AN ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE STUDY OF MISSOURI STATE UNIVERSITY

FACULTY/STAFF IN RELATION TO THE UNIVERSITY'S

PUBLIC AFFAIRS MISSION

_____

A Dissertation presented to

The Faculty of the Graduate School

at the University of Missouri-Columbia

_____

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Doctor of Education

_____

by

Marissa LeClaire Weaver

Dr. Robert Watson, Dissertation Supervisor

JULY 2012

DEDICATION

In honor of:

All of the educators in my life.

My husband Jason Weaver, who is always there for me no matter what

and makes my life better every day.

My mother Dianne Diamond, who has also been my biggest fan

and cheered me on to the finish line.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF FIGURES

AN ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE STUDY OF MISSOURI STATE UNIVERSITY

FACULTY/STAFF IN RELATION TO THE UNIVERSITY'S

PUBLIC AFFAIRS MISSION

By:

Marissa LeClaire Weaver

Dr. Robert Watson, Dissertation Supervisor

ABSTRACT

The purpose of the study was to address a problem of practice of the public affairs mission through the perceptions of faculty and staff members at Missouri State University of the University's organizational culture. The design included a phenomenological study with a set of organizational culture procedural questions related to the perceptions and behavior of the faculty and staff members at MSU. This study took the three pillars (community engagement, cultural competence, and ethical leadership) of the public affairs mission at MSU and examined how faculty and staff members' perceptions of MSU leaders compared with the embedding mechanisms (Schein, 2010) that influence organizational culture. Schein's (2010) six primary embedding mechanisms: (a) What Leaders Pay Attention to, Measure, and Control, (b) Reaction to Organizational Crises, (c) Role Modeling, (d) How Resources are Allocated, (e) Allocation of Rewards, and (f) Recruitment, Selection and Dismissal shaped questions for the participants.

The methods for the research included both interviews of leaders within the organization and focus groups with Missouri State University faculty (tenured and non-

tenured) and staff members from two of the main areas of the university. The intent was to have the faculty and staff members describe their points of view of the organizational culture at the university (Mertens, 2005).

The findings for the first pillar, community engagement did not reflect a significant connection to any of the embedding mechanisms. Faculty and staff could give specific examples of how it was implemented across campus when asked directly about community engagement though. The cultural competence component of the public affairs mission, had limited connections. The answers in general to the specific questions regarding the six embedding mechanisms rarely directly connected with the pillar cultural competence, except for (f) Recruitment, Selection and Dismissal. The Diversity Hiring Process was mentioned in 40% of the leader interviews. The embedding mechanism (a) What Leaders Pay Attention to, Measure, and Control demonstrated the most common themes of being a role model for ethical leadership (40%) and demonstrating transparency (40%) were noted most important for how our leaders should demonstrate it in their behavior. Demonstrating transparency was also mentioned (b) Reaction to Organizational Crises in regards to the sharing information in both the University Administrators Resigning and the Financial Uncertainty.

Implications for practice can provide insight for further work on how to integrate the public affairs mission more effectively into the organization. Given the importance the university has placed on the public affairs mission, how are the embedding mechanisms in MSU's culture reflective of the mission should be a question the MSU leaders ask themselves.

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY

Background

In a time of evolving economic realities, public colleges and universities are being challenged to reflect a new way of doing business. From budget cuts to more educational competitors, doing things the way they have always been done will no longer be possible. Rising college costs have made institutional effectiveness and performance prominent issues for the general public (Fugazzotto, 2009). Colleges and universities are under pressure to determine out what contributes to their culture as an organization and how to improve. Developing an understanding of organizational culture in higher education has increased dramatically over the last few decades (Knight & Trowler, 2000). University administrators are learning that leaders need to be conscious of the culture or the culture will manage them (Schein, 2005). To best understand the culture of an organization, one must learn the "shared assumptions of individuals participating in the organization" (Tierney, 1988, p. 4).

The analysis of a university's organizational culture is essential to maintain the balance between its values and the behavior of its members (Folch & Ion, 2009). "An organization's culture is reflected in what is done, how it is done and who is involved in doing it. Its culture concerns decisions, actions, and communication both on an instrumental and symbolic level" (Tierney, 1988, p. 3). The faculty and staff members are instrumental at any institution, they greatly affect the organizational culture, and they are pivotal to influencing organizational change (Tierney, 1998). Understanding faculty/staff

involvement in campus decisions and how much they influence the culture and climate on campus are more important than ever (Nadler, Miller, & Modica, 2010).

To understand the organizational culture of a university, the mission must also be understood. "Mission statements dictate the core activities of an organization" (Fugazzotto, 2009, p. 285). Understanding how both the culture of the university and the mission of the university come together provides a rich description of the culture of the organization (Thorton & Jaeger, 2007). The question of "how things are done around here" (Tierney, 1988, p. 3) becomes important for both internal and external stakeholders of the organization, especially in times of financial uncertainty.

Missouri State University (MSU) is a public, comprehensive university system with a mission in public affairs, whose purpose is to develop educated persons. In 1995, Senate Bill 340 gave MSU a statewide mission in public affairs. MSU identifies this mission as a way to define how an education from the institution is different from that of other universities (MSU, 2011a). For many years, the mission has been summarized as follows: *"The University's identity is distinguished by its statewide mission in public affairs, requiring a campus-wide commitment to foster competence and responsibility in the common vocation of citizenship"* (MSU, 2011b).

In 2007, the University's public affairs mission was better defined by including three components: (a) community engagement, (b) cultural competence, and (c) ethical leadership. As MSU continues to integrate the public affairs mission into the curriculum by expecting every major to offer an intensive focus on public affairs and staff goals are measured by learning outcomes tied to the mission, it is important to research faculty and staff members' perceptions of the MSU organizational culture related to the mission.

Currently there are no comprehensive assessment tools to evaluate this major focus for the University.

Despite the fact that most colleges and universities have mission statements, there are very few studies that examine the relationship of the mission statement and culture of the university through the perceptions of faculty and staff members. This study took the three pillars (community engagement, cultural competence, and ethical leadership) of the public affairs mission at MSU and examined how faculty and staff members' perceptions of MSU leaders compared with the embedding mechanisms (Schein, 2010) that influence organizational culture. The six primary embedding mechanisms are: (a) What Leaders Pay Attention to, Measure, and Control, (b) Reaction to Organizational Crises, (c) Role Modeling, (d) How Resources are Allocated, (e) Allocation of Rewards, and (f) Recruitment, Selection and Dismissal.

Conceptual Underpinnings for the Study

Despite the fact that most colleges and universities have mission statements, there are very few studies that examine the relationship of the mission statement and culture of the university through the perceptions of faculty and staff members. This study took the three pillars (community engagement, cultural competence, and ethical leadership) of the public affairs mission at MSU and examined how faculty and staff members' perceptions compared with the embedding mechanisms (Schein, 2010) that influence organizational culture. This study utilized the transformational leadership theory (Burns, 1978) and Schein's embedding mechanisms (2010) to provide the conceptual underpinnings for the study while using a constructivist approach.

The theoretical framework used for this study was a constructivist approach. The constructivist research paradigm is most closely associated with qualitative methods and is defined by the ontological perspective of the existence of one knowable reality (Mertens, 2005). The constructivist axiology is value-ended in the sense the researcher seeks to better understand and get along in the social world. Therefore, reality can only be discovered by piecing together the interpretations of multiple individuals. In an effort to do this accurately, the researcher took into account both the researcher's perspectives and the research subjects. The researcher looked for complexity of viewpoints in light of the research questions, which provided a better understanding of the perceptions of the organizational culture by faculty and staff members at MSU (Creswell, 2007).

Transformational Leadership

Transformational leadership, a post industrial leadership theory (Komives, Owen, Slack & Wagner, 2011), is aimed at leadership being collaborative to create change for the common good (Northouse, 2010). James MacGregor Burns, in his influential book *Leadership* (1978) presented this concept of leadership as a values-based process between both the leader and follower. He distinguished between transforming (i.e., mutually beneficial processes) and transactional (i.e., exchanged-based processes) leadership (Komives et al., 2011). Burns's philosophy emphasized the role of the positional leader as someone who empowered those around him or her to also become leaders. This included being concerned about the follower's needs and developing shared goals. MSU is a public university and this leadership theory aligns with the approach educators may take with students to create civically minded students. "In a highly innovative and satisfying organizational culture, we are likely to see transformational

leaders who build assumptions on such as: people are trustworthy and purposeful; everyone has a unique contribution to make; complex problems are handled at the lowest level possible." (Bass & Avolio, 1993, p.113)

In his book *Leadership in Organizations,* Yukl (2006) compared and contrasted transformational and charismatic leadership to show how the situational variables may increase the likelihood that transformational leadership will occur or may enhance the effect of such leadership on followers. Yukl suggested transformational leadership is likely to be more important in a dynamic, unstable environment that increases the need for change, and such leadership is more likely when leaders are empowered and encouraged to be flexible and innovative. Higher education has regularly been presented a dynamic environment that is changing constantly.

Transformational leadership theory (Burns, 1978) complements the public affairs mission at MSU by providing a practical way for both the follower and leader to approach the process together. Utilizing the transformational leadership theory through the public affairs mission keeps educators grounded in the leadership process yet focused on the educational purpose. This theory can help leaders acknowledge the politics surrounding the issue while finding a shared reason to work together. Transformational leadership encourages university leaders to provide an environment where others feel empowered and encouraged to be flexible and innovative to deal with the inevitable conflict. People want to find a shared goal for the common good, especially when the expectation is given to them.

With the mission in public affairs, all of MSU's goals should tie back to the University mission which gives each department a shared interest. "Within formal

organizations, norms and expectations develop that make the exercise of influence expected and accepted. Thus, the social control of one's behavior by others becomes an expected part of organizational life" (Pfeffer, 1981, p. 291). Being such a large organization, a shared connection to the mission of the university can be complicated, but essential to the success of the organization. It is necessary for organizations to adopt a learning culture in which learning is continuous to meet the rapidly changing environment in higher education (Mavrinac, 2005). The combination of transformational leadership and organizational culture are summed up by Mavrinac who wrote "Vision, mission, structure, processes, attitudes, behavior, underlying assumptions and rewards must be congruent and consistent with the intended change" (p. 392).

Schein's Embedding mechanisms

Schein (2010) offered six embedding mechanisms to influencing the culture of an organization. The first component, attention, is reflected in how members of the organization communicate priorities, goals, and assessment plans; and what is highlighted or hidden. For example, observe what types of areas are commented on, noticed, and given attention from the leadership or the organization. Just as important is what is not brought up and given attention in the organization.

The second item to consider is how members of the organization react to crises. This may include how decisions are made during difficult economic times or during a change in leadership. Creating new norms, values, and working procedure reflects underlying assumptions about the culture. A crisis in the organization is an especially important time in its history, and while it can heighten anxiety, it can also motivate new learning.

Role modeling is the third component, which includes communicating values through actions. This behavior can come in many forms such as more deliberate forms like teaching and coaching or more informal means through everyday behavior. In this study, the researcher would look for the ways the public affairs mission (MSU, 2011a) reflected through MSU faculty and staff members' responses of their role models at MSU.

The fourth item is how resources are allocated (e.g.., how the budgets are created and what is assumed about that process is important). The researcher will look for who is included in the process and does it follow the traditional hierarchy of an organization top down. The responses may differ from the leaders of the organizations versus the faculty and staff members. Resource allocation can be one of the most contentious issues in an organization.

Next is the allocation of rewards, which may be formal or informal recognition or lack thereof, related to the public affairs mission. Members of the organization learn from their own experience with promotions, performance appraisals, and conversations with their supervisor. What actually happens is much stronger than what is written or said in regard to rewards or punishments. Finally, the criterion for selection and dismissal of faculty and staff members is a key component to influencing the culture of an organization. This should include not only the search and selection process of new employees, but also whether they are retained.

<center>Statement of the Problem</center>

While researchers agree that understanding organizational culture in higher education is important (Schein, 2010; Tierney, 1988), very little is known about how the

mission statements at a college or university impact the organizational culture. Universities are being forced to evaluate their role in communities and how relationships among their various constituencies and stakeholders affect their decisions. The term "mission confusion" is used to describe how universities take on similar ideals but are not sure how to accommodate all of their stakeholders (Jongbloed, Enders, & Salerno, 2008, p. 304).

MSU has tried to integrate the public affairs mission into the University culture. Tierney (1988) explained organizational culture is "the study of particular webs of significance within an organizational setting" (p. 5). The public affairs mission reflects the desire to have the entire organization of faculty, staff, students, alumni, and various constituents embody the three components. "The beliefs, values, and assumptions that organization members hold in common, but that often remain implicit, define culture and group/organizational identity" (Fugazzotto, 2009, p. 286).

The focus on faculty and staff members was chosen because of the influence they have on the university's organizational culture. The faculty and staff members of MSU are expected to know and understand the public affairs mission, and integrate it into their responsibilities and interactions with students. There is no handbook, training, or administrator specifically responsible for the faculty and staff members' understanding or implementing of the public affairs mission. This study is needed to provide the leaders of MSU with a picture of how and why the public affairs mission is prevalent in the organization. This study can also be replicated by other universities and organizations to understand the ways their mission is reflected in the culture.

The embedding mechanisms being studied are "the major tools that leaders have available to teach them to teach their organizations how to perceive, think, feel and behave based on their own conscious and unconscious convictions" (Schein, 2010, p. 236). There is very little research found on how leader behavior can be measured using Schein's primary embedding mechanisms. This study provided this information.

Missouri's Coordinating Board of Higher Education Expectations of MSU

In July 2008, Missouri's Coordinating Board for Higher Education (MCBHE) adopted the "Imperatives for Change: Building a Higher Education System for the 21st Century" which emphasized "The imperative for change is clear: those educational systems that adapt to the new environment will be positioned to lead their states to succeed in a global competitive world" (2008, p. 2). One of the basic values of the Missouri Coordinating Board, "Higher education is a public good as well as a private benefit, contributing both to economic development and civic engagement" (2008, p. 3) complements MSU's public affairs mission. The plan states that Missouri institutions will "increase learning experiences beyond the classroom and service activities in support of promoting civic engagement, understanding international and cultural issues, and improving critical thinking" (2008, p. 11). To meet the standards that the Missouri Coordinating Board of Higher Education has outlined in this plan, research is needed to inform administrators at MSU on how our organizational culture of our faculty and staff members currently reflects this expectation.

MSU's Long Range Plan

In 2011, MSU completed the 2011-2016 Long Range Plan for the University. The plan was guided by three overarching and enduring commitments to student learning,

inclusive excellence, and institutional impact. The purpose of the long-range plan was to direct strategic actions that yield demonstrable outcomes and progress in support of these commitments.

"Student learning is the primary goal of the University and the key indicator of our success. As a community of learners, we embrace learning outcomes that encompass liberal arts education, professional preparation and a concentration on public affairs, and we pledge to support student learning in curricular, co-curricular, extra-curricular and research contexts" (MSU, 2011b, ¶ 5).

MSU's Long Range Plan (2011b, ¶ 4) specifically identified key tactics to "incorporate public affairs into all aspects of University life". Some of the key tactics included items such as (a) developing public affairs competencies, (b) integrating public affairs better into general education, (c) creating policies and rewards for gaining external funding to support public affairs, and (d) emphasizing public affairs research. The success of implementing these tactics is dependent on the MSU faculty and staff members integrating the public affairs mission into their roles on campus. Despite the fact MSU has chosen to focus a tremendous amount of time and resources towards the public affairs mission, there is no data to support how the perceived behaviors of the leaders at MSU affect the organizational culture.

At the time of the research study, MSU was in a state of reflection and change. Nine months prior, both the University president and provost resigned their positions. To make matters even more complicated, the president was in his role for less than a year and the decision to step down was effective immediately. Tierney (1998) noted that many

times in education, people do not pay attention to what the organizational culture until they are a time of conflict and change.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this phenomenological study is to better understand how the public affairs mission is impacting the faculty and staff members' perceptions of Missouri State University culture. The impact was generally defined by six primary embedding mechanisms (Schein, 2010). The six primary embedding mechanisms are: (a) What Leaders Pay Attention to, Measure, and Control, (b) Reaction to Organizational Crises, (c) Role Modeling, (d) How Resources are Allocated, (e) Allocation of Rewards, and (f) Recruitment, Selection and Dismissal.

This research of MSU faculty and staff members' perceptions of leader behavior provided MSU a profile of itself to stimulate a deeper analysis of the organizational culture (Schein, 2010). The study was not meant to be a complete picture of the entire organization, rather information to provide insight for further work on how to integrate the public affairs mission more effectively into the organization. It is important to know more about how the faculty and staff members describe the organizational culture at MSU to know how the public affairs mission affects the culture, if at all. Given the importance the university has placed on the public affairs mission, how are the embedding mechanisms in MSU's culture reflective of the mission? Because there are few studies examining the mission of a university from a faculty and staff member perspective of university culture, a phenomenological study devoted to better understanding the organization's mission through the perspective of the faculty and staff lent itself to examining this research study.

Research Questions

The primary research questions are as follows:

1. How are the embedding mechanisms in MSU's faculty/staff culture reflective of the community engagement component of the public affairs mission?

    a. What Leaders Pay Attention to, Measure, and Control

    b. Reaction to Organizational Crises

    c. Role Modeling

    d. How Resources are Allocated

    e. Allocation of Rewards

    f. Recruitment, Selection and Dismissal

2. How are the embedding mechanisms in MSU's faculty/staff culture reflective of the cultural competence component of the public affairs mission?

    a. What Leaders Pay Attention to, Measure, and Control

    b. Reaction to Organizational Crises

    c. Role Modeling

    d. How Resources are Allocated

    e. Allocation of Rewards

    f. Recruitment, Selection and Dismissal

3. How are the embedding mechanisms in MSU's faculty/staff culture reflective of the ethical leadership component of the public affairs mission?

    a. What Leaders Pay Attention to, Measure, and Control

    b. Reaction to Organizational Crises

    c. Role Modeling

d. How Resources are Allocated

e. Allocation of Rewards

f. Recruitment, Selection and Dismissal

Limitations and Assumptions

A phenomenological study seeks to provide a deeper understanding of a phenomenon as experienced by several individuals (Creswell, 2007). In this study, the researcher seeking a greater understanding of her own institution can provide some needed background information, but also can be a limitation. In qualitative research, the researcher has to be cautious about assumptions not being made about what the data does or does not say. This section will list the limitations and assumptions of this study.

Limitations

Some limitations to the study were that only one university was studied, there is only one year of data, and purposeful sampling was used. Purposeful sampling (Mertens, 2005) was used to determine who the participants would be in the focus groups and interviews. Due to the nature of the population being researched (faculty and staff members) and the desire to have focus groups and interviews, participants had to self select themselves and volunteer (Mertens, 2005) to be a part of the study. Purposeful sampling is used to help the researcher understand the research problem, but it is not random or a large number similar to quantitative research (Creswell, 2009). Only one university was selected for the research due to the researcher's focus on connecting the data to MSU's public affairs mission. The research timeline only involves one year's worth of data.

Another limitation of this study is researcher bias (Creswell, 2009). The researcher is an employee at the institution being studied and has some job responsibilities related to the public affairs mission. As a staff member at the institution, the researcher also works directly with some of the interview participants and focus group members. Special attention was given to ensure participants understood the difference between the researcher's position at the university versus the role in this research project. It was important for the participants to see the researcher as a doctoral student conducting general research, not as a representative of the department who employs the researcher.

Assumptions

Schein (2010) warned researchers to be aware that the sample of employees surveyed may not be representative of the "key culture carriers" (p. 160). This may influence the validity of the study. As with any focus group, the researcher had to be sensitive to groupthink (Janis, 1971) occurring particularly when a group's cohesiveness increases. The researcher used several safeguards to minimize personal bias and assumptions about the study (Mertens, 2005).

Definition of Key Terms

The definitions of the key terms were important to define as they are part of the research questions of the study. The terms included define the Schein's primary embedding mechanisms and the MSU terms related to the public affairs mission (MSU, 2011a). In qualitative research, "the need to ground thoughts in authoritative definitions constitutes good science" (Creswell, 2009, p. 40).

Embedded mechanisms. These are behavioral *things* leaders use to teach their organizations how to perceive, think, feel, and behave in their organization (Schein, 2010).

Attention. The first embedding mechanism is reflected in how members of the organization communicate their priorities, goals, assessment plans; and what is highlighted or hidden (Schein, 2010). What types of areas are commented on, noticed, and given attention from the leadership or the organization? Just as important is what is not brought up and not given attention in the organization (Schein, 2010).

Reaction to crises. The second embedding mechanism is how members of the organization reacts to crises (Schein, 2010). This may include how decisions are made during difficult economic times or during a change in leadership. Creating new norms, values, and working procedures reflects underlying assumptions about the culture (Schein, 2010).

