removal of your participation in this study.

Risks Statement:
There is no anticipated risk in your participation other than your time. You have the right to retract any information or remove yourself from this study at anytime if you feel your participation might have any risks you foresee.

Expected Benefits Statement:
Although you may not receive direct benefit from your participation, others may ultimately benefit from the knowledge obtained from this research.

Confidentiality Statement:
Your confidentiality will be achieved by removing your name from any documents submitted. A respondent ID has been created which will be used instead of your name throughout the entire research project. Specific information such as your name, institution, and personal information will not be disclosed at any point during this research. Your name will not even be coded into the data. You have been assigned a Respondent ID, which will be used throughout my research to ensure security of your identity and personal information. You will be provided a sheet of labels with your Respondent ID number that you can affix to any document you provide me. Feel free to strike your name from any document you provide me, just ensure you have affixed your Respondent ID number.

Research Data Collection:
I will be providing you with access to my aggregate data and conclusions upon completion of my analysis. Your role will consist of three activities. The first activity will be reporting your educational background and work history along with signing this consent form. The second activity would require you to respond to a case, which would take approximately one hour of your time. The last activity is an interview, which would take approximately half an hour of your time. The second and third activity would be conducted at your institution at a time convenient for you.

I have read, or been informed of, the information about this study. I hereby consent to participate in the study.

Print Name ___________________________ Sign ___________________________ Date ___________________________

One copy of this document will be kept together with the research records of this study. Also, you will be given a copy to keep for your records.

The University at Albany

MAY 21, 2010

Approved by IRB
Valid Thru:
Activity II

Case Instructions:

Step 1:
Please read the following case of Micommcoll, which is a fictitious Community college. All figures and issues have no relation to any real Community college. While reading the Micommcoll case, please identify all issues. Please make any notes, comments, and/or marks directly on the paper that you would normally if reading a work related document. Please note if you would ask for additional information on any issue or topic.

An issue shall be defined as any problematic or questionable occurrence that might become a burden upon the institution in any form including but not limited to financial, political, community, etc.

Step 2:
Upon completion of Step 1, list the issues you have identified onto the form provided (Step 2 Form). Once you have listed all of the issues you identified, review each issue and rate the issue on a scale from 1-7 (1 being extremely important that requires immediate attention to 7 being not detrimental to the operations of the organization that might need attention within the next few months). Please note, you may have several issues rated at the same level of importance.

Please feel free to copy the Activity 2 Form as many times as you need.

Step 3:
Upon completion of Step 2, from all of the issues you have identified, note which issue is the most important.
Case

*Micommcoll*

*About Micommcoll*

Micommcoll is a mid-sized Community college with an approximate student body of 7,000 students 40% full-time and 60% part-time. Student enrollment has been increasing between 7 to 11% every year for the last three years. The overall demographics of the college are relatively comparable to the local community demographics.

The current president at Micommcoll was hired three years ago, who came from a vice president position at another institution. The president is widely liked by the board of trustees, administrators, staff, faculty, and students but seems to have a difference of opinion on some issues with local politicians. While these differences of opinions do not seem to affect the politicians unwavering support of the president, the local media uses every chance to put the president in the paper with commentary that is not supported with facts.

Only one of the current vice-presidents has been with the college for more than five years. All of the other vice-presidents and associate vice-presidents have been employed with Micommcoll for less than three years. The remaining administrators and staff have been employed at Micommcoll for an average of 13 years. The faculty is broken into three groups, approximately 33% that have been employed less than five years, 8% that have been employed five to ten years, and 59% that have been employed more than ten years. Of that 59%, 87% will be eligible to retire within three years. A questionnaire was sent to
these faculty members and the responses showed that if an early retirement incentive were offered, almost 90% would take advantage of the incentive.

**Finances at Micommcoll**

This year’s state-level funding at Micommcoll is 22%, which is a one percent decline from last year. The sponsor’s funding has also declined by one percent down to 24%. This has caused another student tuition increase, which has been the trend for the last ten years due to declining state and local sponsorship support. In addition, the state’s support of direct student aid is also declining compared to federal support. These trends are forcing Micommcoll to enhance their fund-raising efforts to assist offsetting student tuition, which has reached its all-time high. The current student tuition is nearing the maximum financial burden most of the local families can undertake.

Currently, Micommcoll employs one person that doubles as a grant writer and fund raiser. While this person has been diligently working on several grants, he has missed a few deadlines, which has caused the college to miss two grant submissions. The president feels this is due to the person taking on too many tasks. The president feels that grant writing and fund-raising is an under utilized funding stream at Micommcoll.

Micommmcoll has been considering several ways to attempt to reduce student tuition by increasing funding streams. One of which is hiring three new employees, two grant writers and a fund-raising manager. While the board of trustees and local politicians support this consideration, the local news papers seem to believe hiring three new employees will not create new revenue
streams, only a larger financial commitment by the college in salaries and benefits that will further increase student tuition.

**Technology at Micommcoll**

Micommcoll has been trying to follow a three-year recycling plan for the computers on campus. However, in the last few years, due to finances, the plan has not been followed and the realization of recycling computer equipment slowly became five to six-years. One vice-president informed the president that he had read an article that discussed the significant shortcomings of Microsoft’s Vista and urged users to switch to Linux. Linux is an operating system that comes with an office suite, all of which is free. In addition, significant support is offered for Linux over the Internet, also free. By switching to Linux, the college could use the funds scheduled to upgrade to Microsoft Vista and other Microsoft software to purchase new hardware. Along with additional funding and if the college were to switch the Linux, the college would be able to purchase new computers for every staff and faculty member as well as replace all of the campus computers in the library, computer labs, and open student study areas.

The president asked the vice-president to head up an implementation task force to look into the viability of switching to Linux campus wide. The vice-president selected two other people from his staff and quickly made the recommendation to adopt Linux campus wide and replace all existing computers with the newest technology available. The president accepted the task force’s findings and made a commitment to replace all of the computers on campus. It is not clear at this time if the financial savings by switching to Linux will cover all of
the equipment purchase costs. However, the president is confident that the new
grant writers and fund raisers will get any funding required to replace all of the
campus computers if the cost is not covered by the switch to Linux. The board of
trustees voted to switch to Linux and upgrade all of the campus computers based
upon the president’s recommendation, which was approved.

The president asked the vice-president to address the staff and faculty
body with the task force’s findings. Some of the staff and faculty voiced some
concerns with the decision to switch to Linux. One concern was making such a
decision without any input from faculty and staff. The other concern was all of
the existing documents in a Microsoft platform. The vice-president believes this
group of employees are simply against change and are not technologically
proficient and do not understand the positive outcomes of switching to Linux.
The president has suggested that the implementation task force meet with the
concerned employees and attempt to align this group to understand the
committee’s outcomes. The task force has met with this group of employees and
presented their rationale for the decision. The group was not satisfied with the
meeting and requested another meeting with the task force, but the task force
feels no other meetings are required.

Reaccreditation at Micommcoll

Micommcoll recently received reaccreditation and the major comment of
findings was to improve verifiable evidence, such as learning outcomes, student
satisfaction, etc. While most of administration has geared up to implement new
data collection systems and procedures to demonstrate accountability of
teaching at Micommcoll, faculty has shown some resistance to administration’s implementations. Some of the faculty voiced concern of their limited input into the new data collection systems and procedures that they feel are infringing upon their academic freedoms.

During an assembly meeting, a faculty member with over 15 years of employment at Micommcoll asked four questions of administration with respects to the implemented collection systems: What is wrong with the current processes? Can the current processes be improved? How were these new collection systems determined as improvements? What exactly are we trying to demonstrate with these new collection systems that the current processes are not? Once finished asking these questions, all of the faculty stood and clapped.