Role modeling. The third embedding mechanism is role modeling, which includes communicating values through actions. This can come in many examples such as more deliberate approaches like teaching and coaching or more informally through everyday behavior (Schein, 2010).

Resource allocation. The fourth embedding mechanism is how resources are allocated. How the budgets are created and what is assumed about that process is important. The researcher will look for who is included in the process and does it follow the traditional hierarchy of an organization top down (Schein, 2010).

Reward allocation. The fifth embedding mechanism is allocation of rewards, which may be formal or informal recognition, or lack thereof (Schein, 2010). Members of

the organization learn from their own experience with promotions, performance appraisals, and conversations with their supervisors. What actually happens is much stronger than what is written or said in regard to rewards or punishments (Schein, 2010).

   Selection and Dismissal of Faculty/Staff. The sixth embedding mechanism, the criteria for selection and dismissal of faculty and staff members, is a key component to influencing the culture of an organization. This should include not only the search and selection process of new employees, but also whether they are retained (Schein, 2010).

   MSU's faculty/staff culture. This term refers to the study of particular "webs of significance" within the university setting (Tierney, 1998, p. 4) at Missouri State University among full time faculty and staff members.

   Public affairs mission. The University's identity is distinguished by its statewide mission in public affairs, requiring a campus-wide commitment to foster competence and responsibility in the common vocation of citizenship (MSU, 2011b).

   Public affairs components. The public affairs mission at MSU was more specifically defined in 2007 by three broad components of (a) community engagement, (b) cultural competence, and (c) ethical leadership (MSU, 2011a).

   Community engagement. This term describes one of the three public affairs components. It is recognizing needs in the communities within which one belongs, then contributing knowledge and working with the community to meet those needs. Community engagement requires extending beyond one's self for the betterment of the community - a process that fosters greater awareness and personal growth (MSU, 2011a).

   Cultural competence. The term describes another of the public affairs components. Cultural competence begins with cultural self-awareness and expands to

16

knowledge of, respect for, and skills to engage with people of other cultures. Culturally competent individuals respect multiple perspectives and are able to successfully negotiate cross-cultural differences (MSU, 2011a).

Ethical leadership. The term describes the last of the public affairs components. Ethical leadership is striving for excellence and integrity as one continually develops ethical and moral reasoning while contributing to the common good. Ethical leaders have the courage to live by their principles in all parts of their personal and professional lives (MSU adapted from the Center for Ethical Leadership; MSU, 2011a).

Organizational culture. Organizational culture is a set of shared mental assumptions that guide interpretation and action in organizations by defining appropriate behavior for various situations (Ravasi & Schultz, 2006).

MSU long-range plan. "The long-range plan at MSU was developed over 17 months, included about 100 faculty, staff and students on seven initial work groups, and took input via email and multiple open forums" (MSU, 2011b, p.1) It was officially approved at the Board of Governors meeting on June 17, 2011.

Significance of the Study

This research can contribute information on how leaders at a college or university can better understand whether its faculty and staff members' perceptions of university culture, reflect their mission statements, and in what ways. In tough economic times when it seems as though every university is being asked to do more with less, this research can help organizations work smarter. This research will inform leaders and administrators at colleges and universities about what is influencing faculty and staff perceptions to better understand what is needed to impact change. Specifically at MSU

this research can make a great contribution. As the public affairs mission continues to be embedded into major goals and curricular changes, understanding the faculty and staff members' perceptions is essential for administration. The public affairs mission is rooted in transformational leadership theory grounded in the idea that getting an education at MSU will contribute to the greater good. There are expectations from the stakeholders of MSU to run an effective organization and live up to both the University's Long Range Plan (MSU, 2011b) and the Missouri Coordinating Board of Higher Education plans (MDHE, 2008).

On a larger scale, this study will inform university administrators across the country in how their every day behavior of the leaders affects their organizational culture related to their mission. Staff members at other universities may replicate the study using Schein's embedding mechanisms as a guide to evaluating how their university mission is reflected in their own faculty and staff members. This study could also be replicated by business leaders who want to interview their employees and managers in the same way. Any organization can benefit from having information from its members related to both culture and mission. Considering the importance of the faculty and staff members' perspective, the expectations of the Missouri's Coordinating Board of Higher Education (MCBHE, 2008) for MSU, and the key tactics in the University's Long Range plan (MSU, 2011b), this research was instrumental in holding MSU accountable to its stakeholders. Universities emphasize the importance of their organizational goals and strategic planning connecting with their mission statements. Yet, there is very little research to reflect effective ways to implement it.

Summary

This chapter included the problem statement, research purpose, research questions, and conceptual framework. It also listed definitions of key terms in the study and identified both the limitations to the study and why the research is important. The six primary embedding mechanisms were defined: (a) What Leaders Pay Attention to, Measure, and Control, (b) Reaction to Organizational Crises, (c) Role Modeling, (d) How Resources are Allocated, (e) Allocation of Rewards, and (f) Recruitment, Selection and Dismissal (Schein, 2010) and are evident in the three public affairs components: (a) community engagement, (b) cultural competence and (c) ethical leadership from the perceptions of the faculty and staff members at MSU. Although there have been various studies on organizational cultures at universities, there has not yet been a study that evaluates the integration of the mission within the organization. As leaders evaluate their universities while going through complex economic times, learning more about how their faculty and staff members perceive the behavior of the leaders of the organization is pivotal. Chapter Two will review literature related to transformational leadership theory, organizational culture theory, and organizational culture studies in higher education related to mission statements.

CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Introduction

Rising college costs have made institutional effectiveness and performance prominent issues for the general public (Fugazzotto, 2009). Colleges and universities are under pressure to figure out what contributes to their culture as an organization and how to improve it. Developing an understanding of organizational culture in higher education has increased dramatically over the last few decades (Knight & Trowler, 2000). University administrators are learning that leaders need to be conscious of the culture or the culture will manage them (Schein, 2005). To best understand the culture of an organization, one must learn the "shared assumptions of individuals participating in the organization" (Tierney, 1988, p. 4).

The analysis of a university's organizational culture is essential to maintain the balance between its values and the behavior of its members (Folch & Ion, 2009). "An organization's culture is reflected in what is done, how it is done and who is involved in doing it. Its culture concerns decisions, actions and communication both on an instrumental and symbolic level" (Tierney, 1988, p. 3). The faculty and staff members are influential at any institution, they greatly affect the organizational culture, and they are pivotal to affecting organizational change (Tierney, 1998). Understanding faculty/staff involvement in campus decisions, and how much they influence the culture and climate on campus are more important than ever (Nadler, Miller, & Modica, 2010).

To understand the organizational culture of a university, the mission must also be understood. "Mission statements dictate the core activities of an organization" (Fugazzotto, 2009, p. 285). Understanding how both the culture and mission of the university come together provide a rich description of the culture of the organization (Thorton & Jaeger, 2007). The question of "how things are done around here" (Tierney, 1988, p. 3) becomes important for both internal and external stakeholders of the organization, especially in times of financial uncertainty.

Despite the fact that most colleges and universities have mission statements, there are very few studies that examine the relationship of the mission statement and culture of the university through the perceptions of faculty and staff members. In this research, relevant literature has been viewed based on the following constructs: transformational leadership theory and organizational culture related to the public affairs mission. Edgar Schein's (2010) six primary embedding mechanisms are: (a) What Leaders Pay Attention to, Measure, and Control, (b) Reaction to Organizational Crises, (c) Role Modeling, (d) How Resources are Allocated, (e) Allocation of Rewards, and (f) Recruitment, Selection and Dismissal along with the three pillars (community engagement, cultural competence, and ethical leadership) of the public affairs mission at MSU are studied to inform the research.

Transformational Leadership

Transformational leadership, a post industrial leadership theory (Komives, 2011), is aimed at leadership being collaborative to create change for the common good (Northouse, 2010). James MacGregor Burns, in his influential book *Leadership* (1978) presented this concept of leadership as a values-based process between both the leader

and follower. He distinguished between transforming (i.e., mutually beneficial processes) and transactional (i.e., exchanged-based processes) leadership (Komives, 2011). Burns's philosophy emphasized the role of positional leaders as ones who empower those around him or her to also become leaders. This included being concerned about the follower's needs and developing shared goals. . Transformational leadership theory (1978) is also an appeal to social values that encourages collaboration among leaders to motivate followers to achieve a greater good. MSU is a public university and this leadership theory aligns with the approach educators have with students to create civically minded students. If MSU is fulfilling the public affairs mission through the transformation leadership theory, the leaders of the organization must empower the faculty and staff members to also be leaders.

Bass (1985) and Bass and Avolio (1990) extended Burns's (1978) work with transformational leadership, continuing to explore follower motivations in the leadership process and the multitude of factors associated with the transformational leadership process. Bass (1985) conducted research using the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) in the business setting. From his results, he explained the importance and benefits of managers using transformational leadership versus transactional leadership with their employees. He identified four areas of transformational leadership (a) charisma, (b) inspiration, (c) intellectual stimulation, and (d) individualized consideration. Charismatic leadership consists of idealized behaviors when the leader considers the moral and ethical consequence of decisions, has a strong sense of purpose, and reflects on the importance of trust. Inspirational motivation includes behaviors such as providing an exciting image for the future of the group, displaying confidence in goals, and taking a

stand on controversial issues. Intellectual stimulation would be seen in a leader who seeks different perspectives, suggests new ways to look at problems, and questions traditional practices. Finally, individualized consideration behavior would be demonstrated when the leader treats others as individuals, helps others to find their strengths, and promotes self-development. The combination of all four of these behaviors is considered idealized attributes which are when the leader builds others' respect, self-sacrifices for the group, and reassures others.

When looking at leadership using the MLQ model as an assessment tool, it appears that transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire styles of management are useful in certain situations. Transformational appears to be most useful when it is necessary to help the employee to develop some internal motivation, while transactional is most useful when an employee is motivated externally. The laissez-faire approach is useful when an employee does not necessarily need motivation. Therefore, there is not a correct form of leadership for motivating employees; rather, all forms are useful depending on the situation, type of employee, and the given circumstances.

"In a highly innovative and satisfying organizational culture, we are likely to see transformational leaders who build assumptions such as: people are trustworthy and purposeful; everyone has a unique contribution to make; complex problems are handled at the lowest level possible" (Bass & Avolio, 1993, p. 113).

Transformational leaders create an environment that aligns others with their vision by empowering the followers to take responsibility in achieving the same vision (Bass & Avolio, 1993). The culture of the organization encourages change and growth and all members are expected to be developed to their "full potential" (p. 113). As the

organization evolves with new members coming in, they may challenge the culture of the organization.

"It is incumbent upon the leaders in the organization to view the development of assumptions and values as an evolutionary process—a process in which the organization and its membership periodically question its assumptions and change them if the conditions warrant change" (Bass & Avolio, 1993, p. 114).

As MSU has grown into the name Missouri State University from Southwest Missouri State University, developed the statewide mission in public affairs (MSU, 2011a) and changed individuals in key leadership roles over the last few years, it is not clear if the organization has demonstrated transformational leadership. In his book *Leadership in Organizations,* Yukl (2006) compared and contrasted transformational and charismatic leadership to show how the situational variables may increase the likelihood that transformational leadership will occur or may enhance the effect of such leadership on followers. Yukl suggested transformational leadership is likely to be more important in a dynamic, unstable environment that increases the need for change, and such leadership is more likely when leaders are empowered and encouraged to be flexible and innovative. Higher education has regularly been presented as a dynamic environment that is changing consistently (Yukl, 2006). When decisions are made through consensus and power is shared, it is assumed that leaders and staff members have shared values and common interests within a university (Bush, 2003). Bush emphasized, however, that this model might be used as a vehicle for the manipulation or control of educators who are required to support the 'vision' and aims of the leader. He also pointed out that the contemporary policy climate in education can limit the opportunities to use

transformational leadership. Schein (2010) points out charisma can impact the culture, but it is not a reliable way to approach changing the culture.

Transformational leadership theory complements the public affairs mission at MSU by providing a practical way for both the follower and leader to approach the process together. Utilizing the transformational leadership theory through the public affairs mission keeps educators grounded in the leadership process yet focused on the educational purpose. It can also help leaders acknowledge the politics surrounding the issue while finding a shared reason to work together. Transformational leadership encourages university leaders to provide an environment where others feel empowered and encouraged to be flexible and innovative to deal with the inevitable conflict. People want to find a shared goal for the common good, especially when the expectation is given to them (Bass & Avolio, 1993).

With the mission in public affairs, all of MSU's goals should tie back to the University mission which gives each department a shared interest. "Leaders who can achieve a mutuality of actualization for the individual and the organization are also likely to achieve success in the change process" (Mavrinac, 2005, p. 391). Being such a large organization, a shared connection to the mission of the university can be complicated, but essential to the success of the organization

Organizational Culture

The organizational culture can be greatly affected by its leaders while at the same time the culture influences and cultivates the leaders (Bass & Avolio, 1993). Bolman and Deal (2008) used a four-frame model to better understand organizational culture. In Bush's (2003) book of *Theories of educational leadership and management*, he breaks

the theories into various models including the cultural model. Edgar Schein's (2010)

extensive research on organizational culture includes six primary embedding mechanisms

for leaders to consider when using their behavior to impact their culture.

Bolman and Deal (2008) used a four-frame model to examine organizations by

synthesizing literature and research. One of the four frames, the cultural/symbolic frame,

is how to shape a culture that gives purpose and meaning to work through symbols of

ritual, ceremony, and story. They pointed out that some argue that organizations have

cultures versus organizations are cultures. Bolman and Deal advocated organizational

"Culture is both a product and a process. As a product, it embodies wisdom accumulated

from experience. As a process, it is renewed and re-created as newcomers learn the old

ways and eventually become teachers themselves" (p. 269).

Bush (2003) connected major theories of educational leadership and management

into six models including the cultural model. The central features of organizational

culture focuses on "values, beliefs and ideology as the heart of the organization" (p. 156),

the "development of shared norms and meanings" (p. 161) and using "rituals and

ceremonies" (p. 161) to celebrate them. This model provides a "focus for organizational

action" (p. 175) where leaders combine their own values with the organizations.

"In cultural models, goals are an expression of the culture of an organization.

The statement of purposes, and their espousal in action, serves to reinforce the beliefs of

the institution. The core values help to determine a vision for the school or college. This

vision is expressed in a mission statement which in turn leads to goals" (Bush, 2003, p.

180)

Bush (2003) warned cultural models have three significant weaknesses. First, there may be an ethical dilemma of leaders using their values to influence the organization. This may be regarded as a manipulation by other members. Second, it may not be realistic to "assume that leaders can determine the culture of an organization" (p.173) on their own. Finally, he cautions focusing on rituals and ceremonies can distort reality. The symbols may or may not reflect the current reality of the institution,

Understanding the culture of an organization can benefit it in many ways. For instance, Denison and Mishra (1995) developed a model of organizational culture and effectiveness using four traits of organizational cultures: (a) involvement, (b) consistency, (c) adaptability, and (d) mission. Their research indicated that these four traits are positively related to how performance is perceived, to return on assets, and to sales growth. Organizational culture was measured related to important organizational outcomes in this research. Overall, understanding organizational culture is complex and how organizations can improve can be even more difficult.

Edgar Schein, an emeritus MIT Sloan School of Management professor and expert on organizational psychology and development (Fincher, 1986), stated culture is the most difficult organizational attribute to change, outlasting organizational products, services, founders, and leadership, and all other physical attributes of the organization. Schein also believed organizations must become perpetual learners to deal with the constancy of change. Schein (2010) offered six embedding mechanisms of leader behavior to influencing the culture of an organization. Each embedding mechanism is explained related to similar literature in the field.

What Leaders Pay Attention to, Measure, and Control

The first component of Schein's (2010) six embedding mechanisms, attention, is reflected in how the organization communicates priorities, goals, assessment plans, and what is highlighted or hidden. What types of areas are commented on, noticed, and given attention from the leadership or the organization? Just as important is what is not brought up and given attention in the organization. Priorities often times by leaders can be determined by who they are surrounded by in the organization. Organization members will choose to focus their attention on what is measured and controlled by both their peers and the leaders.

Organizations are coalitions of assorted individuals and interest groups (Bolman & Deal, 2008). Transformational leadership keeps the focus on bringing the coalitions together to create change for the common good. As Bolman and Deal pointed out, this is extremely complex because "coalition members have enduring differences in values, beliefs, information, interest, and perceptions of reality" (p. 194). Even with all of these differences, coalitions will form because they need each other to get things done. These coalitions may influence the leaders in the strongest way, which then affects the faculty and staff members.

Alliances and networking are essential in any organization, but particularly universities. Kotter (1982) through his research showed that successful senior managers were attentive to building and cultivating ties with friends and allies. When cultivated through shared goals, these relationships will be stronger and more authentic when each side trusts the other. This differs from transactional leadership where it is simply an exchange process. Trust greatly depends on shared interests as difficult and complex

28

decisions are made in organizations. Deal and Kennedy (1982) connected bureaucracies

with organizations that focus more on how things are done than what is accomplished.

While very little feedback may be offered, the results can be consistent. When leaders

focus their attention on areas such as building trust and developing shared interests, it can

reflect transformational leadership in what is measured and controlled.

At MSU, employees are given an annual review which is referred it as the

"Appraisal and Development Plan" (ADP) which controls and measures the employees

contribution to the organization over the year (MSU, 2012a).

"The University's Appraisal and Development Plan (ADP) process is designed to

support the growth and development of employees within the organization and to

recognize employees for their overall performance and contribution to the organization.

The Appraisal and Development Plan (ADP) process consists of establishing

performance objectives, providing support through leadership and development, and

documenting outcomes and performance in the form of a written evaluation" (MSU,

2012a).

Effective January 2012, a new diversity component was added to the process for

MSU employees ADP's (MSU, 2012a). Because the University's Long Range Plan

(MSU, 2011b) includes a component for diversity and inclusion each employee is

expected have at least one on their 2012 ADP. This additional expectation added to the

process by the leaders of the organization signal to its members what will be measured

and controlled.

Organization members will choose to focus their attention on what is measured

and controlled by both their peers and the leaders. This is evident by who leaders

surround themselves with and how they build relationships. It can also be seen by who is not included in their coalitions.

Reaction to Organizational Crises

The second item in Schein's (2010) embedding mechanisms is how the organization reacts to crises. This may include how decisions are made during difficult economic times or during a change in leadership. Creating new norms, values, and working procedures reflects underlying assumptions about the culture.

A crisis in the organization is an especially important time in its history, and while it can heighten anxiety, it can also motivate new learning. Amy (2008) researched a Fortune 500 company looking for empirical support in delineating the role leaders play in fostering or hindering learning. Her findings revealed that learning leaders have several distinct characteristics and skills, but the participants gave the most emphasis to emotionally intelligent communication. Leaders often underestimate the importance of communication in helping members cope and learn new information as it happens.

As the level of insecurity increases so does our preference for involvement in the decision-making process for stakeholders (Grint, 2005, p. 1478). "Since organizations depend on their environment for resources they need to survive, they are inevitably enmeshed with external constituents whose expectations or demands must be heeded. These constituents often speak with loud but conflicting voices, adding to the challenge of managerial work" (Hoskisson, Hitt, Johnson, & Grossman, 2002, p. 235). The balance becomes how are the stakeholders opinions balanced among each other before, during and after a crisis.

Finally, leaders are challenged with how they react to the demands of their position by how a crisis is perceived. "A coalition forms because of interconnections among its members; they need one another, even though their interests may only partly overlap" (Bolman & Deal, 2008, p. 196). As mentioned earlier, in a dynamic, unstable environment, transformational leadership may thrive (Yukl, 2006). For many years, Missouri colleges and universities were competitive with each other for state funding and while the competition is still there, they have joined together more recently to advocate together for funding for higher education rather than just their own institution (MO Governor, 2009). MSU is currently recovering from a leadership crisis of losing both the president and provost within one year and is expecting an additional reduction of funding from the state of around 8%, which is approximately six million dollars (MSU, 2012c).

Role Modeling

Role modeling is the third component of Schein's (2010) embedding mechanisms, includes communicating values through actions. This can come in more deliberate forms like teaching and coaching or more informally through everyday behavior. Employees often fail to get things accomplished because they rely too much on reason and not enough on relationships (Bolman & Deal, 2008). Whether it is dealing with an ethical dilemma, developing a vision or implementing a new idea, role models become apparent at various times in an organization.

In *Reframing Organizations*, the authors emphasized Lax and Sebenius who provide a set of criteria for leader's actions when dealing with ethical issues. The four areas include (a) mutuality, (b) generality, (c) openness, and (d) caring (2008, p. 226). Organizational excellence includes when a leader can pull people together for meaningful

purposes despite the thousands of forces that push people apart (Kotter, 1985).