The vice president of academics responded that no evidence has emerged that would lead us to believe the new collection systems are infringing upon faculties academic freedoms and while merit exists in your questions, we need to look forward and embrace new methods of improvement.

**Occurring Today at Micommcoll**

Micommcoll, being an open door institution, is currently seeing its all-time high of developmental education. Fifty-one percent of new students are placing into at least one developmental course. Most of the administrators and faculty are attributing this fact to local high schools ill-preparing students for college level work entering into the college and Micommcoll’s high student expectations. However, today some local politicians during a public event began questioning the fact that a small number of students retake the same developmental course
three to five times and attributing the students’ lack of success to the faculty’s inability to teach this group of students.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank 1 – 7 (1 being extremely important to 7 being not as important)</th>
<th>Identified Issue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rank 1 – 7</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Activity 2 Form
### Data Codes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>G1</strong></td>
<td>Group – 1 Educational Admin 5+yrs, 2 New Educational Admin &lt;1 yr, 3 Business Admin 5+ yrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>G2</strong></td>
<td>Gender – 0 Female, 1 Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E1</strong></td>
<td>Education Background – 0 non-Administration, 1 Administration, 2 Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E2</strong></td>
<td>Education Level – 1 Bachelors, 2 Masters, 3 Doctorate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>W1</strong></td>
<td>Work Background – 0 Education, 1 Business, 2 Finance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>W2</strong></td>
<td>Working in field of degree major attained – 0 No, 1 Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A1</strong></td>
<td>Years in Administration Position – 1 (1-3yrs), 2 (4-6yrs), 3 (7-10yrs), 4 (11-15yrs), 5 (&gt;15yrs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A2</strong></td>
<td>Years in non-Administration Position – 1 (1-3yrs), 2 (4-6yrs), 3 (7-10yrs), 4 (11-15yrs), 5 (&gt;15yrs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>P1</strong></td>
<td>Positional Level – 1 President, 2 Vice President, 3 AVP/Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>L1</strong></td>
<td>Poor Communications/shared decision making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>L2</strong></td>
<td>Relatively new President and VPs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>L3</strong></td>
<td>Participatory Governance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>L4</strong></td>
<td>Lack of transparent strategic planning process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>L5</strong></td>
<td>Gain faculty interest and support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>L6</strong></td>
<td>Poor relations with constituents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>L7</strong></td>
<td>Technology migration decisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>L8</strong></td>
<td>Implementation task force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>L9</strong></td>
<td>Board of Trustee’s Oversight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D1</strong></td>
<td>Developmental Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>S1</strong></td>
<td>Aging faculty that may retire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>S2</strong></td>
<td>Staffing with multiple roles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>S3</strong></td>
<td>Faculty Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I1</strong></td>
<td>Increasing enrollment and student demand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F1</strong></td>
<td>Declining revenues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F2</strong></td>
<td>Increasing student tuition when grants and other fundraising options should be pursued first</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F3</strong></td>
<td>Increase Pres/VP support to gain funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F4</strong></td>
<td>Fundraiser/Grant writer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Coded Data

The respondents’ data codified as follows;

| ID | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| G1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| G2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| E1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| E2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| W1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 |
| W2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| A1 | 2 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 4 |
| A2 | 5 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 5 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 5 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 2 |
| P1 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| L1 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| L2 | 5 | 5 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| L3 | 1 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| L4 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| L5 | 5 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| L6 | 4 | 2 | 5 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 3 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| L7 | 7 | 6 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 5 | 2 | 4 |
| L8 | | 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| L9 | | 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| I1 | 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| D1 | 6 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 5 | 3 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| S1 | 7 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 2 | 3 | 7 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 2 |
| S2 | 5 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| S3 | | 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| F1 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| F2 | 3 | | 1 | 3 | 3 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| F3 | | 3 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| F4 | 3 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Note: The ranks underlined were identified by the respondents in Activity II, step 3 as the single most important issue facing the institution.
Second Study

Please allow me to introduce myself. I am Thomas Giorgianni, Professor at SUNY Orange and a Doctoral Candidate at SUNY Albany. I have completed my primary dissertation research. The primary research suggests that business leaders perceive some issues differently than academic leaders. However, my research has provided only weak support. Therefore, I am focusing on this issue in a second study that might shed more light on the question if there is a difference between academic and business leaders’ perceptions.

I am requesting your participation in this second study, which will require you to read, sign a consent form, and provide an interview (questions below) to discuss your observations dealing with business leaders. This interview will last thirty to sixty minutes. You are being asked based upon your position and probability that you have dealt with business leaders. However, I will ask that you do not refer to any specific business or individual by name to maintain their confidentiality.

If you agree to assist me, please sign the consent form attached. Three signature lines are provided, one to give consent to the study, one to record the interview if you allow me, and one to directly cite you if you allow me to. The consent form can be mailed to:

[Address omitted]
**Interview questions for leaders**

1. May I record this interview?
2. May I directly quote you and cite this interview?
3. Please provide some background about yourself, including education and work history.
4. Have you ever included opinions from business administrators into your decision-making inputs?
   If so why?
   Was there any difference about their perspective that you noticed?
5. Have you ever hired a person from the business sector?
   If so why?
   Did this person bring something different to the table?
   Did you feel this person had a heightened perception on any topic more so than other academic administrators? If so, please elaborate.
6. Do you believe your background (business or academic) influences the way you approach problems or issues confronting the college?
   If so, could you explain why you think so?
7. Have you any experience working with people from the business sector that had different perceptions of academic issues than you?
   Where there any other issue(s) that you noticed a difference between you and the other individual?
   Did you feel compelled to educate them on your perception of the subject?
   Did you want them to elaborate on their perception to understand why their perception was different than yours?
8. Review the following specific issues. Please respond to how you would address these issues.
   - How do you create and maintain relations with constituents
   - What can you say about developmental education and the cause
   - Given the choice of a fundraiser or grant writer, which one and why
   - What are your thoughts regarding demands placed upon students
   - What are your comments regarding Collegial Self governance
   - What are your thoughts regarding aging faculty
   - Would you like to say anything about business versus academia
Consent Form

Contact Information:
Thomas Giorgianni, Ph.d. candidate at SUNY Albany
Educational Administration and Policy Studies at SUNY Albany
(845) 341-4487
thomas.giorgianni@sunoorange.edu

Faculty Advisor at SUNY Albany
Dr. Heinz Dieter Meyer
(518) 442-3662
hmeyer@albany.edu

Research: This study is an attempt to gather data supporting or rejecting a hypothesis that a person's background influences their perception of issues.

Procedures: You are being invited to participate in this research. Your role will consist of an interview, which would take approximately half an hour to an hour of your time. Upon your acceptance, an interview will be scheduled. During the interview you will be requested to grant permission to be recorded and to also grant rights to directly quote your interview in the final dissertation. If successful in defending the dissertation, it will be published. If you choose not to be recorded or cited, your responses will be aggregated into the data set and no reference regarding you will appear. Upon completion of the dissertation process, all notes and recordings not published will be destroyed.

Voluntary Participation Statement: Your participation in this research is voluntary. Even after agreement to participate in the research or signing of the informed consent, you may decide to leave the study at any time without penalty or loss of benefits to which you may otherwise have been entitled. You may also choose not to answer any questions and my refuse to complete any portions of the research you do not wish to for any reason.