Communicating values through action (Schein, 2010) can be most evident in ethical

situation.

Finally, if an organization is dealing with change, it may be difficult for members

to picture how they are going to behave. Role models in the organization can exhibit the

new behavior, so members can imagine themselves doing it (Schein, 2010). As a role

model in an organization, one would assume that communicating values through action

(Schein, 2010) would be a powerful tool. Kanter (1983) shared a similar example

explaining "While gathering information, entrepreneurs can also be 'planting seeds'-

leaving the kernel of an idea behind and letting it germinate and blossom so that it begins

to float around the room from many sources other than the innovator" (p. 218). This can

also work well when other administrators are bought into the same idea, so when the

students mention the idea, the administrator can give their viewpoint, but still support the

initiative.

Role models in an organization can be formal relationships or based on more

informal, every day behavior. Whether it is dealing with an ethical dilemma, developing a

vision or implementing a new idea, it is important for role models to communicate their

values through action (Schein, 2010). The next embedding mechanism focuses on how

resources are allocated and how it can impact the organization's culture.

How Resources are Allocated

The fourth embedding mechanism (Schein, 2010) is how resources are allocated.

How the budgets are created and what is assumed about that process is important. Who is

included in the process and does it go "bottom up" or "top down"? Resource allocation

can be one of the most contentious issues in an organization (2010). Important decisions related to money and resources in organizations are complicated due to conflict and power. Conflict can sometimes help shake things up a bit in an organization.

Heffron stated "Conflict challenges the status quo [and] stimulates interest and curiosity. It is the root of personal and social change, creativity, and innovation. Conflict encourages new ideas and approaches to problems, stimulating innovation" (1989).

Knowing that conflict is not necessarily a bad thing and almost certainly inevitable, it is most important how the conflict is managed. As an administrator dealing with conflict in relation to an idea or vision it is important to remember that most people will eventually find a compromise. "Even though groups have conflicting preferences, they have a shared interest in avoiding incessant conflict. So they agree on ways to distribute power and resources, producing settlements reflected in organizational design" (Pffefer, 1978, p. 224).

For example, if a university is going through budget cuts, it does not make sense to request a new staff or faculty position for the department. On the other hand, if one can find something that is really important to a main administrator at the university, such as a vice president, and use the language and framework to fit their goals, it just may happen. Bolman and Deal (2008) suggested, "Goals are not set by edict at the top but evolve through an ongoing process of negotiation and bargaining" (p. 197). Jeffrey Pfeffer (1981) used an example from Wildavsky who explained that "Organizational politics involves those activities taken within organizations to acquire, develop, and use power and other resources to obtain one's preferred outcomes in a situation in which there is uncertainty or dissensus about choices" (p. 292).

Determining how resources are allocated comes down to power. As mentioned earlier, power is explained as part of the political frame as "how competing groups articulate preferences and mobilize power to get what they want" (Bolman & Deal, 2008) p. 201). When an administrator of a department is figuring out what his or her goals are going to be or what should be accomplished over the next year, prioritizing a preference for a reasonable request must be part of the decision making process. Bolman and Deal (2008) explained how schools and universities have had to deal with alternating years of much support to very little over the years, depending on the economy or politics. The repeated years of MSU suffering from consistent funding cuts from the state of Missouri (MSU, 2012a), resource allocation has become an increased issue.

Allocation of Rewards

Next embedding mechanism (Schein, 2010) is the allocation of rewards, which may be formal or informal recognition, or lack thereof. Members of the organization learn from their own experience with promotions, performance appraisals, and conversations with their supervisor. What actually happens is much stronger than what is written or said in regard to rewards or punishments. When the organization expects its members to learn something, there must be a reward system to ensure this behavior.

Whether it is formal or not, one way to reward a member is to show how this person can be helped in the future and build a coalition with them. "The basic point is simple: as a manager, you need friends and allies to get things done. To sew up their support, you need to build coalitions" (Bolman & Deal, 2008, p. 220). Building coalitions is obviously a different approach than coercion or demanding that people comply. This can be shown by explaining to others the reasons to move forward with the goal or

change and grounds for being trusted. "People rarely give their best efforts and fullest

cooperation simply because they have been ordered to do so. They accept direction better

when they perceive the people in authority as credible, competent and sensible." (Bolman

& Deal, 2008, p. 221). As an administrator, one must establish credibility first. "The

more legitimate the coercion, the less it will produce resistance and decreased attraction"

(French & Raven, 1959, p. 318). People want and expect there to be a good reason for

doing something. When expectations for members of the organization are clear and

reasonable, the rewards can be more focused on giving members autonomy and respect.

Recruitment, Selection and Dismissal

Finally, the criterion for selection and dismissal of employees is the last

embedding mechanisms (Schein, 2010.) The faculty and staff are a key component to

influencing the culture of an organization. This should include not only the search and

selection process of new employees, but also whether they are retained. The mission of a

college should be expressed through its vision and goals (Bush, 2003). This can be

complicated though by mission statements being too vague, which then creates unclear

goals, and it is difficult to use the goals in decision-making (Schein, 2010).

As the organization evolves, it is important to consider that members are at

different stages of their understanding of the organizational culture and mission. Cook

and Yanow (2005) sought to answer the questions, "Can organizations learn?" and "What

is the nature of learning when it is done by organizations?" The authors asserted that an

organization can indeed learn and acknowledged this could be viewed as individuals were

learning in the context of the organization or as the organization itself learning as a

distinct entity. Cook and Yanow supported the latter concept and proposed that

organizational learning is best understood from a cultural perspective. They used the example of three small workshops that made flutes, demonstrating that each company learned how to produce exceptional flutes, but each maintained techniques and cultures different from the other. These methods were unique to each organization, and new members learned through experiencing the artifacts of the organizational culture. Furthermore, the ongoing development of an organization's culture is a dynamic learning process as individual members come and go. As members of MSU are recruited, selected and retained, their learning of the mission may be unique depending on the stage they are in similar to making flutes.

Edgar Schein's (2010) six primary embedding mechanisms: (a) What Leaders Pay Attention to, Measure, and Control, (b) Reaction to Organizational Crises, (c) Role Modeling, (d) How Resources are Allocated, (e) Allocation of Rewards, and (f) Recruitment, Selection and Dismissal are ways leaders can understand how their behavior influences the organizational culture. Bush (2003) and Bolman and Deal (2008) have summarized organizational culture into frames and models to synthesize the various theories. Next, organizational culture in higher education will be reviewed.

Organizational Culture in Higher Education

Organizational culture in higher education has many levels of understanding. First, Bolman and Deal (2008) will describe all four of the frames and how they relate to higher education. Next, the organizational culture and how it impacts the college student will be reviewed. Finally research over faculty and staff members in higher education related to organizational culture are included.

Four Frames of Organizational Culture in Higher Education

Bolman and Deal (2008) used a four-frame model to break down understanding organizations: (a) structural, (b) human resource, (c) political and (d) symbolic frame. Each of these frames can play a large role in a collegiate setting. When studying the university organizational culture, it can be beneficial to consider the frames individually and together.

The structural frame serves as a logical starting point to begin an analysis of any organization, providing an objective road map to study the organization without interjecting personalities and other more subjective criteria. The key concepts to be are establishment of goals, division of labor, and re-integration practices. Universities list many goals typically on their website and organizational charts. Re-integration tends to be more complicated. Bolman and Deal (2008) described the concept of re-integration as creating roles and units to ensure different efforts come together. When true-integration is achieved, it allows employees and managers to communicate and cooperate to accomplish organizational goals (Taylor, 2005). This type of communication can greatly be effected by the people involved even more than what their title or position at the university may be.

In the human resource frame, people and organizations need each other. Organizations exist to serve human needs rather than the converse (Bolman & Deal, 2008, p. 112). The difference in the structural frame and human resource frames as "Where the human resource approach emphasizes dealing with issues by changing people (through training, rotation, promotion or dismissal), the structural perspective argues for putting people in the right roles and relationships (2008, p. 47).

"We all want tangible evidence of our social importance. We all want to have a skill that is socially recognized as useful. We want the feeling of security that comes not so much from the amount of money we have in the bank as being an accepted member of the group. A man whose job is without a social function is like a man without a country; the activity to which he has to give the major portion of his life is robbed of all human meaning and significance" (Hawthorne, 1941, p.166).

The political frame focuses in on figuring out what you want, who can help you get there and who will try and stop you (Bolman & Deal, 2008, p. 214). "Within formal organizations, norms and expectations develop that make the exercise of influence expected and accepted. Thus, the social control of one's behavior by others becomes an expected part of organizational life" (Pfeffer, 1981, p. 291). There are many unwritten rules with the university culture and learning to navigate will help ensure being more successful.

Within the symbolic frame (2008), the authors pointed out that institutions of higher education are rated on factors such as enrollment numbers, age, beauty of the campus, faculty credentials, among many other things. It is then imperative for the important constituents to understand what the graduates offer in skills and talents to their community. Combining the structural, human resources, political and symbolic frame offers a more complete picture of working in a collegiate setting.

Thompson (2005) studied the differences in job satisfaction between a balance and unbalanced organizational climate as perceived by college administrative and support staff members in the context of Bolman and Deal's four frame organizational theory. The study included the responses from 280 full and part-time administrative and support staff

members who provided perceptions of the organizational behavior and characteristics of the college at which they were employed. The structural and human resource frames were connected to management and the political and symbolic frame were related to leadership. The findings suggested that organizations perceived as having a balanced organizational climate, have greater levels of perceived satisfaction among employees. While understanding the overall organizational culture is important, being more specific on how the students are impacted is essential.

Organizational Culture and How it Impacts the College Student

When trying to better understand the organizational culture of a university, how the culture affects the students is another important perspective one may consider. Tinto (1993) stated "Research has indicated that the campus climate fostered through both the curricular and co-curricular life of the campus plays a key role in fostering student success and student college communities" (p.25). Universities across the United States promote many of the same ideals, with the hope being that the goals of the university and the culture of the organization eventually become congruent. A more specific example may include, "The social action relationship, using Bank's approach, would be realized when student organizations take deliberate actions to recognize and solve campus multicultural issues that promote and enhance the institution's diversity goals" (Kuk and Banning, 2010, pg. 358). Students embracing the needs of the campus and changing their behavior to reflect this need is ideal. Rarely do students come to their own understanding of the culture without the benefit of having the faculty and staff there to guide their journey. Understanding what approach has the greatest impact on helping faculty and staff influence organizational culture will benefit the students.

Organizational Culture in Higher Education with Faculty and Staff Members

Awbrey (2005) examined how higher education administrators and faculty can obtain more successful and sustainable general education reform outcomes by applying knowledge on organizational change and recognizing the importance of systematically integrating cultural and structural approaches to change. Schein's three-level model (a) artifacts (b) values and beliefs and (c) tacit assumptions was used illustrate how academic culture interacts with change initiatives. Her findings showed that deeper levels of cultural change may be achieved by examining the values, beliefs, and assumptions of the reformers and their decisions about general education. "The deeper the level of cultural awareness and learning, the richer the change process and the more likely the organization is to continue learning" (p. 18). Gaining a better understanding of how problems are dealt with in a university can affect change.

Grint's (2005) social construction of leadership including "Tame, Wicked and Critical Problems" (p. 1473) argued that decision makers often use their preferred mode of engagement rather than what the situation demands. How organizations handle the various types of problems can greatly affect the culture. A Tame Problem may be "complicated but is resolvable" (p.1473) and has probably happened before. A Wicked Problem is "complex with no apparent solution" and often times have no right or wrong answer (p. 1473). Finally a Critical Problem is similar to" a crisis with very little time for decision making and action" (p.1473).

Barley, Meyer and Gash (1988) reviewed the texts of 192 articles on organizational culture written between June 1975 and December 1984, and examined them for evidence of acculturation. The data strongly suggest that those who wrote for

practitioners and academics initially conceptualized organizational culture differently. Over time, however, academics appear to have moved toward the practitioners' point of view, while the latter appear to have been by the former. This relationship between practioners (staff) and academics (faculty) on the culture of a university may differ, too.

Gibson (2006) conducted a phenomenological study on the mentoring experience for female faculty members and the role of organizational politics and culture. The study revealed the political climate of the organization as an essential attribute of this experience. Female faculty members identified organizational culture and gender issues that affected the mentoring they received. This study suggested the need for human resource and organization development initiatives to facilitate the provision of academic mentoring for female faculty members—individually, departmentally, and culturally—as a means to foster transformation and change in academic institutions.

The ultimate goal for most faculty is gaining tenure. Wood and Johnsrud (2005) researched the underlying assumptions of faculty members related to post-tenure review of over 400 instructional faculty members at two research universities. This study contributes to what is known about organizational culture at a university through the faculty beliefs and values. Conversely, faculty and admistrators tend to have very different goals. Del Favero (2003) addressed the struggle between faculty and administrator relationships and how critical the need is for there to be a strong partnership to have an effective shared governance. The struggle in the relationship is the faculty member's goal being autonomy and the administrator's goal being authority constantly work against each other in most university settings. Social rewards that influence social exchanges among faculty and administrators must be identified. One example given was

"social capital" (p. 913) which is a valuable resource that can be used in future social interaction. The public affairs mission at MSU can serve as a starting point for these two groups to connect.

<div style="text-align:center">Organizational Culture in Higher Education including Mission Statements</div>

While researchers agree that understanding organizational culture in higher education is important (Schein, 2010; Tierney, 1988), very little is known about how the mission statements at a college or university impact the organizational culture. The mission of a college should be expressed through its vision and goals (Bush, 2003). This can be complicated though by mission statements being too vague, which then creates unclear goals, and in turn, it is difficult to use the goals in decision making (Schein, 2010).

Uncertainty of Effect of Mission Statements

Universities are being forced to evaluate their role in society and how relationships among their various constituencies, stakeholders, and communities affect their decisions. The term "mission confusion" is used to describe how universities take on similar ideals but are not sure how to accommodate all of their stakeholders (Jongbloed, Enders, & Salerno, 2008, p.305). Colleges and universities struggle with "goal ambiguity" (Baldridge, 1983, p.39) having vague goals where they must develop structures to deal with making decisions and uncertainty. "Expertise becomes more important than ever, and leadership increasingly amounts to the ability to assemble, persuade, and facilitate the activities of knowledgeable experts" (p.58).

Morgan (1997) compared organizations to organisms connecting small changes create larger effects and how influential environments are on organizations. As

universities combine their mission statements into the framework of their long-range planning, utilizing the concept of a "matrix organization" (p. 52) could be instrumental to systematically reflecting a project-team structure with a bureaucracy. The beauty of the public affairs mission in a strange way is that eventually, once the train gets moving fast enough, people tend to just buy in whether they are excited about it or not. "Within formal organizations, norms and expectations develop that make the exercise of influence expected and accepted. Thus, the social control of one's behavior by others becomes an expected part of organizational life" (Pfeffer,1981, p. 291). Being such a large organization, most people realize at some point they just have to accept the inevitable and get on board.

Most mission statements at colleges and universities will identify developing leaders as a central goal. Dugan's (2006) research on socially responsible leadership in students validated the important role of involvement on campus. Controversy with civility and citizenship were notably lower than other categories within the Social Change Model of Leadership Development (Komives, et al., 2011) and the author suggests a need for student affairs staff members to be intentional about engaging students in a dialogue more effectively around these topics. This suggestion may imply that the student affairs staff members are informed themselves on these issues and comfortable engaging students in these topics.

Intentionally Integrating the Mission into the Culture

MSU has admirably tried to integrate the public affairs mission into the university culture. Tierney (1988) explained organizational culture is "the study of particular webs of significance within an organizational setting" (p. 5). The public affairs mission implies

43

the desire to have the entire organization of faculty, staff, students, alumni, and various constituents learn the three components. "The beliefs, values, and assumptions that organization members hold in common, but that often remain implicit, define culture and group/organizational identity" (Fugazzotto, 2009, p. 286).

Staff members at the University of Minnesota combined their mission and goals to develop a leadership program to build exceptional students, faculty and staff, to become one of the top three public research universities in the next decade (Martens & Salewski, 2009). The goal of the program was to help develop its internal resources for leading strategic process improvement projects and improving performance across the system. The program teaches participants how to apply proven management techniques to higher education, but it provides an outlet for employees to connect with colleagues across campus. This approach targets teaching members of the organization about what is being changed and how to adapt to the change. Many universities simply just decide what to change only.

On the community college level, Kezar (1998) studied community college leaders using a participatory model rather than a hierarchical model of leadership. The new president at this institution used servant leadership as a model intending for the approach to be more inclusive, but because multiple leadership beliefs were not acknowledged, some felt excluded. Finding a model where all college or university members feel included is difficult.

When a university can find a good structure for their organizational structure, many goals can be accomplished. Kezar (2001) focused on the struggle of colleges and universities to find organizational fit for its members when utilizing a participatory

44

leadership model. As higher education institutions have moved away from the traditional, hierarchy model of leadership, toward participatory and collaborative leadership, Kezar offered the case for her research to (examine whether and how participatory leadership environments are capable of reducing organizational fit) and whether (collaborative leadership leads to the inclusion of diverse voices). The study was focused on one community college which used participatory leadership through Total Quality Management (TQM) and principles of servant leadership. In the literature review, the author highlighted the Social Change Model to reflect principles of pluralistic leadership through its emphasis on consciousness of self, and how it relates to the campus and larger social context. This leads to an understanding of power conditions which can impact perspectives and how to have controversy with civility. The author argues that this model addresses issues ignored by participatory models such as perspective, power, and differences. The research design included an in depth case study of one campus to explore the context and power, to understand how participatory leadership was operationalized, and to examine leadership more broadly. The researcher interviewed 36 individuals: 24 faculty and 12 administrators. This study found that the participatory environment ended up being no different from a hierarchical model. Some participants found the participatory set of leadership characteristics more agreeable; however, this process did not ensure that a diversity of voices was heard.

Staff members are important to the university culture. Nadler, Miller and Modica (2010) focused their study on the role of staff members on campus and how much they influence the culture and climate on campus. They cite staff sizes are increasing to manage the university and the importance of understanding staff involvement in campus

decisions is more important than ever. Times have changed from when faculty or staff members would just do whatever their supervisor expected of them. "The more legitimate the coercion the less it will produce resistance and decreased attraction" (French & Raven, 1959, p. 318). People want and expect there to be a good reason for doing something. If the person has believed in and trusts the system, it seems to always work better.

Peers of members in organizations can be very powerful. Mavriac (2005) studied the complex nature of transformational change required to achieve a learning culture. Peer mentoring was the focus on her research as a learning process combining values-based transformational leadership within the process field for librarians. "Values are the foundation for organizational life. The connection between individual wants and needs and public values is at the heart of transformational leadership." The public affairs mission (MSU, 2011a) is closely tied with transformational leadership theory.

Public Affairs Related Research

The public affairs mission (MSU, 2011a) at MSU has three components: (a) community engagement, (b) cultural competence, and (c) ethical leadership. These three components are very similar to most the goals of most universities to promote civic responsibility, appreciation of diversity and being a responsible citizen. These areas were included in the section below.

Thorton and Jaeger (2007) conducted a comprehensive ethnographic study on both cultures of universities and dominant institutional beliefs about civic responsibility, and how they come together at a university. This study focused on five dimensions of civic responsibility: (a) knowledge and support of democratic values, systems and

46

processes, (b) desire to act beneficially in community and for its members, (c) use of knowledge and skills for societal benefit, (d) appreciation and interest in those unlike oneself, and (e) personal accountability. The role model approach emerged as a unique institutional approach to civic responsibility. This included how the institution viewed itself as a role model to the community on how it's members should act within the larger community for the betterment of the state.

Due to a tight labor market, organizations strive toward attracting, retaining, and effectively using employees in efficient ways. In the midst of the demand for workers, increased diversity for workers with specific skill sets creates problems and opportunities. Cox (2005) argued that a diverse group leads to better production levels if diversity training exists. If diversity training is nonexistent, the results are actually worse than a homogenous group. In effect, diversity can lead to both problems and opportunities. Diversity can be viewed as a value-added activity through improved problem solving, enhanced creativity and innovation, increased organizational flexibility, improved human resources, and improved marketing strategies. Even if organizations identify diversity as an issue, the efforts at utilizing diversity to improve the organization can fail if the problem is misdiagnosed, the wrong approach is taken, or the learning curve is underestimated. He concluded that it is not enough to hire minorities or women; the organization must change the culture of the workplace if it is to encourage individuals to work to their highest potential of creativity, problem solving, and organizational flexibility, as well as improve the quality of personnel through better recruitment. He further maintained that organizations must be prepared to wait for results as managing

diversity is not a quick fix, but a long-term process of changing culture, attitudes, and values that may be deeply-set in the organization's structure.