Research Inclusion Statement: If you choose not to answer or refuse to answer any questions of the research, your previous responses might not be sufficient and no longer suitable to include into the research. Therefore, might not be included into the research. Thus, please be sure to answer the questions as through as possible. Failing to do so might result in the removal of your participation in this study.

Risks Statement: There is no anticipated risk in your participation other than your time. You have the right to retract any information or remove yourself from this study at anytime if you feel your participation might have any risks you foresee.

Expected Benefits Statement: Although you may not receive direct benefit from your participation, others may ultimately benefit from the knowledge obtained from this research.
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Word Utilization Inventory

After the completion of the inventory issue analysis it was noticed that several administrators seem to utilize slightly different words. Based on this feature, it seemed appropriate to create a word utilization inventory to examine the relationship between a particular word set and an administrator’s background. Therefore, it appeared logical to scrutinize the word usage through a similar methodology employed for the issue inventory analysis.

The electronic document of all interviews was then used to create a table of words utilized in each section that was delineated by interview question. As the section of the transcribed document was reviewed, any word that appeared as though it may have some relation to an individual’s background was added to a word utilization table. The electronic document was then searched by the computer’s program to find reoccurrences of each word. When the word was found within that section, a “X” was then placed under the respective identification for the respondent that utilized the word. A table was created for each question section.

Within this section convergence is indicated when a word is used fifty percent (50%) or more by both academic and business administrators. Divergence will be considered when a word is utilized fifty percent (50%) or more by one group over the other.
Relations with Constituents

While reviewing the transcript of the interviews on the topic of relations with constituents Table 1 was created.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word Utilization Inventory</th>
<th>Administrators with an Academic Background</th>
<th>Administrators with a Business Background</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Approach</td>
<td>X X - - - -</td>
<td>- - - - - - - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Community(ies)</td>
<td>X X X - - X</td>
<td>- - - - - - - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Decision</td>
<td>X X - - - -</td>
<td>- - - - - - - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Environment</td>
<td>X - - X</td>
<td>- - - - - - - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Partnerships</td>
<td>X - - - - - - - - - - -</td>
<td>- - - - - X - - - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Respect</td>
<td>- X - - - - - - - - - -</td>
<td>- - - - X - - - - - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Responsibilities</td>
<td>- X - - - - - - - - -</td>
<td>X - - - - - - - - - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Stakeholders</td>
<td>- - - - - - - X - -</td>
<td>- - - X - - - - - - -</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 11 – Word Utilization Inventory - Relations with Constituents Section**

*Note:* X represents unsolicited utilization of word  - - represents no utilization of word

When creating the word utilization inventory common words were not included (i.e. the, I, and, etc.) as the frequency of their use does not indicate any particular meaningful conclusion. Within the interview question Relations with Constituents, no words seemed to be utilized that had convergence between the two groups.

**Divergence – “Community”**

There was one word of divergence within this section. The word “community” along with the plural “communities” was utilized by four of the six academic administrators. None of the business background administrators utilized “community” or “communities”. The following demonstrate the usage of the word;

A1 Response:

“Once they get to the point that they understand the necessity, what it is going to do to advance the college, and the communities that
we serve, then they vote, they have the whole picture, no surprises, but then in the end, because they voted and they get to take the bows.”

A2 Response:
“In the community, often times I think, that while we still form committees and when I am dealing with areas CEOs, it is different. It is hard to describe. It is different when community leaders get together.”

A3 Response:
“On the credit side, it is all of a matter of what our faculty are willing to do, if there is something that needs to be done to meet a community or regional demand that we are not already doing.”

A6 Response:
“I think it is really important to be a good listener, to be a thoughtful and concerned member of the campus community and the external larger community. I think the role is different. I think the people of the community … see me as the administrator of the college here, which I am.”

The usage of the word “community” predominately refers to the community that is external to the college, specifically the role or involvement the college has in relation to the community.

**Developmental Education**

The transcribed interview responses for developmental education contained several words that are listed in Table 1. There is one word of convergence and three words of divergence.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word Utilization Inventory</th>
<th>Administrators with an Academic Background</th>
<th>Administrators with a Business Background</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A1  A2  A3  A4  A5  A6</td>
<td>B1  B2  B3  B4  B5  B6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Align</td>
<td>-    -    X  X  -</td>
<td>-    -    -    -    -    -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Assess</td>
<td>X    -    -    -    -    X</td>
<td>-    -    -    -    -    -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Balance</td>
<td>-    X    -    -    -    -</td>
<td>X    -    -    -    -    -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Challenges</td>
<td>-    -    X  X  X  -</td>
<td>-    -    -    -    -    -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Folks</td>
<td>-    X  X  X    -</td>
<td>-    -    -    -    -    -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Home</td>
<td>X    -    -    -    -    -</td>
<td>X    X    X    X    X    X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Involve</td>
<td>-    -    X    -    -    -</td>
<td>X    X    -    -    -    -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Outcomes</td>
<td>-    -    -    X  X    -</td>
<td>-    -    -    -    -    -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Placement</td>
<td>X  X    -    -    -    X</td>
<td>X    -    -    -    -    -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Prepare</td>
<td>-    X  -    X  -    X</td>
<td>-    -    -    -    -    -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Reason</td>
<td>-    -    X    X    -    -</td>
<td>X    -    -    -    -    -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Successful</td>
<td>-    -    X  X    -    -</td>
<td>-    -    X    -    X    -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Support</td>
<td>-    -    -    X    -    X</td>
<td>-    -    X    -    -    -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Test</td>
<td>X  X  X    X  X    X</td>
<td>X    X    -    -    -    -</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 12 – Word Utilization Inventory – Developmental Education Section

Note:  X represents unsolicited utilization of word  - represents no utilization of word

Convergence – “Test”

The word “test” was utilized by both groups. The following demonstrates the usage of the word “test”;

A1 Response:

“The real culprit is that the public schools K12 are in fact, the phrase the faculty use in schools use is that they are held hostage, that is the phrase they use, by what they just refer to the tests. … The test manufactures, this is a multibillion dollar industry. The college board and the rest of them obviously got to congress before we did, and convinced congress that the solution to accountability and making public education better… is testing. …They are teaching on that track because they are forced to do it, and they will tell you, we are teaching for the test.”

A2 Response:

“They are so use to taking multiple choice tests because of No Child Left Behind and some things the New York State Regents had put in place.”
A3 Response:

“... the focus on the test, the teaching to the test and all that ... that is the really bad part of No Child Left Behind and that is not good for preparing kids for college, where we do not do a lot of multiple choice tests. ... There is not a ton of route memorization in college, it is more critical thinking. And that is the problem with No Child Left Behind is it mitigates the pedagogy toward critical thinking, problem solving, and creativity and pushes toward a very finite these are the answers for the test. So, I think that is bad. That was just an awful part of No Child Left Behind and we are certainly paying a price for that. Now, the upside is that No Child Left Behind put a focus on kids that were otherwise marginalized in the past. ... I think it was a good thing to put a focus on all the kids across the board, rich or poor, black or white, No Child Left Behind did have that thrust to it and that was a good thing. ...”

A4 Response:

“The concept of No Child Left Behind is one thing. The process they put in place to support and implement it is another and as far as the process of looking at some restrictive testing as being measurement of success I do not think has been beneficial at all.”

A5 Response:

“So they come to us probably after a good twelve months, if not more, sixteen, eighteen months of not really having any work in Mathematics directly. Then we take them into a placement test to see if they are ready for college level Mathematics. They are rusty. They are out of shape. So, they are not ready in spite they have a high school diploma that somehow signifies they are ready to do something. ... The other piece tied to it is the emphasis that our K-12 colleagues have had placed upon them. They end up fundamentally teaching to the test, because their own performance is, either as individuals or schools or as school districts, based upon achievement on those nationally normed instruments. Are those the right instruments to give us a real look and a real understanding of their own student learning outcomes or is this because it is being driven externally through Albany or Washington? ... You teach to the test. That is good, but do you accomplish the learning goals that we want our students to have as they move from high school to college.”