<center>Missouri State University Information Related to the Study</center>

Missouri State University (MSU), founded in 1905, is a public, comprehensive university system with a mission in public affairs, whose purpose is to develop educated persons. According to the MSU website (MSU, 2011a), there are four campuses for MSU. Its main campus in Springfield, MO. There are also three additional campuses in Mountain Grove, MO; West Plains, MO; and Dalian, China. In 2011, enrollment for the overall system was over 20,000 students. For incoming freshmen in 2011, the average ACT score, at 24.1, which was higher than both the state and the national average. The average GPA of 3.59 (MSU, 2012).

The University employs more than 3,700 faculty and staff members and nearly 90% of the full-time ranked faculty members have the most advanced degree available in their field. Missouri State has six academic colleges and one Graduate College. The six academic colleges include: (a) College of Arts and Letters, (b) College of Business Administration, (c) College of Education, (d) College of Health and Human Services, (e) College of Humanities and Public Affairs, and (f) College of Natural and Applied Sciences (MSU, 2012).

In 1995, Senate Bill 340 gave MSU a statewide mission in public affairs. MSU identifies this mission as a way to define how a Missouri State education is different from that of other universities (MSU, 2011a). For many years, the mission has been summarized as follows: "The University's identity is distinguished by its statewide

mission in public affairs, requiring a campus-wide commitment to foster competence and responsibility in the common vocation of citizenship" (MSU, 2011b).

In 2005, the University's name changed to Missouri State University from Southwest Missouri State University reflecting its enrollment of tens of thousands of students, as well as higher admissions standards and increased graduate programs. In 2007, the university's public affairs mission was more defined by including three components: (a) community engagement, (b) cultural competence, and (c) ethical leadership. Each year Missouri State hosts a Public Affairs Week and the Public Affairs Conference.

Missouri's Coordinating Board of Higher Education Expectations of MSU

As state appropriations for higher education get more competitive each year, the pressure is on for universities like MSU to perform as effectively as possible. In July 2008, the Coordinating Board for Higher Education adopted the "Imperatives for Change: Building a Higher Education System for the 21st Century" (MCBHE, 2008) which emphasized "The imperative for change is clear: those educational systems that adapt to the new environment will be positioned to lead their states to succeed in a global competitive world" (p. 2). One of the basic values of the Missouri Coordinating Board, "Higher education is a public good as well as a private benefit, contributing both to economic development and civic engagement" (p. 3) complements MSU's public affairs mission. The plan states that Missouri institutions will "increase learning experiences beyond the classroom and service activities beyond the campus in support of promoting civic engagement, understanding international and cultural issues, and improving critical thinking" (p. 11).

MSU's Long-Range Plan

In 2011, MSU completed the 2011-2016 Long Range Plan for the university (MSU, 2011b). The long-range plan was developed over 17 months, included about 100 faculty, staff, and students on seven initial work groups, and took input via email and multiple open forums. The plan was guided by three overarching and enduring commitments to student learning, inclusive excellence, and institutional impact. The purpose of the long-range plan was to direct strategic actions that yield demonstrable outcomes and progress in support of these commitments.

"Student learning is the primary goal of the University and the key indicator of our success. As a community of learners, we embrace learning outcomes that encompass liberal arts education, professional preparation and a concentration on public affairs, and we pledge to support student learning in curricular, co-curricular, extra-curricular and research contexts" (MSU, 2011b, ¶ 5).

MSU's Long Range Plan specifically identified key tactics to "incorporate public affairs into all aspects of University life" (2011b, ¶ 4). The key tactics that will be employed to achieve the objectives of public affairs integration included items such as: (a) public affairs competencies, (b) general education, (c) external funding, and (d) public affairs research.

Summary

Despite the fact that most colleges and universities have mission statements, there are very few studies that examine the relationship of the mission statement and culture of the university through the perceptions of faculty and staff members. In this research study, relevant literature has been reviewed based on the following constructs:

(a) transformational leadership theory and (b) organizational culture related to the public

affairs mission. Edgar Schein's six embedding mechanisms were reviewed to connect

behavioral things leaders do to teach their organizations how to perceive, think, feel, and

behave in their organization (Schein, 2010).

This chapter examined how organizational culture overall and at a university

differ, university mission statements and the three pillars (a) community engagement, (b)

cultural competence, and (c) ethical leadership of the public affairs mission at MSU .

In Chapter Three, the research design and methodology utilized in this study will

be described. Included in this description will be a discussion of the population and

sample, data collection and instrumentation, and data analysis. Chapter Four will describe

the data collected. In the last chapter, Chapter Five will address the contributions of the

research findings and limitations.

CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH AND METHODOLOGY

In a time of evolving economic realities, public colleges and universities are being challenged to reflect on a new way of doing business. From budget cuts to more educational competitors, doing things the way they have always been done will no longer be possible. Rising college costs have made institutional effectiveness and performance prominent issues for the general public (Fugazzotto, 2009). Colleges and universities are under pressure to determine what contributes to their culture as an organization and how to improve it. Developing an understanding of organizational culture in higher education has increased dramatically over the last few decades (Knight & Trowler, 2000). University administrators are learning that leaders need to be conscious of the culture or the culture will manage them (Schein, 2005). To best understand the culture of an organization, one must learn the "shared assumptions of individuals participating in the organization" (Tierney, 1988, p. 4).

Qualitative research was chosen for this study because ultimately the goal is to explore a human problem. Collecting data through the use of interviews and focus groups, the rich descriptions offered a vivid perspective of a view of the MSU organizational culture from the MSU faculty and staff members. "The researcher builds a complex, holistic picture, analyzes words, reports detailed views of informants and conducts the study in a natural setting" (Creswell, 2007, p. 4). The analysis of a university's organizational culture is essential to maintain the balance between its values and the behavior of its members (Folch & Ion, 2009). "An organization's culture is reflected in what is done, how it is done and who is involved in doing it. Its culture

concerns decisions, actions and communication both on an instrumental and symbolic level" (Tierney, 1988, p. 3). The faculty and staff members are instrumental at any institution in, greatly affect the organizational culture, and are pivotal to influencing organizational change (Tierney, 1998). Understanding faculty and staff members' involvement in campus decisions and how much they influence the culture and climate on campus are more important than ever (Nadler, Miller, & Modica, 2010).

To understand the organizational culture of a university, the mission must also be understood. "Mission statements dictate the core activities of an organization" (Fugazzotto, 2009, p. 285). Understanding how both the culture of the university and mission of the university come together would provide a rich description of the culture of the organization (Thorton & Jaeger, 2007). The question of "how things are done around here" (Tierney, 1988, p. 3) becomes important for both internal and external stakeholders of the organization, especially in times of financial uncertainty.

Missouri State University (MSU) is a public, comprehensive university system with a mission in public affairs, whose purpose is to develop educated persons. In 1995, Senate Bill 340 gave MSU a statewide mission in public affairs. MSU identifies this mission as a way to define how a Missouri State education is different from that of other universities (MSU, 2011a). For many years, the mission has been summarized as follows: "The University's identity is distinguished by its statewide mission in public affairs, requiring a campus-wide commitment to foster competence and responsibility in the common vocation of citizenship" (MSU, 2011b).

In 2007, the university's public affairs mission was more clearly defined by including three components: (a) community engagement, (b) cultural competence, and (c)

ethical leadership (MSU, 2011a). As MSU continues to integrate the public affairs mission into the curriculum by expecting an intensive focus on public affairs in each major and staff members' goals are measured by learning outcomes tied to the mission, it is important to research faculty and staff members' perceptions of the MSU organizational culture related to the mission. Currently there are no comprehensive assessment tools to evaluate this major focus for the university.

Despite the fact that most colleges and universities have mission statements, there are very few studies that examine the relationship of the mission statement and culture of the university through the perceptions of faculty and staff members. This study will take the three pillars (community engagement, cultural competence, and ethical leadership) of the public affairs mission at MSU and examine how faculty and staff members' perceptions of the primary embedding mechanisms (Schein, 2010) influence organizational culture.

This study was intended to better understand how the public affairs mission is impacting the faculty and staff members' perceptions of Missouri State University culture. The chapter will begin by introducing the research questions that will be answered followed by an explanation for the design of the study. Next, a description of the population and the process of the sample selection will be reviewed. This will be followed by looking at the data collection steps, explaining the survey instrument that was used, and discussing steps taken to protect the participants. It will finish with a summary of how the data will be analyzed and a concluding summary.

Research Problem

The pressure for higher education in Missouri to produce better results is a serious one. Missouri consistently ranks below the national average in educational attainment (MCHBE, 2011). More than 60% of future jobs nationwide will require a college degree. Only 35% of the population ages 24 to 64 have an associate's degree or higher. One of the basic values of the Missouri Coordinating Board, "Higher education is a public good as well as a private benefit, contributing both to economic development and civic engagement" (p. 3) complements MSU's public affairs mission. The plan states that Missouri institutions will increase learning experiences beyond the classroom and service activities beyond the campus in support of promoting civic engagement, understanding international and cultural issues, and improving critical thinking" (p. 11). If MSU is going to be successful in meeting the state of Missouri's plan, it will need to have an organizational culture that reflects those objectives.

Tierney (1998) noted that often in education, many do not pay attention to the organizational culture until a time of conflict and change. At the time of the research study, MSU was in a state of reflection and change. Just nine months prior, both the university president and provost resigned their positions. To make matters even more complicated, the president served in his role for less than a year and the decision to step down was effective immediately. Internal candidates were appointed to these positions immediately, with no immediate plan to fill the positions with a national search. MSU's Interim President, Clif Smart, stated in his regular posting to the campus, "Clif Notes," in November 2011, regarding the Long-Range Plan, that he and the Administrative Council

feel the overarching and enduring commitments, the mission, the six major themes and the objectives will still serve the University well over the next five years" (MSU, 2011c).

This research of MSU faculty and staff perceptions of leader behavior provided MSU a profile of itself to stimulate a deeper analysis of the organizational culture (Schein, 2010). The study was not meant to be a complete picture of the entire organization, rather information to provide stimulus for further work on how to integrate the public affairs mission more effectively into the organization. Considering the importance of the faculty and staff perspective, the expectations of the state of Missouri for MSU and the key tactics in the University's Long Range plan, this research was instrumental in holding MSU accountable to its stakeholders. Universities base much of their organizational goals and strategic planning on their mission statements. Yet, there is very little research to reflect effective ways to implement it.

<div align="center">Research Questions</div>

The primary research questions are as follows:

1. How are the embedding mechanisms in MSU's faculty/staff culture reflective of the community engagement component of the public affairs mission?

    a. What Leaders Pay Attention to, Measure, and Control

    b. Reaction to Organizational Crises

    c. Role Modeling

    d. How Resources are Allocated

    e. Allocation of Rewards

    f. Recruitment, Selection and Dismissal

2. How are the embedding mechanisms in MSU's faculty/staff culture reflective of the cultural competence component of the public affairs mission?

    a. What Leaders Pay Attention to, Measure, and Control

    b. Reaction to Organizational Crises

    c. Role Modeling

    d. How Resources are Allocated

    e. Allocation of Rewards

    f. Recruitment, Selection and Dismissal

3. How are the embedding mechanisms in MSU's faculty/staff culture reflective of the ethical leadership component of the public affairs mission?

    a. What Leaders Pay Attention to, Measure, and Control

    b. Reaction to Organizational Crises

    c. Role Modeling

    d. How Resources are Allocated

    e. Allocation of Rewards

    f. Recruitment, Selection and Dismissal

Research Design

The study was to address a problem of practice of the public affairs mission through the perceptions of faculty and staff members at Missouri State University of the University's organizational culture. The design included a phenomenological study with a set of organizational culture procedural questions related to the perceptions and behavior of the faculty and staff members at MSU. This study took the three pillars (community engagement, cultural competence, and ethical leadership) of the public

affairs mission at MSU and examined how faculty and staff members' perceptions of MSU leaders compared with the embedding mechanisms (Schein, 2010) that influence organizational culture. Schein's (2010) six primary embedding mechanisms: (a) What Leaders Pay Attention to, Measure, and Control, (b) Reaction to Organizational Crises, (c) Role Modeling, (d) How Resources are Allocated, (e) Allocation of Rewards, and (f) Recruitment, Selection and Dismissal shaped questions for the participants. This study was meant to be exploratory due to their being little research existing about this topic.

The methods for the research included both interviews and focus groups with Missouri State University faculty and staff members. The intent was to have the faculty and staff members describe their points of view of the organizational culture at the university (Mertens, 2005). Qualitative research was chosen for this study because the goal was to explore a human problem. "The researcher builds a complex, holistic picture, analyzes words, reports detailed views of informants and conducts the study in a natural setting" (Creswell, 2007, p. 4).

Since the researcher worked at MSU, accessibility was given to administrators, faculty members, and staff members to organize interviews and focus groups. Faculty and staff members were invited through various newsletters and emails. A prominent university administrator also sent out an email on behalf of the researcher to the appropriate dean or vice president to forward on to encourage participation. MSU faculty members participated in either a focus group for those with tenure, or those who did not have tenure. The MSU staff members were divided into two groups, one for those who worked in the Division of Student Affairs and the other for the employees in the Division of Administrative and Information Services. The benefit to utilizing a focus group was to

58

observe how various participants struggle through how the primary embedding

mechanisms and public affairs components at the university were explained. Mertens

(2005) also pointed out that this format "provided evidence of how differences are

resolved and consensus is built" (pg. 245). Upper level administrators such as a Dean or

Vice President of the university were interviewed one-on-one so that his/her presence did

not affect the group.

In qualitative research, the theoretical and conceptual frameworks such as

phenomenological are used to focus the research process to give it some direction rather

than determine how the data will be collected (Mertens, 2005). The interview questions

included Schein's (2010) six embedding mechanisms as a guiding point for asking about

the public affairs mission related to MSU culture. This helped with transferability of the

data while still leaving it open-ended.

Grix (2004) had a similar view related to the interpretivist paradigm using the

idea of building or constructing a theory. Qualitative research is designed to build

throughout the research process, in which the conceptual framework guides the journey

(Merriam, 1998). Schein's embedding mechanisms were used as a guiding point which

may suggest that it was not a true phenomenological study, but these methods were

preferred to categorize areas. Schein's (2010) embedding mechanisms are major tools

leaders have both through their behavior and formal mechanisms to reinforce messages.

Participants

Participants were chosen to participate in the study based on the purpose of the

study, to better understand how the public affairs mission is impacting the faculty and

staff members' perceptions of Missouri State University culture related to the public

affairs components of community engagement, cultural competence and ethical

leadership. In order to construct their points of view, it was essential to have both MSU

faculty and staff members' participate. By utilizing both interviews and focus groups, a

more in-depth picture was created for the purpose of the study.

Interviews

Stratified, purposeful sampling (Mertens, 2005) was used to select individuals

who could inform an understanding of the organizational culture from an administrator

focus (Creswell, 2007). Categories used for the sampling included the number of years

the participant had worked at MSU (less than one year, one-three years, four–seven years,

eight-fifteen years, sixteen years or more) and if they supervised a significant number of

people and/or departments on campus. This list included several vice presidents, deans

and directors on campus. Interviewee selection was based upon accessibility, willingness

to provide information, and ability to shed light on the process being studied. The

researcher utilized snowballing to identify other people of interest (Creswell, 2007), who

were subsequently interviewed until saturation was reached.

The interviewees selected provided first-order narratives by telling stories about

themselves and their own experiences. Each faculty or staff member interviewed was

chosen specifically for his or her role at the University related to the culture and mission

of the University. Due to their campus roles being specifically responsible for areas of the

public affairs mission and/or their responsibility included extensive supervision or

responsibility of a department or division; eleven people were selected for interviews.

Their roles on campus included five Vice Presidents, two Academic Deans, two

department Director's, Faculty Senate Chair, and Staff Senate Chair.

The interviews were conducted using digital audio recorders. In addition, the participant was told he or she could refuse to answer any questions and was free to stop the interview at any time. After transcribing the responses, the information gained through the interview process was examined, and focused on the similarities and differences in the interview responses. While reviewing the transcripts of the interviews, tone and body language of the participants during the interviews was noted when possible.

Focus Groups

An email was sent to each of the six academic deans from a prominent academic administrator on campus asking them to forward the message to their faculty members encouraging them to participate (Krueger & Casey, 2009) in focus groups on campus regarding faculty/staff culture at MSU. The email invited the respondent to sign up through a website, Student Voice, and offered an incentive of a copy of the results. The interested respondent answered general demographic questions regarding length of time at the university, level of employment, gender, and age range. It was important to use the demographic information to place participants into homogeneous groups (Krueger & Casey, 2009). The demographic information was also used to narrow the number of participants and to try to have some differences among the participants. Respondents marked times and dates that they would be available to participate in the scheduled focus groups. The researcher took the responses and invited 12 participants per focus group. The assumption was that there would be some respondents who did not show up to the focus group, to reach the recommended size of 5-8 participants (Krueger & Casey, 2009). The participants were chosen to provide both diversity and balanced points of view.

There were four focus groups conducted. Focus Group #1 included tenured faculty members from each of the six colleges. Focus Group #2 included non-tenured faculty members from each of the six colleges who were not tenured. Focus Group #3 included professional non-exempt staff from the Division of Student Affairs. Focus Group #4 included professional non-exempt staff from the Division of Administrative and Information Services.

The focus group time, date, and location were chosen to be most convenient for the participants and when space was available on campus. Early March is not a particularly stressful time for most faculty and staff members. Snacks were provided to offer an incentive to attend and a way to connect with colleagues (Krueger & Casey, 2009).

Once the respondents were selected, they were sent an email from the researcher inviting them to participate on a particular at the scheduled time. The email asked the respondents to confirm their participation by emailing a response back to the researcher. Each respondent was sent a reminder twenty-four hours in advance of the scheduled focus group. This email emphasized the importance of their participation (Krueger & Casey, 2009).

<center>Instrumentation</center>

Questions for the interviews and focus groups were developed around the stated research questions. General opening and closing questions were added to help the group feel comfortable with each other. Field notes were taken by the researcher during the interview and focus groups to capture initial thoughts and reflections during the process. Appendix A includes the interview questions, Appendix B includes the focus group

questions, the interview field notes worksheet is in Appendix C and the focus group field notes worksheet is in Appendix D.

Interviews

Based on Krueger and Casey's (2009) book, the researcher limited the interview questions to approximately 10 questions, asked open ended questions, and carefully developed the questions while giving context to the participant when necessary. Because the nature of the study was to see how the public affairs components emerged from the responses, the public affairs mission was asked about indirectly to not influence the respondent. The research questions greatly influenced the design of the interview questions using both the embedding mechanisms and the public affairs components. At the end of the interview, the researcher asked the participants to draw a diagram or flowchart of how MSU culture looks for him or her during the interview. See Appendix A for the interview questions.

Focus Groups

Similar to the interviews, the researcher limited the interview questions to approximately 10 questions, asked open ended questions, and carefully developed the questions while giving context to the participant when necessary (Krueger & Casey, 2009). Because the nature of the study was to see how the public affairs components emerged from the responses, the public affairs mission was asked about indirectly to not influence the respondent. The research questions greatly influenced the design of the interview questions using both the embedding mechanisms and the public affairs components. At the end of the interview, the researcher asked the participants to draw

their own diagram or flowchart of how MSU culture looks for them during the interview. See Appendix B for a copy of the focus group questions.

Field Notes

Field notes were taken by the researcher during the interviews and the focus groups. Emerson, Fretz and Shaw (1995) explained, "The process of writing field notes helps the field researcher to understand what he has been observing in the first place and, thus, enables him to participate in new ways, to hear with greater acuteness, and to observe with a new lens" (p.15). See Appendix C for the Interview Worksheet and Appendix D for the Focus Group Worksheet used, outlining what the researcher was looking for while taking field notes.

Human Subject Protection

The researcher shared the purpose of the study, procedures that would be used to protect the confidentiality of the respondents, and the expected benefits of the study (Creswell, 2007) with the participants at the beginning of the interview. The identity of the participants was protected by using pseudonyms during transcription to ensure no documents have their name attached. All recordings were stored and locked in a separate location from the transcriptions.

IRB approval was received by the University of Missouri-Columbia and Missouri State University prior to the data collection stage. Prior to each interview and focus group, the participant was asked to sign an informed consent form (see Appendix I & J) granting permission to conduct and audio record the interview. Instructions and information regarding participation and withdrawal were also read to the participants prior to being interviewed.

Data Collection

This qualitative research study sought to provide understanding and insight into the faculty/staff perceptions of the organizational culture at MSU. The researcher collected qualitative data for this project through personal interviews and focus groups of employees. All interviews and focus groups were digitally recorded. Data collection procedures and human subject protection were considered while conducting focus groups and interviews.