A6 Response:

“We are too busy assessing, but we need to be learning. You need to be instructed and learn before you can be assessed. I think we need to do more project based learning, inquiry were students learn to have an idea about something and test it. The skills that they are still learning in the sciences, I think we need across the board. To have an idea, is it true is it not true, just because it is my opinion does not mean it is true.”
B1 Response:

“Certainly there are big disconnects between what we are teaching in the high schools and our placement tests. That is just a given. Frankly, this is the business side of me, I truly do not understand why this is so hard to fix. Why it takes so much politicking and so many people are so firmly dug in about how the Regents test have to stay the same and why the placement tests have to stay the same and this, that and the other thing.”

B3 Response:

“I think we miss the mark from the very way we just describe it, that we are developmentally educating. I think that is missing the target. I am totally, one hundred and seventy-five percent against having people of all ages, enter our walls and immediately test them and immediately talk about their deficiencies. … I just think we do it wrong and I think it has a dramatic impact on that person’s ability to succeed. I think that once we feel we have tested them and told them they are deficient, that part of the job then is to just send them off to these developmental education classes for them to get better. So we can test them again.”

B5 Response:

“The other thing that we did is our academic and workforce development center [that] is a licensed WorkKeys test site. … with our students, if they have developmental needs, in addition to working with our learning centers, writing centers, our math learning centers, et cetera.”

The use of the word “test” has been utilized by both groups referring to a method of evaluating the students. However, the word “test” is also used by academic administrators referring to the No Child Left Behind legislation. The business administrators did not seem to utilize the word “test” as a reference to the No Child Left Behind Legislation. The preponderance of academic administrators identifying the legislation was discovered in the issue inventory. While the utilization of the word “test” is classified as converging, the context in which the word is utilized is diverging. Since this analysis is simply determining
usage of the word the various contextual meanings are not considered.

Therefore the word “test” is considered converging.

**Divergence – “Challenge”**

The word “challenge(s)” has been used by academic administrators within the developmental education interview responses. The following demonstrates the usage of the word;

A3 Response:

“So, I think the culture of the U.S. having done so well, for so long, you can parallel it with GM, … you can parallel it with IBM in the eighties, our culture is a victim of its own success, in a very substantial way. … We did not have enough time we typically have had to make these economical and cultural adjustments. … [To combat developmental education, we need to] work more closely with the [K-12] schools. That brings challenges unto itself because the schools are such silos and are so tradition and rule bound. It is even harder for them to get past their traditions and rules, than it is for us as public colleges. … We need to get more involved with in the cradle to 12 and we are. We are in a big way … We need to do more with K-12. … I think No Child Left Behind has done some very good things, overall I do not think it was the best federal policy.”

A4 Response:

“I think, societally we are more challenged than ever. I think we have more and more students that have tremendous challenges to face everyday. In the K-12 environment, again in higher ed., but in K-12 there is a lot of students that have a lot of challenges they have to deal with.”

A5 Response:

“… One way that we are finding here … is by having our Math faculty members meet with their high school counter parts so they can learn from one another exactly what the challenges are that they face. They have a greater understanding of who is doing what and ultimately talk about curriculum alignment.”

Three of the six academic administrators utilize the word “challenge(s)”. The business administrators did not utilize this word within their responses to this
Divergence – “Folks”

The word “folks” was utilized by academic administrators when responding to the developmental education interview question. The following demonstrate the usage of the word;

A2 Response:
“National statistics would tell you, a third of the students graduating from high school are college ready. Those are the folks we are seeing.”

A3 Response:
“Our older adults who find themselves out of those traditional American blue collar or gold collar jobs that just do not exist anymore, are not willing to go back to school to retool… folks are not willing to get out there and retool themselves for the jobs that are out there. Because there are plenty of really good jobs out there that we and most community colleges in the country have academic programs for that you can get out and take those jobs. But, not enough folks are willing to come through, for whatever reason, and retool to get those jobs that are in high demand and pay reasonably well.”

A4 Response:
“It may provide some type of scale that folks can look at and use to try to get some sense of, according to that instrument, how they would perceive as school or students to be doing.”

Three of the six academic administrators utilized the word “folks”. The business administrators did not use this word when responding to the developmental interview question. There is a divergence between academic and business administrators with respect to the usage of the word “folks” within the response to developmental education.
**Divergence – “Prepare”**

The academic administrators utilized the word “prepare” when responding to the developmental education interview question. The following demonstrate the usage of the word;

A2 Response:

“We are seeing students under prepared in Math, English, Science, and Reading. That there level of comprehension and reasoning has dropped considerably as well. While community colleges are seeing more students with choice who could have gone anyplace, we are also seeing far more students then we use to, that just are not prepared.”

A4 Response:

“I do not know that the curriculums between K-12 and higher ed. are as well aligned as you would like to see them to be and starting to really prepare students for the differences in college versus their K-12 experience of what they are going to need to do in college to be successful.”

A6 Response:

“So that when a student has to prepare an essay, even if they have had high school instruction, they don’t necessarily have the habits of thoughtful reflection. And also, I think they don’t have the understanding of what it is to support an idea with evidence and facts.”

Three of the six academic administrators utilized the word “prepare” when responding to the developmental education interview question. There is a divergence between academic and business administrators with respect to the usage of the word “prepare” within the responses to the developmental education question.

**Student Demands**

The responses to the student demands interview question were reviewed. The utilization of the words were entered into Table 13.
The interview question regarding student demands did not yield responses utilizing any word demonstrating convergence or divergence. The responses to the student demands interview question were relatively short. The shortest response was by an academic administrator with only four rather long sentences. The longest response was by a business administrator with thirteen sentences. Overall, both groups were short direct responses.

**Expanding Revenue Streams**

The expanding revenue streams question specifically asked given the choice between a grant writer or fundraiser, which one would you choose. The interview responses were reviewed and Table 14 was created.
The expanding review streams interview question did not yield any word utilization by both groups. Therefore there is no convergence within this section of the interview responses.

**Divergence – “Funds/Funding”**

Within the interview responses for this section, all of the academic administrators utilized the word “funds” or “funding”. The following demonstrate the usage of the word “funds” or “funding”;

A1 Response:

“Take a very good look at our current **funding** structure, where we really need staff and where we could probably cut back a little.”

A2 Response:

“They need to be able to pursue government **funding**, wherever it is.”

---

**Table 14 – Word Utilization Inventory – Expanding Revenue Streams Section**

Note: X represents unsolicited utilization of word - represents no utilization of word

The expanding review streams interview question did not yield any word utilization by both groups. Therefore there is no convergence within this section of the interview responses.
A3 Response:
“The vast, 90% of the money is restricted by the donor, so it does not provide us much flexibility for operating funds during times like this. Whereas the grant funds … go direct to operations.”

A4 Response:
“The funds that you bring in can have a large impact on students that are in the pipeline with scholarships.”

A5 Response:
“It allows them to accomplish something that is tangible that they can put their mark on and say I helped to get that done. Or it is a more femoral things such as funding to help support student scholarships or particular programmatic type things.”