Data Collection Procedures

Individual interviews were conducted depending on the administrator's role on campus. Focus groups were a guided discussion (Mertens, 2005); the researcher served as a facilitator with at least 10-14 questions asked during a 1.5 hour session on the MSU campus. The group sizes ranged from 5-8 participants. The focus group provided additional insight from the interaction among the group participants.

First, the researcher met with faculty and staff members of the organization to conduct pilot tests (Mertens, 2005) for the types and order of questions before they were used in the actual data gathering. The researcher conducted interviews before the focus groups to obtain additional background information about MSU from the leader's perspective. Once the interviews were complete, the researcher shared the list of possible questions for the focus groups with the interviewee to get any feedback.

The researcher met and discussed approaches and questions that would be used during the four focus groups with her advisor. Krueger and Casey (2009) explained the value of focus groups is to promote self-disclosure among participants so researchers can gain information about the participants' opinions on the subject.

The four focus groups allowed for what Krueger and Casey (2009) call a double-layer design. In this study, double-layer-designed focus groups provided qualitative data from different classifications of employees (faculty who were tenured and faculty who were non-tenured) and two different types of staff areas (Division of Student Affairs and Division of Administrative and Information Services). Both focus group answers were audio recorded and later transcribed. The researcher also took field notes, which Emerson, Fretz, and Shaw (1995) said were invaluable to the research. Emerson et al. explained that field notes provide important insight into the organization's functioning and the organization's learning processes. These notes were used to describe the focus groups' settings and recreated the scene for readers. It also helped the researcher note particularly important points at the time or if something needed to be improved for the process in the future.

Pseudonyms were used to protect the identity of the participants. The researcher asked all groups similar questions regarding the embedding mechanisms (Schein, 2010) within MSU faculty/staff organizational culture. As Krueger and Casey (2009) advised, the groups were small and manageable but large enough to offer different perspectives.

The second source of data was for ten interviews with various faculty members, staff members and administrators who did not participate in a focus group. During this process, the researcher prepared to collect data by developing an interview protocol, but varied the questions based on open-ended responses by the research participants.

<center>Data Analysis</center>

Using a constructivist approach, the researcher sought to understand the complex world of lived experience from the point of view of those who have lived it (Mertens,

2005). Significant statements were clustered together into themes and an overall

depiction of the organizational culture revealed itself through coding. The data exposed

influential factors in the process relating to community engagement, cultural competence,

and ethical leadership. These concepts provided a framework for better understanding the

perceptions of faculty and staff of the organizational culture. The researcher

acknowledged the study was seated in the constructivist paradigm; therefore, the research

was a product of the values as researcher and could not be independent of them.

Transcriptions of the interviews were analyzed and significant statements

identified to reveal common themes. The data collection process was emergent, allowing

the researcher to change questions and adapt the focus as data was accumulated. The goal

of data analysis was to construct an understanding of the factors influencing the

perceptions of faculty and staff members related to MSU's organizational culture. After

conducting the focus groups, the researcher organized the data, transcribed the focus

group conversations, and analyzed the findings, searching for common themes. The

qualitative data collected from the focus group was compared to the interview findings.

Review of the data offered three distinct categories for sorting and analyzing the

material collected: (a) community engagement, (b) cultural competence and (c) ethical

leadership. To develop these categories, interview transcripts were analyzed first to

determine the commonalities among the various participants involved in the study.

Responses and reactions varied somewhat by the position and background with which the

interviewee was affiliated as well as the years of experience that person held.

Role of Researcher and Trustworthiness

Krueger and Casey (2009) emphasized that the right moderator is the one who can get the most useful information. The researcher has extensive facilitation experience leading focus groups, and because of her familiarity with the topic and the organization, she served as the moderator and interviewer. The researcher is a staff member at MSU, and understood the importance of being confidential with the data and being trustworthy with the participants. The concern of researcher bias was addressed by carefully wording the questions to not imply an opinion either way. The researcher decided to conduct the focus groups and interviews to ensure the questions that were most important to the study stayed central to the time with the participants. The researcher utilized several other researchers in the analysis of the data to protect the process from bias.

Summary

This chapter provided the background, research questions, and research design. It also defined how the participants were selected and identified how the data was collected and analyzed. Finally the role of the researcher was emphasized and how it can greatly impact qualitative research if the proper precautions are not taken. This chapter reviewed which primary embedding mechanisms (Schein, 2010) are evident in the three public affairs components (community engagement, cultural competence and ethical leadership) from the perceptions of the faculty and staff members at MSU. Although there have been various studies on organizational cultures at universities, there has not yet been a study that evaluates the integration on the mission within the organization. As universities evaluate themselves while going through complex economic times, learning more about how their faculty and staff perceive the behavior of the leaders of the organization are

pivotal. Chapter Four will include the data collected, revealing the themes found within

the interviews and focus groups. Chapter Five will summarize the findings of the

research, and include implications and opportunities for further research.

CHAPTER FOUR

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

Introduction

Qualitative research was chosen for this study because ultimately the goal is to explore a human problem. Collecting data through the use of interviews and focus groups provided rich descriptions and offered a vivid perspective of a view of the Missouri State University (MSU) organizational culture from the MSU faculty and staff members. In order to gain an understanding of the organizational culture of a university, the mission needed to also be understood. Clarifying how both the culture of the university and mission of the university come together would provide a rich description of the culture of the organization (Thorton & Jaeger, 2007). The question of "how things are done around here" (Tierney, 1988, p. 3) becomes important for both internal and external stakeholders of the organization, especially in times of financial uncertainty.

Missouri State University is a public, comprehensive university system with a mission in public affairs, whose purpose is to develop educated persons. In 2007, the university's public affairs mission was more clearly defined by including three components: (a) community engagement, (b) cultural competence, and (c) ethical leadership (MSU, 2011a). Despite the fact that most colleges and universities have mission statements, there are very few studies that examine the relationship of the mission statement and culture of the university through the perceptions of faculty and staff members. This study took the three pillars (community engagement, cultural competence, and ethical leadership) of the public affairs mission at MSU and examined

70

how faculty and staff members' perceptions of the primary embedding mechanisms (Schein, 2010) influence organizational culture.

This chapter will provide a detailed description of the results obtained through interviews of the leaders at MSU, and focus groups with both faculty and staff separately. Themes emerged from the responses related to Schein's (2010) six embedding mechanisms and were evaluated in relation to the three public affairs pillars (MSU, 2011a). The six primary embedding mechanisms are: (a) What Leaders Pay Attention to, Measure, and Control, (b) Reaction to Organizational Crises, (c) Role Modeling, (d) How Resources are Allocated, (e) Allocation of Rewards, and (f) Recruitment, Selection and Dismissal. Each of the primary mechanisms were studied in relationship to the three pillars (community engagement, cultural competence, and ethical leadership) of the public affairs mission at MSU. Open coding (Emerson, Fretz, & Shaw, 1995) was used by reading the transcripts of data line by line to identify all ideas, themes or issues. During the research study, 41 faculty and staff members were involved in either an interview or focus group within the month of March 2012. All of the interviews and focus groups were audio recorded and transcribed.

The primary themes will be discussed in relation to comparing the responses of the MSU faculty, staff, and leaders involved with the study. Data sources for examples provided from interview transcripts of leaders at MSU will be as follows: L-1, L-2, L-3, L-4, L-5, L-6, L-7, L-8, L-9, L-10 and L-11. The data sources in the Student Affairs staff focus group transcripts were identified as: SA-1, SA-2, SA-3, SA-4, SA-5, SA-6, SA-7, SA-8, and SA-9. The data sources in the Administrative and Information Services staff focus group were identified as: AIS-1, AIS-2, AIS-3, AIS-4, AIS-5, AIS-6, AIS-7, AIS-8,

71

and AIS-9. The data sources for the non-tenured faculty were identified as: NTF-1, NTF-2, NTF-3, NTF-4, NTF-5, NTF-6, and NTF-7. Finally, the tenured faculty focus group transcripts were identified as: TF-1, TF-2, TF-3, TF-4, and TF-5. Field notes from the corresponding interview or focus group will be noted.

There were 22 male participants and 19 female participants. Years of service ranged from only a few months to over 35 years at MSU. The focus was primarily on exempt staff (16) being part of the focus groups, but there were two non-exempt staff. Faculty were represented from nearly all of the colleges and ranged in rank from instructor to full tenured professor.

The researcher independently coded the responses from all of the questions and then recruited three additional researchers to also review three-four questions and answers independent of the researcher. These results were shared with the researcher, and overall they were able to have an inter-rater reliability of over 90% with all three of them (Mertens, 2005). This helped ensure the researcher did not let any bias affect the themes determined in the research.

This study was intended to better understand how the public affairs mission is impacting the faculty and staff members' perceptions of Missouri State University culture. Chapter Four will begin with a personal reflection on the process. It will finish with a summary of how the data will was analyzed and a concluding summary.

Personal Reflection

As I reviewed the transcripts of interviews and focus groups, and looked over my field notes, I was overwhelmed with the amount of information that I collected in such short amount of time. For the most part, participants seemed open and eager to share their

experiences even though they knew that some of their answers were shared with the acknowledgment of the complexity of the answer. The participants knew that the study was about the MSU organizational culture related to the faculty and staff. They did not know that I was looking for how the three components of the MSU public affairs mission (a) community engagement, (b) cultural competence, and (c) ethical leadership (MSU, 2011a) were reflected in their responses. Schein (2010) believed organizations must become perpetual learners to deal with the constancy of change. He offered six embedding mechanisms of leader behavior to influence the culture of an organization. The six primary embedding mechanisms are: (a) What Leaders Pay Attention to, Measure, and Control, (b) Reaction to Organizational Crises, (c) Role Modeling, (d) How Resources are Allocated, (e) Allocation of Rewards, and (f) Recruitment, Selection and Dismissal. Each of the primary mechanisms were studied in relationship to the three pillars (community engagement, cultural competence, and ethical leadership) of the public affairs mission at MSU. While I think I received a more honest reflection of how the three components were naturally incorporated, it made coding the responses somewhat challenging. I summarized the data by what I learned overall about the embedding mechanisms and then broke down how the three components were evident in the responses.

<div align="center">Data Analysis</div>

Each of the primary embedding mechanisms were studied in relationship to the three pillars (community engagement, cultural competence, and ethical leadership) of the public affairs mission at MSU. Each mechanism was asked about in the interviews and focus groups. The data analysis section is divided into six sections: (a) What Leaders Pay

<div align="center">73</div>

Attention to, Measure, and Control, (b) Reaction to Organizational Crises, (c) Role Modeling, (d) How Resources are Allocated, (e) Allocation of Rewards, and (f) Recruitment, Selection and Dismissal. Within each section, the general themes from the responses are given. Then each embedding mechanism was analyzed to identify in what ways the three pillars were evident. Each pillar was divided into a sub-section. The results were summarized at the end of Chapter Four.

What Leaders Pay Attention to, Measure, and Control

The first component of Schein's (2010) six embedding mechanisms, What Leaders Pay Attention to, Measure, and Control, is reflected in how the organization communicates priorities, goals, assessment plans, and what is highlighted or hidden. What types of areas are commented on, noticed, and given attention from the leadership or the organization? Just as important is what is not mentioned or given attention in the organization. Oftentimes priorities by leaders can be determined by who surrounds them in the organization. Organization members will choose to focus their attention on what is measured and controlled by both their peers and the leaders.

The overwhelming theme in this embedding mechanism was numbers. This included mainly budget, but the comments overlapped greatly with enrollment and how it affected the budget. Over half of the leaders interviewed mentioned budgets, 30% mentioned enrollment, and all four focus groups talked at great length about both enrollment and budget, but focused more on enrollment. Half of the leaders mentioned something related to the overall student experience, student needs, quality of education, and even learning outcomes. The student experience was mentioned only seven times in the focus groups as something leaders pay attention to at MSU. Some smaller themes

worth noting when leaders were asked in their interview what leaders pay attention to, faculty was mentioned 40% of the time and the identity of MSU 30%.

Numbers. When I asked this question to anyone in a position other than a vice president, there was a very specific reaction of either laughter, particularly in the focus groups, or saying words like 'ouch' (I-2). Overwhelmingly, terms such as budget and numbers (first-time enrollment and number of students within particular class/major) were the most common responses initially.

Both tenured and non-tenured faculty members in the focus groups shared some examples of the emphasis on numbers. A non-tenured faculty member said: "My department head has charts showing the total number of credit hours our students are enrolled in, within our department's classes and always looking to see that the numbers are going up over the years (NTF-3)."

A tenured faculty member added more specificity by stating:

> I think there has been increasing emphasis on numbers. Student credit hours, the overall numbers, things like that, and increasingly, programs that don't have a lot of student credit hours, get a lot more scrutiny. They may be incredibly high quality programs, but as state budgets decline and economic pressures mount, understandably many administrators look at which programs generate the dollars and then which cost the dollars. I don't know how that can be avoided necessarily, but I think it's a growing part of administrative philosophy. (TF-3)

The faculty members empathized with the leaders during their discussion regarding the recent focus on numbers and budget being a reality of the economic situation, but several seemed worried that the focus on numbers would override the

emphasis on teaching and students. Some faculty shared concerns over MSU struggling with its identity during this time. While they acknowledged and appreciated some of the resources from the campus, such as workshops from the Faculty Center for Teaching and Learning, they shared the struggle for maintaining the feeling of a small university since they have less time for students.

The staff focus groups also emphasized numbers with their initial answers:

I think for some leaders ultimately it is how many are we graduating a year. I think for a lot of the leaders its numbers. It's not all of them but if you look at what are they looking at, it's the number of enrollments, retention, are we keeping those students and then I think that drives a lot of the conversation and but I think it is a lot of numbers too. (SA-7)

Leaders who were not at the vice president level (dean and directors) also emphasized numbers including budgets and enrollment, but due to their roles (being both a leader over some areas but having leaders above them) answered the question a little differently:

That probably means multiple answers as well depending on the leaders you are talking about. I definitely think leaders are paying attention to numbers. Not to the exclusion of quality but economic reality to maintaining enrollment and growing enrollment a little bit and trying to figure out where the best places are to put our resources. (L-4)

Leaders who were at the vice president level shared balancing of priorities and numbers within their positions:

There is appropriate, I use that word purposely, appropriate sensitivity to the

publics we have to respond to, not only internally, but externally. That goes along

with the realities of state funding going down, fundraising, friend-raising is going

to be even more essential. So there is awareness of that, but not to the detriment

of what's best for students. (L-5)

Student needs. As the conversations went a little deeper into the numbers

including budgets and enrollment, the impact on students was evident in half of the

interviews:

I think it's probably a balance between the students and their needs, and those

external I mean, they have to be paying attention to the external sorts of things,

because otherwise no one else is going to. Do they spend more time with that than

the students? Probably upper administration, just because they have to, and that's

kind of their role. But I think the students are always in their minds, and that's

always part of the conversation, is what's best for them. That's a tough question.

(L-9)

Another leader shared:

I am no longer the lone voice on the administrative council that has asked the

question what is, what's the impact of the decision upon students. Uh, I'd say

right now there is more of a focus on student learning and student outcomes than

there has been in the number of years that I've been here. (L-5)

As part of one of the staff focus groups, one participant noted the strength of the

voice of the students in what the leaders pay attention to at MSU:

I have seen [specific example] and lots of other things happen because students
have taken the initiative to speak up to the administration and say this is what we
want. And I think if it is reasonable, practical, and doable, the University listens
and tries to do things for the students. It may not be what the administration is
necessarily thinking, but when it comes from the students, it definitely is heard.
(SA-5)

Faculty. In 40% of the interviews with leaders, the pressure to focus on what
faculty expect was evident. One leader noted:

There are a lot of people that cater to the faculty needs and desires. Well, it just
seems like any time there, especially when it comes to budgetary concerns, that
there's always the question and the concern raised and it may just be because
faculty senate, um, is very vocal but there is, seems to be a lot of attention paid to
getting faculty up to, uh, peer standards. In recent months, there has been a shift
to including staff which I think is nice, in financial compensation, but I think
primarily that the faculty drives the ship. (L-1)

In one of the staff focus groups, the focus on leaders paying attention to faculty was also
noted:

What I hear a lot is concern for the students, and the faculty as well. I don't want
to leave out the staff in this because I do hear concern for staff, but I think the
focus is on the core business of providing an educational experience for the
students and tied to the budget process, that is what I hear the most. (AIS-6)

MSU identity/big picture. As the conversation evolved away from leaders just paying attention to numbers there was also some acknowledgement from both staff focus groups that the leaders pay attention to the bigger picture of the University:

I would say this focus right now seems to be on how can we take MSU to the next level, how can we provide students with the real student experience that they expect in today's market, things like housing, student housing is upgrading, the Rec Center is coming online, the classroom technology is in place. From a facilities standpoint, those are all things that that we can provide to the students to make them feel, well we are kind of in a transition as a small/medium size university trying to grow as was said earlier, looking down the road, how can we grow into what we really want to be? The University is considered to be a big player on the field, how can we be MSU and not SMS, I think we are still in that transition a bit. (AIS-7)

Several leaders shared they are currently focused on the larger picture of MSU developing from a regional university into a metropolitan, state-wide university:

I would say the current leadership pays attention to strong consensus and they pay attention to things that would define being Missouri State University, as opposed to Southwest Missouri State University. So, defining what that is, is becoming more of a driving factor and current leadership is very in tune with getting a consensus of how best to do things. (L-3)

Community Engagement in What Leaders Pay Attention to, Measure, and Control

The embedding mechanism, What Leaders Pay Attention to, Measure, and Control, in MSU's faculty/staff culture is reflective of the community engagement

79

component of the public affairs mission in several ways. The leaders who were interviewed were able to give very specific examples of community engagement within the faculty, staff, and leaders. Many had excitement in their voices when talking about this component of the public affairs mission. The sub-themes of this section are: (a) Institutional Connection with Community (b) Staff Community Engagement, and (c) Community Service and Tenure.

Institutional connection with community. The most common response, particularly among faculty members in the focus groups, or when leaders referred to faculty in relationship with community engagement, was how faculty could use their expertise to benefit the community, the University, and meet their research interests/needs:

> Well the faculty member, I think, is very much taking advantage of his or her expertise and applying that to the community…It's similar but a little different with staff. We have an obligation to the community, to the city, to the county, to be involved in, um, whatever is going on….Somebody is there from the University, and it's usually somebody that's fairly knowledgeable about that type of thing. That shows where we are, because if we're a metropolitan university and we're the largest by far of all of the, of the colleges in town, we've got to, we've got to have a presence. The phrase they used many times is the town-gown relationship. I know just from talking to colleagues in other universities, uh, we, we are fairly unique. Ours is very good. (I-3)

Another leader shared a similar perspective of MSU's role in the community, but had a different perspective on how successful the University is at community engagement. L-11's explanation included sharing of both power and resources with the

community. He/she emphasized the benefit of having more people involved so that more perspectives can influence the community and more learning will occur for everyone:

It means the cross sharing of resources and the cross sharing of information so that the community grows at a speed comparable to the University and vice versa. And that the sharing of minds, sharing of ideas, and the level of collaboration that makes it difficult for one to grow while the other doesn't. So it's necessary for true community growth. Because how the city is structured, there are too few people who have major hands, who would allow the city to grow more one way then another way. And I think as leadership expands and diversifies, then other areas will have opportunities to grow that weren't there, or weren't as strong, in the past. And community engagement, on that level, just means there will be some redistribution of resources, of policies, of how things come into existence, whether it's business or whether it's educating about the business, whether its teaching in the schools or educating to become a teacher. Those processes will become more connected when things are more diversified. Right now, when they're not, the idea that people will take the path of least resistance, and they won't learn from it. (L-11)

Staff-community connection. While there were many activities listed where staff members play a role on campus such as Relay for Life, Denim Days, United Way campaign, etc, there was some admission of a greater struggle for staff members to have as much of a connection to community engagement:

I get a very strong feeling from staff that they don't feel like they are part of the bigger picture….I think staff, more so than faculty sees it as that's just part of

81

what they do in their personal life. They don't see it as a relationship to like say the public affairs mission. They don't, I don't think they see that as oh, I'm engaged in my community and I'm representing the University. (L-1)

Community engagement and tenure. A few faculty members gave some very specific examples of what leaders should be paying attention to within the University in connection to community engagement regarding tenure and promotion. When asked about what community engagement look like in behavior of leaders at MSU, one leader commented:

I think they [leaders] are doing some of it themselves also trying to facilitate community engagement from the rest of the campus to make it easier finding pathways. One of the important things for the leadership to do is to say that this is what we want our campus to be like and then we need to create incentives to reinforce that. A simple one would be one that counts towards tenure and promotion for faculty. If it is something worthwhile, then we can't just say do it because it is worthwhile but because it is something we value and it might be a combination faculty and staff and flexible hours. For faculty, a big part has to be that if it is something we want faculty to do, it has to count toward tenure and promotion. (L-7)

Overall, once the initial conversations got past the emphasis on numbers and budget, many faculty, staff and leaders acknowledged the University's responsibility to community engagement. Some of the University's coalitions (Faculty Senate, Student Government Association and somewhat Staff Senate) were acknowledged for having the

most direct influence on what the leaders pay attention to, particularly the Student Government Association.

Cultural Competence in What Leaders Pay Attention to, Measure and Control

The embedding mechanism, What Leaders Pay Attention to, Measure, and Control, in MSU's faculty/staff culture is reflective of the cultural competence component of the public affairs mission in very limited ways. The most common theme evident among the leaders about cultural competence was in policies and resources.

Policies and Resources. Several leaders mentioned the responsibility of staff members at the University to have a diversity hiring policy when asked what cultural competence looks like in behavior of the leaders at MSU.

> For leaders, it can be and should be trying to hire and recruit diverse faculty and staff and make this a welcoming an environment for students as well. (L-7)

Another leader explained more specifically how cultural competence would be integrated into everyday life as a leader at MSU:

> Diversity hiring policy I talked about earlier is one good example. It is not so much a demonstration of personal cultural competence but a demonstration of value and willingness to put some action into policy and resources behind promoting that. That is a key thing. When leaders have an opportunity to respond to or address some complaint or conflict issue whether it is on campus or from the community, for example, this past year, there was [specific situation], I thought that the way that Clif [MSU President] handled that, it was appropriate and demonstrated his cultural competence. (L-4)

Another leader explained:

> Very much supporting diverse initiatives on campus, supporting with recruitment of diverse students, faculty, and staff. Helping units to engage in those kinds of activities and I think from my view as administrator is to facilitate things for other people. It is important as to what I do as a role model but also to help people to move forward in those areas themselves. Having administration support those ideals and do whatever they can to do to help. (L-8)

Ethical Leadership in What Leaders Pay Attention to, Measure, and Control

The embedding mechanism, What Leaders Pay Attention to, Measure, and Control, in MSU's faculty/staff culture is reflective of the ethical leadership component of the public affairs mission in subtle ways. Themes of being a role model for ethical leadership (40%) and demonstrating transparency (40%) were noted most important for how our leaders should demonstrate it in their behavior.

Role model for ethical leadership. What leaders pay attention to, measure and control can be reflected in their own behavior choices. One leader shared his/her perspective on this issue.

> Certainly among the University's leadership, we've got to be models of everything that we say we are, and I think the current leadership is. Uh, I think we went through a crisis 12 and 18 months ago, where having the leadership was key. There were several that really wrestled with what the appropriate ethics are. And without exception the right thing was done. (L-3)

84

Another leader shared:

> Whether it is something like an anti-discrimination statement, sexual orientation, domestic partner benefits, or something else, if and when the University does take the domestic partner benefits let's say, it will because we have a president that steps up and says it is the right thing to do and there will be people in the community who will be upset by that. You are not just exercising but using your leadership role to do something ethical and argue for something that is right to do. (L-4)

> *Demonstrating transparency.* Another leader shared the importance of leaders explaining the reasoning behind why they are paying attention to things that they are:

> What it should look like first and foremost is transparency, they say what they want to do, why they want to do it and how they are going to do it and have reasons behind than, rather doing things behind closed doors or without input or saying that they are going to do one thing and do another. Almost always when we have problems it has been of that nature and it is not necessarily just the bad decisions made in private or bad decisions that directly contradicted what they were going to do. Ethical leadership when do you see, is being more open and transparent and doing the things that you say you are going to do. (L-7)

Overall, when faculty, staff, and leaders were asked what leaders pay attention to, the public affairs components were not evident in their initial answers. When asked more specifically about the three pillars and how employee behavior looks at MSU, what leaders pay attention to became slightly more evident. This was a trend through most of

the answers in the entire process. Organization members will choose to focus their attention on what is measured and controlled by both their peers and the leaders.

Summary. In the first embedding mechanism, What Leaders Pay Attention to, Measure and Control, numbers was the highest theme by far. Community engagement was apparent as something that was important to leaders on the campus and the various ways it could be demonstrated. Cultural competence was less clear and focused on structural areas such as policies and resources. Finally, ethical leadership was shown in leader behavior, by being a role model and having transparency. Figure 1 shows the themes in general and then for each public affairs pillar. The most common theme is listed at the top and so on. The next section will review the findings from the second embedding mechanism, Reaction to Organizational Crises.

Embedding mechanism: What Leaders Pay Attention to, Measure & Control	
General themes: (In order of strength)	*-Numbers (Budgets + Enrollment)* *-Student Needs* *-Faculty* *-Identity of MSU*
Comments Related to Public Affairs Pillars	
Community Engagement	*-Institutional Connection with Community* *-Staff Community Connection* *-Community Engagement & Tenure*
Cultural Competence	*-Policies & Resources*
Ethical Leadership	*-Being a Role Model* *-Transparency*

Figure 1. Data Analysis: Themes from the embedding mechanism: What Leaders Pay Attention to, Measure, and Control.

Reaction to Organizational Crises

The second item in Schein's (2010) embedding mechanisms is Reaction to

Organizational Crises. This may include how decisions are made during difficult

economic times or during a change in leadership. Creating new norms, values, and

working procedures reflects underlying assumptions about the culture. Many leaders,

faculty, and staff members interviewed cited MSU as currently recovering from a

leadership crisis of losing both the president and provost within the last year, and

navigating an additional proposed reduction of funding from the state of 8%, which is

approximately six million dollars (MSU, 2012c).

Similar to the first embedding mechanism, when asked what behavior looks like

when the organization reacts in a crisis, there were a lot of laughs and acknowledgements

of this still being a sensitive topic. Many shared more recent thoughts about this question

as they appeared to still be processing how the organization reacts to a crisis, and not sure

if it has really ended. Several of the leaders interviewed talked about their role in trying

to make things less stressful for the people that they supervise. The two major themes of

this section were: (a) University Administrators Resigning, including Trust and

Transparency, and (b) Financial Uncertainty.

University administrators resigning. Many responses from the leader interviews

(70%) addressed MSU before the resignation of the two top leaders and how it is slowly

changing with interim leadership in place:

> [Chuckled] Behavior looks very different, certainly we had an unfortunate
>
> situation last year when we had a president who came in and was only here 10
>
> months. I'd say from university standards, that is a crisis. Certainly untypical and

very stressful environment and different units handled it differently. People tried

to do whatever they could to lessen that impact on staff members or faculty. I

think that was the reaction of most chairs and deans, department heads to try and

shield folks as much as they could from that situation. (L-8)

Another leader shared his/her experience with the recent crisis at MSU:

It is very much, uh, fold the tent. And we've been through a crisis situation. Work

productivity suffers dramatically because people are not inclined to want to put

out the effort. People are scared. There is a lack of trust that is demonstrated in a

crisis mode like that; can I trust you? I don't want to share my concerns with you

unless I can trust you. And then as a result, that trickles all the way down and

people get, people can sense that in the leadership, that something's not right, and

so while that top level's work doesn't get done to the same level that it should, uh,

that gets translated down, and while you try to put on a good face it is tough. (L-

3)

Another leader gave his/her perspective on the leadership change at MSU, explaining the

organization may still be in a crisis currently:

…you have to think that there was something majorly wrong with only having a

president for ten months. That's almost a national record for the shortest tenure of

a presidency without the person passing away or becoming terminally ill or

something like that. Just to have a situation where you hire on a person to lead,

who decides within ten months that he wasn't the right person, that says an awful

lot about the inflexibility of the culture or it says an awful lot about the

dogmatism of the person that was hired. Either way, it results in people in the boat

being scared to row, scared to lose their job, scared to advance in any real way that would be good for the students. (L-11)

Trust and being transparent were themes that came up both related to the leadership change and the financial uncertainty:

I think it all becomes very open, kind of. Like when you said crisis, I thought this past summer when the Provost and then the President left and it was like, first, there was no information and then the flood gates opened, it was kind of awkward to read in the News-Leader first to get your news about your workplace. (AIS-4)

Another leader shared the changes he/she has seen more recently in the organization with the new interim leadership:

I think right now we're more moving into a phase of being more proactive. Just from just the feeling. I mean I feel like it's a lot more, settled right now; that people are less, tense and on edge about decisions that are being made. I think there's more confidence in decisions that are being made. That they're being made with, information provided and actually being considered before decisions are being made. That's the overall feeling – that I get. (L-1)

Financial uncertainty. When these interviews were being conducted in the spring 2012 semester, there were still many questions about how big the threat of state funding cuts would be. Another staff member shared his/her thoughts related to the financial uncertainty at the University:

Um, financial crisis I think as long as I've been employed here the University's always operated in a very conservative manner which can be challenging with staffing but at the same time the other universities in Missouri have had to

89

literally let people go because of financial reasons. Missouri State has never had

to do that and so I think they just, from a financial standpoint any crisis that come

out, they address them as, as, they'd prepared for them I guess before they actually

happen so it's not necessarily a huge crisis. It is crisis but it's something that

they've just worked through and, and try, and I have seen, the administration be

very, very open with people and I think that's a good thing as well for the culture

of the campus, for people to really understand what is going on and that the

University's trying to be open and let them know that this is just the way it is and

we can only do so much and sorry but that's the way it's going to be. (SA-5)

A tenured faculty member pointed out a concern that several shared of the buildup of the

financial cuts over the years:

I think what I'm most concerned with is not a crisis, but a cumulative small

problem here, and the next small problem two years from now, another problem,

and so it's kind of cumulative effect of financial problems that I think is our

biggest challenge. I think the University handles the big stuff either pretty well or

managed to dodge a bullet somehow (TF-4).

Community Engagement within a Crisis in the Organization

The embedding mechanism, Reaction to Organizational Crises, in MSU's

faculty/staff culture is reflective of the community engagement component of the public

affairs mission in subtle ways. When discussing community engagement and the strength

of relationships among community leaders in Springfield, the change in leadership was

noted as a tough time by one leader interviewed:

90

You've got a really unique type of thing here, and, and I think, I don't take it for

granted. But it is, it's unique and we, we have to work hard to, to keep it, and we

almost lost it, a year, 18 months ago. Came very close to losing it. (L-3)

Cultural Competence within a Crisis in the Organization

The embedding mechanism (b) Reaction to Organizational Crises, in MSU's

faculty/staff culture is reflective of the cultural competence component of the public

affairs mission in very limited ways. There was little stated within the research, but a few

points are worth mentioning:

At one point, it has always been a struggle here, I think. You hear the rumors

about the demographics being skewed so white here that we don't have any

cultural competence and, and that means so much more. We had a discussion

about this in staff senate the other day [because of] adding cultural competence

and diversity in engagement principles, things to our ADP (Appraisal and

Development Plan). It caused some consternation from staff because they don't

have the opportunity, like I mentioned earlier, to really be engaged in a lot of

things 'cause they're doing their, their job. That they're, they don't know how to

include it, and it was explained to me so that I could then explain to the rest of the

senate, found out that it's about doing your job well and in a university, it should

automatically be thinking about diversity. It doesn't necessarily mean it needs to

be spelled out but it is thinking about what you're doing and how you can be more

open. I think we, we like to think we are in some ways but I think in perception

we're not. It's part of where we live. How, um, I see many faculty making the

leap to try to do more. It's tough. Students are being, are more savvy to that.

91

They're really looking at that and saying do we have the diversity we need to
succeed later. So I think that there's a movement. I don't think we're good at it. I
think we're getting better. (L-2)

A faculty member in a focus group explained that even the city has identified the need for
diversity in the local community in recent years:

Yeah, even the city of Springfield, the Chamber of Commerce is pounding the
table, says we are losing industry because industry comes here, my work force
would come here, but it lacks diversity to it. So the city itself is alarmed. (TF-1)

The two major crises noted by most participants lacked the inclusion of
connecting the component of cultural competence with the cultural competence definition
including respect for multiple perspectives and are able to successfully negotiate cross-
cultural differences (MSU, 2011a). As the institution continues to work through the
leadership changes and financial uncertainty, the value of different viewpoints could be
helpful, not just consensus.

Ethical Leadership within a Crisis in the Organization

The embedding mechanism, Reaction to Organizational Crises, in MSU's
faculty/staff culture is reflective of the ethical leadership component of the public affairs
mission in subtle ways. The balance becomes how the stakeholders' opinions are
balanced among each other before, during, and after a crisis. Some examples given were
faculty being upset with President Cofer being hired and staff not feeling like they were
informed properly when he resigned. This leader shared how complicated change can be
in the University setting, particularly during a crisis:

When I said earlier about denying crisis reflects a broader mindset that is true

in most universities because of what they are of just a general resistance to

change or at least a resistance to change in their own backyard. You can

always point to other things that should change, but we wouldn't be doing it

over here if we didn't think they were good already. Sometimes ethical

leadership means willing to step outside that comfortable zone and or

assumption that things are 98% good the way they are now and being able to

take an honest look from an outside perspective, willing to engage colleagues

and faculty as to what is best overall and what are the creative solutions and

looking ahead 20 years as well as looking back 20 years. Because faculty have

a lot of opportunity and responsibility to being engaged in decision making,

that is where they have the best opportunity. (L-4)

Summary. A Reaction to Organizational Crises in the organization is an especially

important time in its history, and while it can heighten anxiety, it can also motivate new

learning. The major themes that emerged were the two recent crises that the organization

has had to deal with in the last year (a) university administrators resigning, and (b)

financial uncertainty. The third component of ethical leadership was the most evident in

the answers by including the lack of information shared and the importance of

transparency as the organization reacted to the crises. Figure 2 compares the themes in

the general responses to the theme in relationship to the three public affairs pillars.

Embedding mechanism: Reaction to Organizational Crises	
General themes: (In order of strength)	*-University Administrators Resigning* *-Financial Uncertainty*
Comments Related to Public Affairs Pillars	
Community Engagement	*-Strength of relationship with community challenged*
Cultural Competence	*-Local area in struggle to be more diversified*
Ethical Leadership	*-Lack of Information & Transparency*

Figure 2. Data Analysis: Themes from the embedding mechanism: Reaction to Organizational Crises.

Role Modeling

Role modeling, the third component of Schein's (2010) embedding mechanisms, includes communicating values through actions. This can come in more deliberate forms like teaching and coaching or more informally through everyday behavior. Whether it is dealing with an ethical dilemma, developing a vision, or implementing a new idea, role models become apparent at various times in an organization. Finally, if an organization is dealing with change, it may be difficult for members to picture how they are going to behave. Role models in the organization can exhibit the new behavior, so members can imagine themselves doing it (Schein, 2010).

When the leaders were asked to think of a role model they have at MSU and what traits the person exhibits, the most common themes were: Honesty/Transparent/Trustworthy (50%), Open-minded/Objective/Analytical (80%), Friendly/Enjoyable/Sense of Humor (40%), and Respect/Equal/Approachable (40%). Many of them seem to refer to their peers when describing the traits of their role model. In the focus groups on the other hand, role model seemed less likely to be a peer, but

rather someone in a leadership role above them. The most common themes were related to being encouraged to grow and make mistakes and treating you as an equal with respect.

Role modeling with honesty/transparent/trustworthy. This leader tied in almost all of the most common themes:

They are hard working, they do what they say they're going to do, they are transparent about it, and they share decisions openly so that not only do I know, but everyone else who is impacted knows. And this person can make a decision, and know that they might be making some people unhappy, some people happy, and can justify it and explain it well, so that you know. There's not a lot of right or wrong answers most of the time it's sort of grey and in the middle, and so someone that can explain that and justify it and then you move on, and deal with that, and go on to the next thing. So someone who can stay calm in all of that and make a reasoned decision and then articulate it, that's just key to me in a role model as well as someone who works hard. Part of that is being trustworthy. (L-9)

Another leader explained:

Along with integrity comes honesty, I can handle a lot of things if I believe I have all of the information. Even with the worst news and as soon as you know the bad news, then you can develop a plan and react to it. It's when you don't know or feel like you are hearing one thing and someone reports that they are hearing something different, it is very unsettling and you can't really act because you are afraid that you might take a wrong turn. Find out the next week that the situation isn't really what you thought it was. Honesty is real key. Another thing is, don't

want to be so trite to say sense of humor, but someone who enjoys working and what they are doing and tries to make work enjoyable for everybody. Sometimes that is sense of humor, sometimes that is kindness, doing the unexpected, sometimes it is generosity, all those characteristics we look for in friends and families that needs to somehow come out in work relationships as well. (L-4)

Open-minded, objective, analytical. This leader shared the value of being open-minded and calm as a leader:

That's easy for me answer, there is some that I can identify, that short three letter word they ask a lot, is why. Why are we doing that, it ties into what's the impact on students, to give me a full understanding, no snap judgments, some of these things get referred to me, the initial report is something oh my gosh, this is something else. The awareness, of there is probably another side to this story. There is that level, if again if something in my area, if I can use that language, if something is not perceived right, or somebody criticizes, or whatever you get the opportunity to check it out, find out really what has happened or hasn't happened, and recognition that this is another trait of this person, recognition of that not everybody is perfect, there's going to be mistakes made, and particularly if we try to be creative with reduced resources and all that, not everything we try is going to work. But also that individual has a definite respect for people, value people, and values diverse opinion, and I think that's so important to have an atmosphere where people can disagree. (L-5)

Below is a discussion regarding role model traits they see at MSU. The discussion reflects more a mentor role than what the leaders mentioned in their interviews:

Also someone who pushes you to personally grow, somebody who accepts what

you are doing but gives you challenges, it makes so it is not the same year to year,

so challenging yourself and growing. (AIS-8)

And they have provided the support to do that. (AIS-7)

Yes. And you are not afraid to fail. You know that if you struggle at all, you can

go back and ask for help and they will help push you along. (AIS-8)

I agree. (AIS-2)

Trusting ties to that, trusting that you will make the right decisions. Whether they

are around or not around. (AIS-6)

The results of this embedding mechanism showed that the focus group identified

with themes that were more deliberate such as mentoring and guiding. The leaders on the

other hand when discussing their role models indentified more informal, everyday

behaviors. Communicating values through action as role modeling was evident in the

three public affairs pillars.

Community Engagement Behavior within Role Models

The embedding mechanism, Role Modeling, in MSU's faculty/staff culture is

reflective of the community engagement component of the public affairs mission in

minor ways. One faculty member explained how the department head models community

engagement:

My department head is actually very good about community engagement and, you

know, I think it's just in her case about being receptive, to serve in capacities that

she's asked to serve in. She teaches a [subject] class and there's a lot of interest in

having an expert on [class subject] speak to different groups especially in the

97

[subject] industry. And she's always willing to do that or if some kind of, she was

probably speaking for the [MSU organization] before during their week of

programming. Just being willing to give a hand when you're asked to, to

volunteer. (NTF-3)

Cultural Competence Behavior within Role Models

The embedding mechanism, Role Modeling, in MSU's faculty/staff culture is

reflective of the cultural competence component of the public affairs mission in very

limited ways. The first leader explained how role modeling for leaders is evident by

being involved outside the University. This exposure and connectedness can contribute to

cultural competence:

Again, I think there needs to be a modeling, I really think a number do model.

Everything from our VP for administration services who worked in state

government and still has direct ties and awareness to that. Everybody on the

administrative council, I don't know if I can say everybody, because I'm not fully

aware of involvements of every single one. Most of them I know are on a

community board or a committee initiative or something. And I think that's real

important. Motivation for that may be to keep visibility of the University on these

issues, but I think there's a sense of need for service. (L-5).

A leader in the organization explained what cultural competence looks like as a

role model at MSU as a faculty member, staff member and a leader:

Cultural competence would take a couple of different forms. One again would be

a role model and being a champion for diversity and to the other way would be to

make sure you are bringing them into your classroom. That is more challenging

for some disciplines than others although certainly not impossible for anyone.

Sometimes people think that oh well, I am teaching math, how can I possibly do

that and there are a lot of diverse people that have contributed greatly to the field

of mathematics. You make your students aware of that and lots of ways to do that.

The faculty member would bring it into the classroom and be that role model.

Staff, again would have the opportunity to be a role model and participate in

activities that promote diversity and encourage students to participate in those

activities. That way both groups would have that opportunity. Leaders should be

Very much supporting diverse initiatives on campus, supporting with recruitment

of diverse students, faculty, and staff. Helping units to engage in those kinds of

activities and I think from my view as an administrator is to facilitate things for

other people. It is important as to what I do as a role model but also to help people

to move forward in those areas themselves. Having administration support those

ideals and do whatever they can to do to help. (L-8)

Ethical Leadership Behavior within Role Models

The embedding mechanism, Role Modeling, in MSU's faculty/staff culture is

reflective of the ethical leadership component of the public affairs mission in subtle ways.