A6 Response:
“But if you have a fundraiser, and if they were fortunate to get unrestricted types of funds, and you can really target them and use them more efficiently for the things you need at the college. You can also start an endowment that will continue to pay dividends, you cannot do that with grant funds, once they are spent they are gone. So, in the long term of the health institution and the ability to do what you want to do, it would be sounder to raise funds, unrestricted funds than to go for grants.”

None of the business administrators utilized the word “funds” or “funding” within the response to this interview question. All of the academic administrators utilized the word “funds” or “funding”. There is complete divergence between academic and business administrators with respect to the utilization of the word “funds” or “funding” within the responses to expanding review streams.
Collegial Shared Governance

The words utilized within the collegial self governance interview question were used to create Table 1. Twenty two words are entered into the table but only five met the criteria to be classified as either converging or diverging.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word Utilization Inventory</th>
<th>Administrators with an Academic Background</th>
<th>Administrators with a Business Background</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A1  A2  A3  A4  A5  A6</td>
<td>B1  B2  B3  B4  B5  B6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Buy In</td>
<td>-     -     -     -     -     X</td>
<td>-     -     -     -     X     -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Campus</td>
<td>-     X     -     -     -     -</td>
<td>-     -     -     X     X     -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Committee</td>
<td>X     -     -     -     X     X</td>
<td>-     X     -     -     -     X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Deadline</td>
<td>-     -     -     X     -     -</td>
<td>-     -     -     X     -     -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 <strong>Decision</strong></td>
<td>-     X     X     -     X     -</td>
<td>X     X     X     X     X     X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Downside</td>
<td>-     -     X     -     -     -</td>
<td>-     -     -     -     -     -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Good</td>
<td>-     X     X     -     -     X</td>
<td>-     X     -     X     -     X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 <strong>Institution</strong></td>
<td>-     X     -     X     X     -</td>
<td>-     -     -     -     -     -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Issue</td>
<td>-     -     -     -     -     -</td>
<td>-     -     -     X     -     X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Mind/Remind/Mindset</td>
<td>-     X     -     -     -     -</td>
<td>-     -     -     X     X     X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Model</td>
<td>-     -     X     -     -     -</td>
<td>-     X     X     -     -     -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Operational</td>
<td>-     X     -     -     -     -</td>
<td>-     X     -     -     -     -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Opportunities</td>
<td>-     -     -     -     X     -</td>
<td>-     -     -     X     -     -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Organization</td>
<td>X     -     -     -     -     -</td>
<td>-     -     -     -     X     -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 <strong>Process</strong></td>
<td>-     -     -     -     X     X</td>
<td>X     -     X     X     X     X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Responsibilities</td>
<td>X     X     -     -     -     -</td>
<td>-     -     X     -     -     -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Serve</td>
<td>-     -     -     -     -     -</td>
<td>-     X     X     -     -     -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Supportive</td>
<td>-     -     X     -     -     -</td>
<td>-     -     -     X     X     -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 System</td>
<td>X     -     -     X     X     X</td>
<td>X     -     -     X     -     -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Timely</td>
<td>-     -     X     -     -     -</td>
<td>-     -     X     -     -     -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Value</td>
<td>-     -     -     -     X     X</td>
<td>X     X     -     -     -     -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 <strong>Work</strong></td>
<td>-     -     -     -     X     X</td>
<td>X     -     X     X     -     X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 15 - Word Utilization Inventory – Collegial Shared Governance Section**

**Note:** X represents unsolicited utilization of word  - represents no utilization of word

**Convergence – “Decision”**

The word “decision” was utilized by both academic and business administrators. The following demonstrates the usage of the word;

**A2 Response:**

“… if the **decision** made goes wrong, it is not the college senate’s picture in the paper, it is mine.”
A3 Response:
“So, when you get in tough times like these and major decisions need to be made fairly quickly and in order to keep the ship maintaining some forward momentum. Sometimes you have to make decisions very quickly and shared governance does not lend itself to that at all. … During bad times, it is 75% a blessing, it makes hard to make decisions in a timely fashion.”

A5 Response:
“Those are important pieces, that for people outside of academia where business environment decisions maybe made and people given assignments and direction, this is what we are doing. … I am thinking, decisions about curriculum and the role of a Curriculum committee to ensure that whatever is dealt with be it modification of a grading system or a proposal of a new course, or design of a new degree program, whatever it is, that there has been participation throughout the institution. … I think from that shared governance approach comes better decision making because you got more eyes and more brains that are looking at it, working on it. It allows us to avoid that situation where maybe a person or a small group of people end up making decision based upon information that may or may not be complete and may or may not be accurate.”

B1 Response:
“I will say that over the years I have come to really value it because of the richness it brings to the decision making process, to have ways for different people to express their opinions, to try to diffuse this idea that all decisions are made at the top.“

B2 Response:
“I like to make my own decisions and move quickly but I see how it fits into the academic model.”

B3 Response:
“I think it is a nice concept, as long as it does not hinder those parties responsible from making timely decisions.”

B4 Response:
“I think the shared governance drives overall better decisions. I truly believe that the more minds you put to it, the better your decisions are going to be. The concern is that you can still get good decisions with the less governance piece. But it is the time sensitivity of those decisions with the shared governance, I think that is the only downfall of the shared governance, is time sensitivity. Because when you have such a large group, it takes a lot of time for those decisions to be made.”
B5 Response:
“Compared to what I do in the work force, decisions are made far more quickly.”

Three academic and five business administrators utilized the word “decision”. At least fifty percent of both groups used the word “decision”. Therefore there is convergence between the two groups with relation to the utilization of the word “decisions” within the responses to the collegial shared governance interview question.

Convergence – “Good”

Both academic and business administrators utilized the word “good”. The following demonstrates the usage of the word;

A2 Response:
“I think it is good to have shared governance on a college campus. … You cannot rely on one person, the president, to have all of the good ideas of where things should go.”

A3 Response:
“So that is the downside, during good times, shared governance is 98% a blessing. During bad times, it is 75% a blessing, it makes hard to make decisions in a timely fashion.”

A6 Response:
“Sometimes an administrator might think this is a really good idea, even faculty agree it’s a great idea, but once it goes to a committee, it takes forever. That being said, I think it makes the administrative job so much easier to have governance, because then you have buy in on ideas. You also have the benefit of really good ideas from people, from your perspective you might not have seen, and coming from the faculty, I see sometimes I come up with an idea or have a reaction and one of my colleagues in administration will say oh, you are still a faculty member, you cannot take the faculty member out…but they are lucky I am at the table.”
B2 Response:
“Because I did come from a private sector background … I like to do things fast and accomplish things fast. And I am not real good with shared governance.”

B4 Response:
“The concern is that you can still get good decisions with the less governance piece. … Will people support or not, so you could have put yourself back 60 days if your explanation was not good or sub par at senate.”

B6 Response:
“I do not think it is working good at all. I think it is something that could work.”

Both academic and business administrators had three of six that utilized the word “good” within their response to the collegial shared governance interview question. The two groups converge with respects to the utilization of the word “good”.

It should also be noted that some of the responses negated the word “good” with not. One could argue the negated “good” utilization should not be counted within this context. However, one could argue the word “good” was utilized being negated when the response could have utilized different words or wording. For example the response from respondent B4 stated “…if your explanation was not good or subpar…” could have been “… if your explanation was bad or subpar …”. Therefore, I would argue to include the negated usage of the word “good” within this analysis.
Divergence – “Institution”

The academic administrators utilized the word “institution” when responding to the collegial shared governance “interview” question. The following demonstrate the usage of the word;

A2 Response:

“The administration still has primary responsibility for the operation of the institution. … while I think shared governance is important, and I think that kind of dialog is important, it is the administration that is held responsible for the operation of the institution.”