Some of the faculty shared their concern related to making accommodations for

international students with language barriers:

Our students are really still homogenous. In the [name] department, you know,

there isn't diversity at all in the classes that I teach. Um, I had a few students, um,

from the China campus come. But there is a language barrier and, you know, as

far as the work and I'm not sure how ethical this would be, but, you know, they do

99

the work, they just understand it differently and so I have to basically mold the class around, for that student, accommodate that student. And I don't know if I'm doing them a disservice in doing that. Uh, I struggle with that. (NTF-2)

Summary. Role modeling can come in more deliberate forms like teaching and coaching which the focus groups identified with or more informally through everyday behavior such as the leaders explained. If an organization is dealing with change, role models in the organization can exhibit the new behavior, so members can imagine themselves doing it (Schein, 2010). As the organization evolves with new leadership, role modeling will continue to be an important behavior to consider. The public affairs mission was not as clear in the answers as one may have expected. See Figure 3 below to connect with the role model general themes along with the three pillars. The next embedding mechanism focuses on how resources are allocated and how it can impact the organization's culture.

Embedding mechanism: **Role Modeling**	
General themes: (In order of strength)	*-Honesty/Transparency/Trustworthy* *-Open-Minded/Objective/Analytical* *-Friendly/Enjoyable/Sense of Humor* *-Respect/Equal/Approachable* *FG-Encourage to Grow & Develop*
Comments Related to **Public Affairs Pillars**	
Community Engagement	*-Leader Exemplifies by Modeling Behavior*
Cultural Competence	*-Faculty: Curriculum Should Include Diverse People in Field* *-Staff: Encourage Participation in Activities* *-Leaders: Role Model & but Help Areas Move Forward*
Ethical Leadership	*-Struggle with Making Accommodations with International Students*

Figure 3. Data Analysis: Themes from the embedding mechanism: Role Modeling.

How Resources are Allocated

The fourth embedding mechanism (Schein, 2010) is how resources are allocated. It includes how the budgets are created and what is assumed about that process is important. Who is included in the process and does it go "bottom up" or "top down"? Resource allocation can be one of the most contentious issues in an organization (2010). The most common theme among leaders interviewed was the use of cost centers (60%). Within MSU cost centers conflict still exists, but some there is control, too. When the University went to a cost center model a few years ago, it gave more power to individual colleges to control where the money is allocated.

Bolman and Deal (2008) explained how schools and universities have had to deal with alternating years of much support to very little over the years, depending on the economy or politics. MSU has been suffering from consistent funding cuts from the state of Missouri for years (MSU, 2012a) which has made resource allocation an increased issue. Because the budgets tend to go down or stay the same, participants shared that their budgets were primarily based on the second most common theme, history, or what they got the year previously.

Cost center budgeting. Across the University, various departments and colleges are broken up into cost centers to determine where revenue and costs with be placed. Since it is a fairly new system that very few employees work with, there seemed to be a disconnect on how money was really allocated, as one leader explained:

It is a complicated budget system. Go through lots of different steps, each one of the colleges is a cost center and then the other units, such as student affairs or provost office where individual cost centers do have control over our budgets but

in particular in this situation, the cuts went across the board but there was a

difference when we found out that we were not going to get as big as cut, for

example, the colleges weren't hit in the same way that some of the other units

were. Then within the colleges, they all had budget committees and within

departments, had to figure out what their priorities are as well. We have all these

microsystems under the macrosystems and fairly complex. New initiatives, when

people want to request money, in this particular system it is fairly difficult

because of the cuts and the way resources are allocated. (L-8)

Another leader shared his/her perception on the cost center approach is an improvement,
but not without flaws:

Because of some recent changes I think it's probably somewhat fairer than it used

to be because it is based on enrollment and a cost-centered approach, and that's

strictly on the faculty side. I don't know that staff is ever considered in that,

especially student affairs side of the house. I think, I think it is probably, I kind of

feel, I like the idea of the cost center; it's more of a business model than what has

been used in the past for deciding how things are going to be funded. However I

do know that there are programs that are going to inherently be small and I think

there need to be safeguards put in to protect those programs and not eliminate

them just because they don't have enough enrollment. (L-1)

Another leader shared his/her experience within his/her department and the discretion the
dean has in their cost center:

Our dean has been very clear with the budget and that numbers make a difference.

And she across the board allocates, she makes sure that there the numbers of

professors needed to teach. And, I mean I think she does it fair. And there's

somebody from each department on the budget committee and everybody reports

back from all the different degrees and programs and schools. And I already said

it's a fair allocation of money. And she's even allowed us to hire, she could have

took a line away from us and she did not. I mean, 'cause we needed the person to

teach. And, so, I will say I, I feel like at least she's being fair with that. (NTF-1)

Finally, a leader shared both themes of cost center and history related to resource

allocation at MSU:

Initially they are allocated based on what was done last year, the year before that

and the year before that and then with cost centers we have choices to make about

where we put more money into courses, equipment, or faculty salaries. (L-4)

Funding historically. When asked about how resources were allocated at MSU,

many participants admitted that while the process for the overall University is complex, it

tends to reflect what your area or department has gotten historically. May be higher, may

be a lower, but what your budget was last year is the biggest indicator.

One leader explained what effects changes in the budget:

…we have a certain amount of history in how resource allocation is taking place

that will always be there as a foundation to build upon, so what you really end up

talking about is new resources or changing resources. And currently enrollment

demands have a big influence on where new resources will go, and changing any

resource allocation, how to meet those enrollment demands and how to prepare,

not only the faculty, but the other operations of the campus to meet those

activities. (L-10)

103

Another leader explained why budgeting based on history can be complicated over time:

> They have been allocated based on historic precedent more than anything else.
> One of the problems you have in academia is that we have such long careers,
> become tenured and stay there a long time. In good years you might hire someone
> that would be around for many decades. In lean years, retirements aren't replaced,
> that is also coincidence because if you are in a department where you have a
> retirement in lean years, you don't get it replaced. Whereas in better years you
> might get it replaced. Recently they are trying to move away from that model so
> that lines are not specifically tied to departments for example and there isn't
> ownership in that sense but it is still the case. (L-7)

The focus group responses did not produce any clear themes. This may be due to various reasons. A variety of areas of the University are funded very differently and even within colleges, there is a lot of discretion in the process by the dean. Most participants would start their comment by saying, "I am not sure about other areas, but we…" which created a discussion of discovery for some about the differences. There seemed to be a general lack of knowledge about how resources are allocated. Others could explain the process, but seemed perplexed by why it was the way it was.

Frustration with process. Two staff members shared their frustration with the current process:

> It seems you are given your same old pot. It is adjusted upward or downward by
> percentage. There is not any zero based budgeting, that I have seen which is a
> little unusual. (AIS-6)

104

It is usually downward because of budget cuts and everything. Your pot doesn't

increase very often. (AIS-3)

Right, but we don't really ask at this point, what would it really take to do your

job, whether that is up or down. I accept the answer could be in either direction in

some cases. I find it interesting that we sort of get what we get, without

necessarily having input to that point from what I see. (AIS-6)

A tenured faculty member shared concern with the resource of time being the

biggest worry. Everyone is the group shared this concern:

When I think about resources I think about physical resources, technology,

offices, and classrooms. Some programs may need, art may need more supplies,

theater stage equipment, specific programs. For me, the resource that I struggle

with most now is time. The time to do click work, the time to interact with

students, and the time meet growing demands. You mentioned we are all expected

to do more with less. This can be true to a certain point if we have the time to do

it well. If we don't have that time, then we start something's less well that we'd

like to, and we have in the past. So I think for me the resource that is most

precious, in terms how I can, how well according to my job is time. I feel like I

have less and less of that, to really apply to things, let alone outside the office or

outside the University. (TF-3)

Community Engagement in How Resources are Allocated

The embedding mechanism, How Are Resources Allocated, in MSU's

faculty/staff culture is reflective of the community engagement component of the public

affairs mission in several ways. When participants were asked directly about how

resources are allocated, community engagement was not evident in their responses, but when they were asked about the community engagement behavior of employees, resource allocation was mentioned. Both leaders and participants in the focus groups talked about faculty in particular sharing their resource of knowledge or expertise with the community. The collaboration of staff and leaders with community leaders was also noted as being important to our local, regional and state relations.

Faculty knowledge resource allocation into the community. Service to the community by faculty sharing their expertise is a resource that is allocated into the local community on a regular basis. One example of the resource shared by the faculty with the community is explained:

> Well the faculty member, I think, is very much taking advantage of his or her expertise and applying that to the community. There are any number of examples. A very good one was the, city's strategic planning process that went on here a year, year and a half ago. It's still is not in the implementation phase but we had any number of faculty members who, because of their expertise in something, were utilized for that. (L-3)

A tenured faculty member explained:

> I think the emphasis on faculty is to get involved, to be able to share your expertise and how it can fit assist with community needs. And that happens across the board. (T-4)

Staff and leadership resource allocation into community. The staff members and administrators at the University reflect their expertise in a different way than faculty.

There is no research project or article to show for the resources being allocated at the end of the day. It looks more like strong communication and relationships:

> It means that staff are orientated and supervised in a way that reflects that their service at MSU is also a service to the community. The way they are evaluated and the way whatever their product is, is designed, one of the outcomes of their product is to contribute to the betterment of the community. For leaders, it means the cross sharing of resources and the cross sharing of information so that the community grows at a speed comparable to the University and vice versa. And that the sharing of minds, sharing of ideas, and the level of collaboration that makes it difficult for one to grow while the other doesn't. So it's necessary for true community growth. (L-11)

Cultural Competence in How Resources are Allocated

The embedding mechanism, How Resources are Allocated, in MSU's faculty/staff culture is reflective of the cultural competence component of the public affairs mission in very limited ways. As mentioned in an early section of What Leaders Pay Attention to, Measure, and Control, the University has recently implemented an addition to the annual review process for staff to include a diversity component. Resources have been allocated to the development and implementation of this change. Some participants also noted the importance of leaders at MSU being supportive of policy, resources, and recruitment efforts for diversity and inclusion initiatives on campus. The responses reflected more of a vision than a reality.

Diversity policies and resources. Here is one leader's account of what cultural competence behavior looks like in leaders at MSU:

It looks like policies and resources being allocated so that it has the broadest

impact on as many constituents as possible. People are expected to think in terms

of the commonwealth of the University before a policy goes into effect, and that

policy and practices are designed as recruitment tools. You want a person to be

able to come, so that the policy as written will grow, that he or she will be able to

learn without undue distractions, so that he or she will have adequate resources to

engage in whatever activities are associated with discipline, so that he or she is

safe, and on and on in terms of an inclusive campus experience. So, cultural

competency will be seen in how our policies are crafted, and how they are

enforced. (L-11)

Ethical Leadership in How Resources are Allocated

The embedding mechanism, How Are Resources Allocated, in MSU's

faculty/staff culture is reflective of the ethical leadership component of the public affairs

mission in subtle ways. Participants noted various answers related to being good stewards

of the money are resources, since they are accountable to tax payers. Participants also

mentioned the past president and provost contracts seemed unethical, but strides were

being made to correct the problem for the future.

Unethical contracts for leadership. One leader explained the issue with the

contracts and the perceptions of them:

Our former president, even our former provost in their severance packages their

retreat to faculty didn't look very ethical to many. That was a contract, and a

contract's a contract, but to the outside world a large salary like that to have a

year off to research and then come back and teach 6 to 12 hours doesn't seem

108

very ethical. It doesn't seem like a good steward of resources. I think, there's a

lack of general understanding in that. I think that they're moving to fix those sorts

of things so that our perception isn't, the perception in the community isn't

negative (L-2).

The two major themes from the leaders of this section were the use of cost centers

and how funding is allocated historically. There was little agreement among the focus

groups on responses due to a wide range of differences in the process and a lack of

understanding. How the budgets are created and what is assumed about that process is

important. Who is included in the process and does it go "bottom up" or "top down"

varied quite a bit. Figure 4 reviews the general themes from How Resources Are

Allocated and how they connect with the three pillars.

Embedding mechanism: How Resources Are Allocated	
General themes: (In order of strength)	*-Cost Center Budgeting* *-Funding Historically*
Comments Related to Public Affairs Pillars	
Community Engagement	*-Faculty Share Knowledge with Community* *-Collaboration Among Staff & Leaders with Community*
Cultural Competence	*-Current-ADP Process* *-Leaders Need to be Supportive of Policies, Resources & Recruitment of Underrepresented*
Ethical Leadership	*-Be Good Stewards of Resources* *-Past leader Contracts felt Unethical, but Being Corrected*

Figure 4. Data Analysis: Themes from the embedding mechanism: How Resources Are Allocated.

Allocation of Rewards

The next embedding mechanism (Schein, 2010) is the allocation of rewards, which may be formal or informal recognition, or lack thereof. Members of the organization learn from their own experience with promotions, performance appraisals, and conversations with their supervisor. What actually happens is much stronger than what is written or said in regard to rewards or punishments. When the organization expects its members to learn something, there must be a reward system to ensure this behavior.

The leaders overwhelming acknowledged (80%) that the economy and reduction in budgets has greatly impacted salary increases. When I asked the focus groups about how faculty and staff are rewarded, many laughed or joked about the lack of raises. Every focus group discussed the same issue. Leaders also talked about the overall benefits package (including salary, insurance, retirement, tuition, etc.) was a form of reward for employees (60%). Then annual service recognitions for faculty and staff were mentioned (40%) and opportunities for travel/professional development (40%) by the leaders.

Economy. The downturn of both the economy and state funding has impacted providing basic resources and keeping jobs. The overall feeling on rewards was that it was an "extra" and that there were not a lot of resources to put toward things that were "extra." Some examples of how the economy was reflected in the responses are below. As one leader explained:

Well, right now, if you're talking about rewards in the way of raises that just doesn't happen. It hasn't really happened since, at least for several years, putting our development process the ADP [Appraisal and Development Process] behind

in a lot of ways. It was only built for a two-year cycle where we wouldn't have raises but rewards I think come in many different ways. What I look at, I look at it, are we serving the students? (L-2)

A tenured faculty member shared, while there is concern over no raises, having a job was somewhat enough:

All of us are here because we love what we do and we are dedicated to that, and we accept that we will have a lesser financial reward than if we had of gone to other intuitions. I think that's been pretty well known for many years here at Missouri State. And with the change in economy in recent years, I was pleased to have a job. (TF-1)

Another leader explained how the budget cuts have impacted faculty being rewarded:

Used to have awards for teaching research and service at the college level and we explicitly got rid of those when we moved to merit pay and now that we have a merit base system but no merit pay, have to say that faculty are not really rewarded. There are some foundation rewards they are few in between and focus on service, for most the part the tangible rewards have disappeared. (L-7)

Benefits. While the economy can affect benefits packages in the traditional sense, themes such as insurance, retirement, tuition remission, etc. were seen as a reward compared to positions outside of the university. Several participants gave examples of how benefits are reflected in their remuneration as employees:

I think some departments are better at rewarding people non-monetarily than others by allowing them to go to conferences or allowing more flexibility on, on days to be gone or, or things like that, than others. (L-1)

Two faculty members shared some of the benefits of working at MSU that they felt were rewards:

> I feel that I have benefited greatly actually from research grants and fellowship that the University has provided. I know those are competitive and all that, but I would not have been able to do some of the work that I have done in the last five years, had it not been for that money and so the support from the department heads and deans and the time the provost. That's been quite wonderful and compensated for the low salary in certain years and then the rewards of the students definitely colleagues are too. (TF-5)
>
> I will have to admit to and piggy back on what you said. I have had two sabbaticals while I've been here at Missouri State so that definitely was a good allocation of resources so that I could return to industry and come back into the classroom and say this is the way it is out there and this is what you are going to encounter. I'm very thankful for that opportunity. (TF-2)
>
> *Annual recognitions.* During the leader interviews, 40% mentioned the annual

recognitions as an Allocation of Rewards. MSU offers annually one recognition event for faculty and one for the staff. It typically includes service awards (5, 10, 15 years and so on), retirement recognition, and a handful of specific awards. It normally is a luncheon where everyone to gathers. While participants appreciate the event, they shared that it cannot be the only reward for the year. One staff member shared his/her perspective:

> When you asked about rewards, I thought about that annual staff recognition banquet, I think that is back to luncheon, I think that was a big deal, which everyone seems to enjoy, but I think what gets missed more on a daily basis or a

112

weekly basis of the recognition of staff and faculty for that matter of things that

don't cost money. It would be nice if there was money to give a bonus for truly

outstanding performance, but there doesn't seem to be that going on. In our office,

if we do good job we get a thank you or maybe pizza or something, or baking

cookies for someone who did a nice job. There are ways to get recognized that I

don't see it as much as I have seen in other organizations. (AIS-4)

Travel/professional development. As budgets have been cut over the years, either

the threat or results have been to limit "extra" costs to the University. As a community of

lifelong learners, connecting with colleagues and improving one's expertise was valued

significantly by many participants. One leader shared his/her experience:

Within the college, we try to do as much as we can to reward faculty for specific

instances as well. I try to support travel and professional development as

maximum level as we can, things like sabbatical and release time for special

projects. I give $200 for every master's advisor in the department for their travel

and development. (L-4)

Several of the focus groups talked about working with great people on campus as

a reward, but said it is a benefit that you have to get out of your office and take advantage

of whenever possible. The relationships formed with co-workers can really make work

not only more enjoyable, but these colleagues can help you with your own goals. Plus, it

is better for students.

Community Engagement in Allocation of Rewards

The embedding mechanism, Allocation of Rewards, in MSU's faculty/staff

culture is reflective of the community engagement component of the public affairs

113

mission in several ways. Several faculty and staff noted teaching the Introduction to University Life course (GEP 101) for first semester freshmen, and their relationship to both the public affairs mission, but mainly community engagement. The course's description for GEP 101 states it is "An integrative and interdisciplinary experience which addresses public affairs issues and individual choices promoting academic success. Required of all freshmen during their first semester" (MSU, 2012d). Instructors get paid an additional stipend to teach the course if it is outside of the normal job duties. The non-tenured faculty member shares the benefit to teaching GEP 101:

> I've taught only the regular GEP courses in the fall of service learning the first time and so then I went to a conference with the two of them on service learning and getting the students engaged. And like part of it is getting myself engaged with them. And I know in just my regular GEP classes we have gone and worked at the [Ozarks] Food Harvest and, but I go with them as a class. We've gone to The Kitchen and worked with the homeless there in the kitchen. And my students, that's one of their favorite activities is to actually engage out in the community instead of just talking about things in class. (NTF-2)

A leader explained the reward of connecting service with the class to enhance learning:

> That is one of our strengths as a University is that we have this mission. I'm totally for it and I think I see more faculty moving towards it, you know, I've even started taking, even as busy as I am, taking on service learning as part of the components in what I teach because I really believe that it helps retain students and I believe that students get more out of it when they see their field naturally applied. (L-2)

114

Cultural Competence in Allocation of Rewards

The embedding mechanism, Allocation of Rewards, in MSU's faculty/staff culture is reflective of the cultural competence component of the public affairs mission in very limited ways. Other than the diversity and inclusion being tied to the annual review for staff (ADP) process for staff which has already been mentioned, it was briefly mentioned that departments are rewarded for bringing in and hiring diverse candidates.

Ethical Leadership in Allocation of Rewards

The embedding mechanism, Allocation of Rewards, in MSU's faculty/staff culture is reflective of the ethical leadership component of the public affairs mission in subtle ways. As noted in the Allocation of Resources section, some participants questioned the rewards in both the president and provost contracts. While many understood the problem was being addressed, they felt it was unethical to use our funding in such a frivolous way.

In tough economic times, the allocation of rewards was a sensitive topic for many of the participants. While many were grateful for the job and benefits they have, the combination of cut backs to awards, lack of raises, and funding cuts in their areas clearly affected the morale. There was some patience and understanding for the current situation, but many alluded to the strain of doing more with less with little recognition. In Figure 5 the general themes for Allocation of Rewards are noted along with the responses for the three pillars. In the next section, the last embedding mechanism, Recruitment, Selection and Dismissal is reviewed.

Embedding mechanism: Allocated of Rewards	
General themes: (In order of strength)	*-Economy/Reduction in Budgets* *-Overall Benefits Package* *-Annual Service Recognitions* *-Opportunities for Travel/Prof Dev.*
Comments Related to Public Affairs Pillars	
Community Engagement	*-GEP 101* *-Service Learning*
Cultural Competence	*-ADP* *-Rewarded to Bring In/Hire Diverse Candidates*
Ethical Leadership	*-Past Leader Contracts felt Unethical, but Being Corrected*

Figure 5. Data Analysis: Themes from the embedding mechanism: Allocation of Rewards.