A4 Response:

“So, to build mechanisms where all those folks can contribute to the betterment of the institution, I think, is a valuable experience.”

A5 Response:

“I am thinking, decisions about curriculum and the role of a Curriculum committee to ensure that whatever is dealt with be it modification of a grading system or a proposal of a new course, or design of a new degree program, whatever it is, that there has been participation throughout the institution.”

Three of the six academic administrators utilized the word “institution” within their responses to the collegial shared governance interview question.

Business administrators did not utilized “institution” within their response to the collegial shared governance interview question. Therefore there is a divergence between academic and business administrators with respect to the utilization of “institution” within the collegial shared governance interview question.
Divergence – “Process”

The word “process” was utilized by business administrators fifty percent more than by academic administrators. The following demonstrate the utilization of the word “process”;

A5 Response:

“They [faculty members] want to know why. They want to know are there more options. What have we looked at? What is the process? What kind of input? What kind of discussion has there been? …People do not necessarily understand the process orientation that we deal with as a part of shared governance. … But I think in the end it is a better process.”

B1 Response:

“I will say that over the years I have come to really value it because of the richness it brings to the decision making process, to have ways for different people to express their opinions, to try to diffuse this idea that all decisions are made at the top.”

B3 Response:

“How do we work together in knowing we each have those responsibilities in way that keeps all parties involved in the process?”

B4 Response:

“When you see an opportunity in the market and one of your divisions are ready to hit the ground running with this, the whole academic process takes probably 90 days to get off campus.”

B5 Response:

“You cannot just put a sign, don’t smoke within fifty feet of a building. So, it was more realizing it is a slower process, culturally, to get buy in even in our governing system.”

Only one of the six academic administrators utilized the word “process”.

Four of the six business administrators utilized the word “process”. Since there are fifty percent more business administrators utilizing the word over academic administrators, a divergence is occurring with respects to the word “process” within the responses to the collegial shared governance interview question.
Divergence – “Work”

The word “work” was utilized by business administrators fifty percent more so than academic administrators. The following demonstrate the word utilization;

A5 Response:
“...To be able to work through items in a way that will be productive. ... I think from that shared governance approach comes better decision making because you got more eyes and more brains that are looking at it, working on it.”

B1 Response:
“When I went to ... [college name omitted] from the outside [business] world, this whole [community college] world of shared governance was tough for me to get, to really understand it, to figure out how to work in it. It is such a contrary thing to the business world. It just kind of smacks you upside your face about how does this [shared governance] thing works. ... Now, I cannot imagine working without a shared governance system. ... It is a very, very difficult thing [shared governance] for somebody who comes in ... as a new senior leader ... to understand what it is and how it works.”

B3 Response:
“How do we work together in knowing we each have those responsibilities in way that keeps all parties involved in the process? ... I think the model works.”

B5 Response:
“Compared to what I do in the work force, decisions are made far more quickly.”

B6 Response:
“I do not think it is working good at all. I think it is something that could work. ... Maybe that works in a search committee, but it does not work in these governance committees."

The utilization of the word “work” was a questionable one to include.

Since the response given by a business administrator (B5) refers to “work force” and not just “work” the intent of the utilization of the word is different. However, the word was used, therefore included. With the inclusion of B5’s response,
business administrators have utilized the word “work” fifty percent more than academic administrators. Thus, there is a divergence with the utilization of the word “work” with respects to the collegial shared governance interview question.

**Aging Faculty**

The results of reviewing the responses to the aging faculty interview question were utilized to create Table 16.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word Utilization Inventory</th>
<th>Administrators with an Academic Background</th>
<th>Administrators with a Business Background</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A1  A2  A3  A4  A5  A6</td>
<td>B1  B2  B3  B4  B5  B6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Culture</td>
<td>X    -    X    -    -    X</td>
<td>-    -    -    -    -    -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Experience</td>
<td>-    -    -    X    -    X</td>
<td>X    X    X    X    X    -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Institution</td>
<td>X    X    X    X    X</td>
<td>-    -    -    X    -    -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Memory</td>
<td>X    -    -    X    -    X</td>
<td>-    -    -    -    -    -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Organization</td>
<td>X    -    -    -    X</td>
<td>-    -    -    -    -    X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Opportunities</td>
<td>X    -    -    -    -    -</td>
<td>-    -    -    X    X    -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Program</td>
<td>-    -    -    -    -    -</td>
<td>-    -    X    X    X    -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Retire</td>
<td>-    -    -    X    X</td>
<td>X    X    X    -    X    X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Risk</td>
<td>-    -    -    X    -    -</td>
<td>-    -    X    -    -    -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Senior</td>
<td>-    -    X    -    -    -</td>
<td>X    -    -    X    -    -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Successful</td>
<td>-    -    -    X    -    -</td>
<td>-    -    -    -    -    X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Succession Plan</td>
<td>-    -    X    -    -    -</td>
<td>-    -    -    -    -    X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 16 - Word Utilization Inventory – Aging Faculty Section**

*Note:* X represents unsolicited utilization of word  - represents no utilization of word

There were no words within the responses to the aging faculty interview question that were utilized by fifty percent of both groups. Therefore no words within the aging faculty interview question responses converged.

**Divergence – “Culture”**

The word “culture” was utilized by academic administrators when responding to the aging faculty interview question. The following demonstrates the word utilization;
A1 Response:
“The real advantage is that the culture of the college changes. … I think the trick is to keep those elements of the culture of the college that are really important intact forever.”

A3 Response:
“You lose the really good ones that have an excellent influence on the culture…”

A6 Response:
“But I think the history and culture of an institution is important to preserve. … you lose a lot all at once of that commitment, history, cultural memory, etcetera.”

Three of the six academic administrators utilized the word “culture” within their response to the aging faculty interview question. The fifty percent of the academic administrators utilizing the word “culture” is a divergence between the two groups with respects to the aging faculty interview question.

Divergence – “Experience”

The word “experience” was utilized within the responses to the aging faculty interview question. The following demonstrate the utilization of the word;

A5 Response:
“In many cases we continue to have the benefit of their years of experience.”

B1 Response:
“I’m interested in ways to keep a good mix of faculty on campus so that we get experience along with outside new ideas.”

B2 Response:
“As I am getting closer to retirement, I think wow, some of the younger people on campus don’t have enough experience.”

B3 Response:
“… the value of experience. There is no credential, there is no degree, that replaces the value of experience that people go through in
life. ... An older faculty member with more experience has an awful lot to bring to the table. ... Retirement of those older faculty, while I am sure at higher pay grades, allows for us to continue bring new and more experienced people into the programs. There is still the risk that great breadth of experience in the classroom or maybe writing papers or doing other things, we are going to be missing."

B4 Response:

“But that cost savings comes at a huge loss to the institution, about institutional knowledge, institutional experience.”

B5 Response:

“I believe succession planning is having organizationally, the building blocks as an employee develops, that they then have the opportunity to have programs or professional development that helps them have the skills and experience to do the jobs or projects the college needs at anytime.”

While only one academic administrator utilized the word “experience”, it was utilized by five of the six business administrators. With an eighty three percent utilization of the business administrators, which is sixty seven percent more than academic administrators there is a divergence with respect to the usage of the word “experience” within the responses to the aging faculty interview question.

Divergence – “Institution”

The word “institution” was utilized within the responses to the aging faculty interview question. The following demonstrate the utilization of the word;

A1 Response:

“For the most part, retiring faculty take with them institutional memory that no one else has, by the way that is not just college, that is everyone, all organization on the planet go through that.”
A2 Response:
“… dedication was very strong. Dedication to the students, to the institution… it was there life.”

A4 Response:
“If you have been a successful institution, I think it puts your institution at risk of diminishing some of the, at least short term, quality that maybe you enjoyed. Your institutional memory is very important and I think there are a lot of community colleges, to some degree, that have been in exactly that situation because of the timing of when most of the SUNY community colleges opened. Because of how some of the recruiting of faculty in those institutions was done, we are at a point where the aging out of long term faculty. … And try to pass on some of the institutional knowledge.”

A5 Response:
“[With retiring faculty] Certainly that sense of history and institutional capacity, we lose that.”

A6 Response:
“But I think the history and culture of an institution is important to preserve. … you lose a lot all at once of that commitment, history, cultural memory, et cetera. … So many of them will be willing and they love this place and that is true at any institution.”

B4 Response:
“But that cost savings comes at a huge loss to the institution, about institutional knowledge, institutional experience. … Unless you have a strong mentoring program, on your overall institution it is probably going to be a negative to lose all those people.”

Five of the six academic administrators utilized the word “institution” while only one of the six business administrators utilized the word “institution”. With there being sixty seven percent more academic administrators over business administrators utilizing the word “institution”, divergence is occurring with respects to the aging faculty interview question responses.
Divergence – “Memory”

The word “memory” was utilized within the response to the aging faculty interview question. The following demonstrate the word utilization;

A1 Response:
“For the most part, retiring faculty take with them institutional memory that no one else has, by the way that is not just college, that is everyone, all organization on the planet go through that.”

A4 Response:
“Your institutional memory is very important and I think there are a lot of community colleges, to some degree, that have been in exactly that situation because of the timing of when most of the SUNY community colleges opened.”

A6 Response:
“But I think the history and culture of an institution is important to preserve. … you lose a lot all at once of that commitment, history, cultural memory, et cetera.

Three of the six academic administrators utilized the word “memory” in their response to the aging faculty interview question. Fifty percent of the academic administrators and none of the business administrators utilized the word “memory”. Therefore divergence between the utilization of the word “memory” exists between academic and business administrators within the response to the aging faculty interview question.

Divergence – “Program”

The word “program” was utilized within the response to the aging faculty interview question. The following demonstrate the utilization of the word;
B3 Response:
“Retirement of those older faculty, while I am sure at higher pay grades, allows for us to continue bring new and more experienced people into the programs.”

B4 Response:
“Unless you have a strong mentoring program, on your overall institution it is probably going to be a negative to lose all those people.”

B5 Response:
“I believe succession planning is having organizationally, the building blocks as an employee develops, that they then have the opportunity to have programs or professional development that helps them have the skills and experience to do the jobs or projects the college needs at anytime.”

Three of the business administrators utilized the word “program” within their response to the aging faculty interview question. Fifty percent of the business administrators demonstrate a divergence from academic administrators with respect to the utilization of the word “program” in the responses to the aging faculty interview question.

**Divergence – “Retire”**

The word “retire” was utilized within the responses to the aging faculty interview question. The following demonstrate the word utilization;

A5 Response:
“Because for many of them who retire, it is not retire and gone, playing golf for the rest of my life and move to Florida and I never want to hear from you again.”

A6 Response:
“So how you turn it into a more positive and this is something I think we can do better at, is to not just wave goodbye to the retirement people, but to engage them and ask them to be involved in mentoring new faculty and serving on some committees, helping with special projects.”
B1 Response:
“We have an incentive for faculty to retire at age 55. I hate it because it encourages our most senior people to leave.”

B2 Response:
“As I am getting closer to retirement, I think wow, some of the younger people on campus don’t have enough experience.”

B3 Response:
“Retirement of those older faculty, while I am sure at higher pay grades, allows for us to continue bring new and more experienced people into the programs.”

B5 Response:
“Figures indicate that in the next five years, twenty nine percent of all of our faculty in higher ed. are going to retire. … So, say we have twenty faculty who are deciding now they are going to retire.”

B6 Response:
“I have been able to force is early retirement, early retirement buyouts.”

Two of the six academic administrators and five of the business administrators utilized the word “retire”. Business administrators have fifty percent more word utilization with the responses to the aging faculty interview question. This demonstrates a divergence between academic and business administrators.

Business Vs. Academia

The closing conversation with the respondents was reviewed. Table 17 was created from the responses given by the administrators. There were many words that were included within the table that did not meet the criteria of either converging or diverging.
Table 17 - Word Utilization Inventory – Business vs. Academia Section

Note: X represents unsolicited utilization of word - represents no utilization of word

Convergence – “Work”

The word “work” was utilized within the responses to the closing interview question. The following demonstrate the utilization of the word “work”;
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A2 Response:
“Let me give you an example, … as we were working for area businesses, we would put together programs and we would charge the business for them. … In business there is an 80/20 rule. If you are 80% sure this will work, you should go for it.”

A3 Response:
“Most of the business people I deal with have gone through K-12 and college so they have some knowledge of how a college works. … I have had occasions that I had to educate business people and political people in how the university actually works and have had some dicey moments. … That we cannot make an academic program work the way they would like it.”

A4 Response:
“I have worked with some folks over the years. … You have to work with people that were part of the process to make sure they understood.”

B1 Response:
“The whole nature of our labor contracts, the value of continuing appointment, faculty workloads, etc. all are alien to a business leader, not to mention running programs that cost more than they bring in because they meet a community need.”

B2 Response:
“I am like, what, how does this work? … When I worked at [organization omitted], if I wanted to do a community event or community meeting, … I really had to work at patience. … They have probably worked in the business sector, and they know what responsiveness means … But in the public sector, people could work for years.”

B4 Response:
“You can change a job, but you work in a certain way and it is tough to change how you work. … It has been tough for me to change how I work. I want to get things done. That is what gives me satisfaction in my position to get things done. So that is still how I work. … I worked in a very fast paced, very transaction based organization…”

B5 Response:
“We designed late starting courses, because it was a timing issue, and then we worked together to design courses that actually began after the semester began, which is almost unheard of, that you are going to do a semester within a semester. But we were able to then help over six hundred individuals get enrolled in the college and that required a coordinated effort, with your advising, with your faculty, with your senior
administration, with the company, and the workers. … If I wanted to go out now and say to quite a few of the faculty would you teach this for me at eleven o’clock at night because there is a second shift of workers that need this. I might find a couple people willing to do this, but more times than not, once you get into evenings and weekends, then it is more difficult to find faculty who want to work and teach those hours. … My daughter-in law works for a company and has over two hundred and fifty employees all over the world. I have often asked her how do you manage and get business done when, one you have to fly to all of these countries and you rarely face to face ever see your employees? How do you evaluate their work? … I look at the difference between how that [business] operates and how we [community colleges] operate and how from a business perspective, if you look at quality, measuring outcomes, knowing who your top performers are, and what we have said is many times it ends up and works the reverse.”

B6 Response:

“I want to do the work that the people who report to me do as well as lead the team and that has always worked for me.”

Three academic administrators and four business administrators utilized the word “work”. While the response of B1 was flagged by the computer program as having “work”, it was specifically “workload” and therefore not included within this analysis. The exclusion or inclusion of B1’s response does not change the classification outcome. Since both groups have utilized the word “work” fifty percent or more the academic and business administrators converge with respect to the closing interview question.

Divergence – “Academic”

The word “academic” was utilized within the responses of the last interview question. The following demonstrate the word utilization;
A1 Response:

“I slant toward the academic side, but learn the best, take the best practices from the business community, the private sector and apply it.”

A2 Response:

“When you see someone with a business background and you see someone with a pure academic background, and I do not just mean administrators, I have seen business faculty talking to academic faculty and thinking are you kidding me, it is not right or wrong, it is just different perspectives, seeing things differently.”

A3 Response:

“That we cannot make an academic program work the way they would like it. …Because the faculty just cannot see themselves stretching their academic paradigm that far to do what the business wants.”

A4 Response:

“There was a considerable amount of time that was spent not only creating buy in and understanding with academic area as to why we had to reduce credit hours.”

B1 Response:

“I think part of it is that he was an academic and I am not. … I find that people from the business sector have many different perceptions of academic leaders.”

Four of the six academic administrators and one of the six business administrators utilized the word “academic”. The academic administrators utilized the word “academic” fifty percent more than the business administrators. Therefore a divergence exists with respect to the utilization of the word “academic” within the last interview question responses.

**Divergence – “Job”**

The word “job” was utilized within the last interview question. The following demonstrates the word utilization;
B4 Response:
“You can change a job, but you work in a certain way and it is tough to change how you work.

B5 Response:
“We had a company here in our region and the plant shut down due to trade effected issues where many of the jobs were going overseas. There were eleven hundred individuals that were losing their jobs and they needed career retooling.

B6 Response:
“The situations that caused me to feel that way, of course I love my job here, but obviously in frustration mode, you tend to think things you really do not want to act upon, but what happened was everyone needed to come to me. … and explain what they do, explain the history, what happened ten, twenty years ago. … I need to be managing, I need to be following up on a project, meeting with administration on future projects, making sure that the shop is well oiled, fine tuned, lean, that the people are doing not just a good job but an efficient job. … At my last job, the title itself gave me respect. Here you need to earn it, not just the title. …[In prior business role] they were so intimidated with me … there was intimidation there that if you do not do a good job, you are out of here. … There are consequences to your actions. You have to act a certain way. Not only do your job, you have to act accordingly.”

Three of the six business administrators utilized the word “job” within their responses to the last interview question. Therefore a divergence exists with respect to the utilization of the word “job” within the responses of the last interview question.

Divergence – “Market”

The word “market” was utilized within the responses of the last interview question. The following demonstrate the word utilization;

B3 Response:
“Whether it be time to market, time to get your product delivered, et cetera. I think that is probably the biggest distinction. … I guess my analogy would be a marketing executive in business needs to take into
consideration in making his or her decision particular topic how it impacts production, how it impacts administration, et cetera, et cetera. ... Your financial people would be there, your marketing, production, you know we all

B4 Response:

"That is kind of the way of this market. This market is not quite as fast as the business market."

B5 Response:

“So, speed to market is an issue, where I find, we are constantly, here that one of the concerns business industry says about academia is we are very slow in turning around products and services and we are. ... So that speed to market is one area that I see a big difference. I think we are getting better. ... I have not run into a lot of resistance. But I do know there is a disconnect, sometimes, in a sense of urgency, speed to market. That is probably the biggest area, and delivering our products differently. ... Oh well, there is frustration everyday in the sense of speed to market issues.

Three of the six business administrators utilized the work “market”. The utilization of the word “market” demonstrates a divergence between academic and business administrators with respect to the last interview question.

Divergence – “Meeting”

The word “meeting” was utilized within the responses of the last interview question. The following demonstrates the utilization of the word “meeting”;

B2 Response:

"My first thought was I can not believe I have to call everybody before I can even setup a meeting. I cannot believe I have to call a meeting to have a meeting. ... That was a shock to me. It happened the first or second week I was here. I called a meeting of people together and said please come, we are meeting on such and such, ... if you cannot come please send a designee. And somebody called my boss and said who does she think she is calling a meeting. ... And my boss said, oh you have to query everyone first to see when everyone is available and then put a meeting together from that. And, I am, like, you have got to be kidding me."
B3 Response:
“Program review would have been an emergency meeting in the board room.”

B5 Response:
“We were in a community strategic meeting and we have business leaders there and one of the questions was; “How do we know we are meeting business and industry needs?”

B6 Response:
“I need to be managing, I need to be following up on a project, meeting with administration on future projects, making sure that the shop is well oiled, fine tuned, lean, that the people are doing not just a good job but an efficient job.”

Four of the six business administrators utilized the word “meeting”. This demonstrates a divergence between academic and business administrators with respect to the usage of the word “meeting” within the last interview question.

**Word Utilization Inventory Divergent and Convergent**

The word utilization inventories of each section were then collated to create Table 18. This table shows all of the divergent and convergent words used by both academic and business administrators. There are only four words among the two groups that converged, which are Decision, Good, Test, and Work. It should also be noted that the word Work that converged in the last interview question did not converge in the developmental education interview question.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interview Section</th>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Academic Administrators</th>
<th>Business Administrators</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Business vs. Academia</td>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Developmental Education</td>
<td>Challenges</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Relations with Constituents</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Aging Faculty</td>
<td>Culture</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Collegial Shared Governance</td>
<td>Decision</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Aging Faculty</td>
<td>Experience</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Expanding Revenue Streams</td>
<td>Funds(ing)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Developmental Education</td>
<td>Folks</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Collegial Shared Governance</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Aging Faculty</td>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Collegial Shared Governance</td>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Business vs. Academia</td>
<td>Job</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Business vs. Academia</td>
<td>Market</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Business vs. Academia</td>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Aging Faculty</td>
<td>Memory</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Collegial Shared Governance</td>
<td>Process</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Aging Faculty</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Developmental Education</td>
<td>Prepare</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Aging Faculty</td>
<td>Retire</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Developmental Education</td>
<td>Test</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Business vs. Academia</td>
<td>Work</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Collegial Shared Governance</td>
<td>Work</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 18 – Word Utilization Inventory – Divergent and Convergent Words
The word utilization that did not converge entailed seventeen words. Nine words were utilized by academic administrators and eight were utilized by business administrators. Nine and eight are relatively comparable, that is, the academic administrators only utilized one word more that diverged than business administrators. There is not a significant deviation between the amounts of words utilized by the two groups.

The actual words utilized seem to present a certain thought pattern. Consider the diverging words that were utilized below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Administrators</th>
<th>Business Administrators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>Experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenges</td>
<td>Job</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture</td>
<td>Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funds/Funding</td>
<td>Process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folks</td>
<td>Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>Retire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memory</td>
<td>Work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepare</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The pattern of words utilized by the academic administrators seems to present a certain framing of thought. For example the use of the word “Academic” has a connotation of study. The word “Challenges” presents the connotation of opportunity and engaging. The definition of the word “Funds” is money for a purpose. The word “Prepare” presents the connotation of looking forward to be ready for what is about to be. All of these words together seem to create a forward thinking frame.

The words utilized by the business administrators do not seem to present this same framing of thought. The business administrators utilize words such as “Job” and “Work”. These words give a connotation of being forced to produce
outcomes. The words such as “Process” and “Program” give the connotation of performing systematically to meet some end. The utilization of the word “Experience” seems to use the past for current practice. The business administrators refer to “Market” where the academic administrators seem to refer to “Community”. The business administrators seem to frame their thoughts in terms of responsive action. The utilization of these words seem to present a feeling that the business administrators have inherited problems and it is their “Job” or “Work” to “Process” and “Program” to respond based upon their “Experience”.

The variance in utilized words demonstrates a difference between the two groups based upon their professional background. While the variances in word utilization are interesting and do demonstrate a certain amount of selectiveness, the variances in word utilization cannot be ruled out as being culturally or locality biased occurrences. Therefore, the word utilization inventory is offered here within the Appendix as additional information and not considered overly significant to the study.
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