Recruitment, Selection and Dismissal

The criterion for Recruitment, Selection, and Dismissal of employees is the last embedding mechanism (Schein, 2010.) The faculty and staff are a key component to influencing the culture of an organization. This should include not only the search and selection processes of new employees, but also whether they are retained. The mission of a college should be expressed through its vision and goals (Bush, 2003). This can be complicated by mission statements being too vague, which then creates unclear goals, and it is difficult to use the goals in decision making (Schein, 2010). As members of MSU are recruited, selected, and retained, their learning of the mission may be unique depending on the stage they are in of the three areas

This embedding mechanism was asked in three separate questions: (a) how are faculty and staff recruited at MSU (b) how are faculty and staff selected at MSU and (c) how are faculty and staff dismissed at MSU. Responses from each question were combined when explaining the three pillars.

Recruitment of faculty/staff. The first area, recruitment, included the leaders

noting that they advertise on-line (50%), reach out to personal contacts (40%) and MSU's

diversity process (40%). This section was a little more complicated to code based on the

differences in the faculty process from the staff process. Many acknowledged that they

were familiar with only one process or the other.

Advertising on-line. When asked about the recruitment process, many participants

struggled to explain what MSU did other than posted the job on the MSU website. There

were some differences between faculty and staff, but it mainly related to whether the

position was going to be posted locally, regionally and/or nationally. The perception was

all faculty positions were posted nationally and the level of the staff position affected

how the position was advertised.

One leader explained:

Faculty, it's almost always a national search, where we're advertising in national

places, whether it be the Chronicle, or for different disciplines there's usually a

place for each discipline that nationally, everybody goes to look. So those are all

national searches. Staff are usually regional kinds of searches. Sometimes they're

local, because sometimes it's more of a place bound kind of situation. (L-9)

Another participant explained from one of the focus groups:

All of the faculty positions are usually published in the Chronicle of Higher Ed,

for the full time faculty positions which is kind of a national publication. The

higher the level of job, the farther it is published, like they will do nationwide

searches for the faculty as well as the high level administrators. And then mid-

level positions, like a user support is regional. And then some are just local and

117

those would be for those who aren't going to move to Springfield to take a job

and that would be like your administrative support, crafts and trades, and

custodial. (AIS-3)

Personal contacts. Participants explained the importance of reaching out to

personal contacts when recruiting for open positions at MSU. Some talked more about

making connections locally for adjunct faculty or graduate students who complete their

degrees locally. Others focused more on networking through professional organizations

at conferences or with colleagues to get the information out about the position.

One leader explained:

Um, always starts with open advertisement and solicitation in prominent vehicles

where we think that the kind of person we are looking for. If it's faculty, it's one

area, if it's staff, it may be different, might be reading, and more than one,

typically is, well almost always more than one place, but then depending on who

you are recruiting for, you may have a lot of personal contacts made to schools

that would be graduating people that would be potentially faculty or if it's staff, it

might even be the same answer. It might be more personal contacts of those that

uh, might know people that would be interested to fit nicely in the kind of

position. But, it's a pretty open system and you know positions are posted and

made available for anybody that's looking, always. (L-10)

A faculty member in a focus group explained how they got their position:

And how instructors got, I mean I got hired because I came out of the

graduate program in my department. And, um, they, I think I sort of got

steered into the job. I needed one. I got the job the day of my graduation. I

118

didn't, so, you know, I think that's for instructors I think a lot of them will come out of, out of master's programs. I don't think anybody would move here to take an instructor position. (NTF-6)

Diversity process. Finally, there was significant discussion regarding the newer policies regarding having diverse candidates in your final pool. Many seemed to understand why the policy is in place, but seemed frustrated by the limitations it added to a cumbersome hiring process. Others just recognized it was a new way of doing things and there was going to be a learning process in searching for candidates to apply.

Another leader explained how the diversity process has impacted recruiting for faculty connecting what looks the same and how it is different:

We are doing a better job of recruiting than we have in the years in the past. We did the usual stuff, ads in all the right places. The new policy this year on diversity recruiting has made a significant change in how our departments handle it. We do a lot more faculty recruiting than staff but and I'm sure that you know that requirement is that we have to have diversity in the short list before you can proceed to the finalists. If you have 75 applicants for a faculty position, narrow it down to 8 or 10 people that you want to do phone interviews with before you narrow down to bring 3 people to campus. In that 8 or 10, on the short list, Equity and Compliance has to verify that you some diversity in that pool, not explicitly ethnic or racial diversity but certainly that is the main goal of overall effort or if they can still give you give you permission to proceed, if they look at what you have done in terms of recruiting and determine that you have done everything that you could have reasonably done and have gotten as diversifiable as you can and

then you can proceed. That alone has changed what I know our departments have

done from where they advertise to the personal contact that they have made to

what they do when go they go to professional conferences looking for minority

caucuses or other special interest groups and we have had some success. (L-4)

Selection of faculty/staff. When faculty and staff were sharing their selection processes,

both mentioned the use of a search committee to review applications (60%). Faculty

tended to have only faculty from their department involved in both the search committee

and selection process. Some voted, whereas others shared feedback with the dean who

made the decision. Staff varied somewhat depending on the level and type of position,

but most had search committees with faculty, staff, and students from various

departments. The selection process was based on the feedback of various stakeholders

involved in the process, search committee, the department's employees, and the

supervising administrator. One leader explained the differences in the process between

faculty and staff searches:

> Process is pretty similar for faculty and staff and process is an HR process, not
>
> dissimilar but maybe the only difference, composition of search committees. It
>
> would be rare to have somebody on a committee for faculty search who wasn't a
>
> faculty member in that discipline. Whereas with a staff position, usually there is a
>
> purposeful integration across different units especially units that collaborate with
>
> one another so a little different composition, but the process is similar as far initial
>
> vetting of the applications and smaller group goes through telephone interviews,
>
> even more select groups through on campus interviews before selections. The
>
> process is very similar, just composition of committees would be different. (L-8)

Another leader explained the differences in the search processes:

> Primarily with search committees. So a search committee will go through all the candidates and pick out who meets the minimum qualifications and the top ones, and for a faculty position they'll usually share it with the rest of the faculty and say here's our top candidates, does anyone have anything else to say? We usually do phone interviews with at least six to ten of the top [candidates] and then from there to cut down a little bit more, just so that they're looking at a broader spectrum of people, doing that, instead of getting down to just two names right away from a piece of paper, because I don't think paper tells you everything. So that's kind of how I've done it, and then they might take it down to five or six and do some reference calls, and see if we can't get it down to two or three that we'll invite to campus. Staff, because it's a local thing, there's always a search committee but it might be a smaller group that takes care of things, and the pool generally isn't that big so we might not do phone interviews, we might just do on-campus interviews for that.

Dismissal of faculty/staff. This was another question that often got laughter when asked. It seemed to either be a sensitive subject or a feeling of confusion of how it would happen. Many focus group participants admitted that it was so rare that they were not even sure what one would need to do to get dismissed. For the staff side (50%) of the leaders interviewed said it was a long process with a lot of documentation and paperwork needed. Faculty felt like if you were not tenured, your contract would just not be renewed. If you did have tenure, it would be very complicated, and you would probably

121

have to break the law to get dismissed. You may get moved into a different position before that happened. One leader admitted how frustrating and long the process can be:

Again, very, with much difficulty. Um, our dismissal process on faculty I think is pretty well nonexistent, unless it's, unless you're up in, you know, department head or dean but, even there's a retreating back. Staff dismissals, there's a process and it works but it's cumbersome, and takes time. There is a, you know, the appeal process someplace, unfortunately. I've got three in my area that I've got appeals that are coming up to me. You can dismiss but you have to have, you have to have justification, you have to have your act together. And many times we don't have it. Where I think we fall down is that we do not make use of a probationary period. Many entities, many public entities will have a six-month or a nine-month period where employees hired into probationary, and essentially they can be let go during that time for – for any reason, but it's the time where you, you know, maybe their work's not quite good enough; maybe their personality doesn't mesh; maybe whatever. (L-3)

Community Engagement in Recruitment, Selection, and Dismissal

The embedding mechanism, Recruitment, Selection and Dismissal, in MSU's faculty/staff culture is reflective of the community engagement component of the public affairs mission in indirect ways. The most common theme related to community engagement, as mentioned earlier, was in the way that faculty can use their expertise to benefit the community. This could be used as a way to recruit and select faculty based on their research interests.

Cultural Competence in Recruitment, Selection, and Dismissal

The embedding mechanism, Recruitment, Selection and Dismissal, in MSU's faculty/staff culture is reflective of the cultural competence component of the public affairs mission in limited ways. The diversity hiring policy is a big step in incorporating in cultural competence into the recruitment and selection process.

As one leader explained:

> Diversity hiring policy I talked about earlier is one good example. It is not so much a demonstration of personal cultural competence but a demonstration of value and willingness to put some action into policy and resources behind promoting that. That is a key thing. (L-4)

Another theme that was evident was the fact that the faculty search process is limited to only faculty in that department.

Ethical Leadership in Recruitment, Selection, and Dismissal

The embedding mechanism, Recruitment, Selection and Dismissal, in MSU's faculty/staff culture is reflective of the ethical leadership component of the public affairs mission in subtle ways. This could include being ethical and responsible with the responsibilities you have in the employment of your colleagues. Faculty in particular have a lot of influence over the careers of their peers.

One leader explained how ethical leadership factors in for faculty:

Starts with treating your colleagues fairly and professionally. There are things about the professional role of a faculty member that are different from other roles that professionals have. The evaluation of one's colleagues and recommendation for tenure, for example, is not something that happens in every profession. As far

123

as I know, it doesn't happen in real estate, doesn't happen in accounting, closest

parallel that I can think of is in law firms when people, go through a probation

period and are offered a partnership or not. I think a big area where faculty have

the opportunity to demonstrate ethical leadership is how they enact those

responsibilities and privileges, how they mentor younger faculty, how they offer

assistance to all of their colleagues, how they treat the evaluation process, and

how they treat other levels of faculty of governance. (L-4)

Summary. The last embedding mechanism, Recruitment, Selection and Dismissal

process of faculty and staff members at MSU was the most complex to code. Each of the

three areas became their own question that was answered very differently. While posting

the position on-line and using a search committee was the most common response, the

processes differed between faculty and staff from there. Faculty kept the search process

within their area while staff involved other people from across the campus. Dismissal

differed greatly depending on the level of position and rank you had within your position

with general agreement that the higher up you got, the harder it would be to remove you

from your position. The three pillars of the public affairs mission were lacking greatly in

this embedding mechanism which may be an opportunity for growth within the

organization. Figure 6 reviews the general themes for the Recruitment, Selection, and

Dismissal embedding mechanism and how it connects to the three pillars.

Embedding mechanism: Recruitment Selection & Dismissal	
General themes: (In order of strength)	*Recruit* -*Advertise On-line* -*Reach Personal Contacts* -*MSU Diversity Process* *Selection* -*Search Committee* -*Faculty: Only Faculty* -*Staff: Across Campus* *Dismissal* –*Faculty: Not Tenured, No Contract* *Renewal, Tenured Would Have to* *Break the Law* -*Staff: Long Process with Lots of* *Paperwork*
Comments Related to Public Affairs Pillars	
Community Engagement	-*Expertise in Contributing to Their Field and Community*
Cultural Competence	-*Diversity Hiring Process*
Ethical Leadership	-*Being Responsible with Influence you Have Over Peer Hire and Promotion Process*

Figure 6. Data Analysis: Themes from the embedding mechanism: Recruitment, Selection and Dismissal.

Summary

Schein (2010) offered six embedding mechanisms of leader behavior of

influencing the culture of an organization to deal with the constancy of change. The six

primary embedding mechanisms (a) What Leaders Pay Attention to, Measure, and

Control, (b) Reaction to Organizational Crises, (c) Role Modeling, (d) How Resources

are Allocated, (e) Allocation of Rewards, and (f) Recruitment, Selection and Dismissal

were each used as guiding questions in all of the interviews and focus groups. Each of the

primary mechanisms was studied in relationship to the three pillars (community

engagement, cultural competence, and ethical leadership) of the public affairs mission at

MSU (MSU, 2011a). The participants were aware the study was about the MSU

organizational culture related to the faculty and staff members, but did not know that I was looking for how the three components of the MSU public affairs mission were reflected in their responses. The effect of this approach is unknown, but the initial data showed many embedding mechanisms lacking a true distinction in many of the three areas (a) community engagement, (b) cultural competence and (c) ethical leadership. Figure seven lists all of the general themes from the six embedding mechanisms and how they each connect with the three pillars. While some participants did mention an answer that could connect to one of the three areas that could be used as an example, the majority of them lacked a distinct connection. The possible reasoning for this will be reviewed in the Chapter Five. This chapter will include an overall conclusion to the study, review of the major themes, discuss the limitations and implications for practice and recommendations for future research.

Overall List of Embedding mechanisms Themes		Comments Related to Public Affairs Pillars		
Embedding mechanism	**General Themes: (in order of strengths)**	**Community Engagement**	**Cultural Competence**	**Ethical Leadership**
What Leaders Pay Attention to, Measure & Control	-Numbers (Budgets + Enrollment) -Student Needs -Faculty -Identity of MSU	-Institutional Connection with Community -Staff Community Connection -Community Engagement & Tenure	-Policies & Resources	-Being a Role Model -Transparency
Reaction to Organizational Crises	-University Administrators Resigning -Financial Uncertainty	-Strength of relationship with community challenged	-Local area in struggle to be more diversified	-Lack of Information & Transparency
Role Modeling	-Honesty/Transparency/Trustworthy -Open-Minded/Objective/Analytical -Friendly/Enjoyable/Sense of Humor -Respect/Equal/Approachable FG-Encourage to Grow & Develop	-Leader Exemplifies by Modeling Behavior	-Faculty: Curriculum Should Include Diverse People in Field -Staff: Encourage Participation in Activities -Leaders: Role Model & Help Areas Move Forward	-Struggle with Making Accommodation with International Students
How Resources are Allocated	-Cost Center Budgeting -Funding Historically	-Faculty Share Knowledge with Community -Collaboration Among Staff & Leaders with Community	-Current-ADP Process -Leaders Need to be Supportive of Policies, Resources & Recruitment of Underrepresented	-Be Good Stewards of Resources -Past leader Contracts felt Unethical, but Being Corrected
Allocation of Rewards	-Economy/Reduction in Budgets -Overall Benefits Package -Annual Service Recognitions -Opportunities for Travel/Prof Dev.	-GEP 101 -Service Learning	-ADP -Rewarded to Bring In/Hire Diverse Candidates	-Past Leader Contracts felt Unethical, but Being Corrected

Recruitment Selection & Dismissal	Recruit -Advertise On-line
	       -Reach Personal Contacts
	       -MSU Diversity Process
	 Selection -Search Committee
	       -Faculty: Only Faculty
	       -Staff: Across Campus
	 Dismissal –Faculty: Not Tenured,
	       No Contract Renewal,
	       Tenured Would Have to
	       Break the Law
	       -Staff: Long Process with
	       Lots of Paperwork
		-Expertise in Contributing to Their Field and Community	-Diversity Hiring Process	-Being Responsible with Influence you Have Over Peer Hire and Promotion Process

Figure 7. Data Analysis: Themes from the all of the embedding mechanisms.

CHAPTER FIVE

DISCUSSION

Introduction

In a time of uncertain economic realities, public colleges and universities are being challenged to reflect on a new way of doing business. From budget cuts to more educational competitors, doing things the way they have always been done will no longer be possible. Rising college costs have made institutional effectiveness and performance prominent issues for the general public (Fugazzotto, 2009). Colleges and universities are under pressure to determine what contributes to their culture as an organization and how to improve it. Developing an understanding of organizational culture in higher education has increased dramatically over the last few decades (Knight & Trowler, 2000). University administrators are learning that leaders need to be conscious of the culture or the culture will manage them (Schein, 2005). To best understand the culture of an organization, one must learn the "shared assumptions of individuals participating in the organization" (Tierney, 1988, p. 4).

The faculty and staff members are instrumental at any institution, greatly affect the organizational culture, and are pivotal to influencing organizational change (Tierney, 1998). Understanding faculty and staff members' involvement in campus decisions and how much they influence the culture and climate on campus are more important than ever (Nadler, Miller, & Modica, 2010).

To understand the organizational culture of a university, the mission must also be understood. "Mission statements dictate the core activities of an organization"

(Fugazzotto, 2009, p. 285). Understanding how both the culture of the university and mission of the university come together would provide a rich description of the culture of the organization (Thorton & Jaeger, 2007). The question of "how things are done around here" (Tierney, 1988, p. 3) becomes important for both internal and external stakeholders of the organization, especially in times of financial uncertainty.

Missouri State University (MSU) is a public, comprehensive university system with a mission in public affairs, whose purpose is to develop educated persons. In 1995, Senate Bill 340 gave MSU a statewide mission in public affairs. MSU identifies this mission as a way to define how a Missouri State education is different from that of other universities (MSU, 2011a). For many years, the mission has been summarized as follows: "The University's identity is distinguished by its statewide mission in public affairs, requiring a campus-wide commitment to foster competence and responsibility in the common vocation of citizenship" (MSU, 2011b).

In 2007, the university's public affairs mission was more clearly defined by including three components: (a) community engagement, (b) cultural competence, and (c) ethical leadership (MSU, 2011a). As MSU continues to integrate the public affairs mission into the curriculum by expecting an intensive focus on public affairs in each major and staff members' goals are measured by learning outcomes tied to the mission, it is important to research faculty and staff members' perceptions of the MSU organizational culture related to the mission. Currently there are no comprehensive assessment tools to evaluate this major focus for the university.

The purpose of the study was to address a problem of practice of the public affairs mission through the perceptions of faculty and staff members at Missouri State

University of the University's organizational culture. The design included a phenomenological study with a set of organizational culture procedural questions related to the perceptions and behavior of the faculty and staff members at MSU. This study took the three pillars (community engagement, cultural competence, and ethical leadership) of the public affairs mission at MSU and examined how faculty and staff members' perceptions of MSU leaders compared with the embedding mechanisms (Schein, 2010) that influence organizational culture. Schein's (2010) six primary embedding mechanisms: (a) What Leaders Pay Attention to, Measure, and Control, (b) Reaction to Organizational Crises, (c) Role Modeling, (d) How Resources are Allocated, (e) Allocation of Rewards, and (f) Recruitment, Selection and Dismissal shaped questions for the participants.

The methods for the research included both interviews of leaders within the organization and focus groups with Missouri State University faculty (tenured and non-tenured) and staff members from two of the main areas of the university. The intent was to have the faculty and staff members describe their points of view of the organizational culture at the university (Mertens, 2005).

The following sections of Chapter Five provide an overview of the purpose of the study, and the study's design and procedures for collecting data relevant to the research questions. Then, a discussion section is offered to provide further understanding of the study's findings. Additionally, the limitations of the study are discussed to provide additional insight into some of the challenges of the study. Implications of the study's findings are suggested following the discussion of findings. Finally, recommendations for further research are presented as a conclusion to the study.

Conclusions

The theoretical framework used for this study was a constructivist approach. The constructivist research paradigm is most closely associated with qualitative methods and is defined by the ontological perspective of the existence of one knowable reality (Mertens, 2005). The researcher looked for complexity of viewpoints in light of the research questions, which provided a better understanding of the perceptions of the organizational culture by faculty and staff members at MSU (Creswell, 2007).

Research Question One - Community Engagement

How are the embedding mechanisms in MSU's faculty/staff culture reflective of the community engagement component of the public affairs mission?

    a. What Leaders Pay Attention to, Measure, and Control

    b. Reaction to Organizational Crises

    c. Role Modeling

    d. How Resources are Allocated

    e. Allocation of Rewards

    f. Recruitment, Selection and Dismissal

In reviewing the data to better understand how the embedding mechanisms of MSU's faculty/staff culture are reflective of the community engagement component of the public affairs mission, I found limited connections. The answers to the specific questions regarding the six embedding mechanisms rarely connected directly with the pillar community engagement. Rather, when faculty and staff were asked about what community engagement looks like in employee behavior, the embedding mechanisms became clearer. In Figure 8 below, everything listed under General was mentioned by at

least 40% of the participants. On the other hand, the items listed under community

engagement were less apparent and more likely to be noted by only one or two

participants. These items are to act more as a guide for the leaders of the organization to

see how these embedding mechanisms could be better integrated.

Overall List of Embedding mechanisms Themes		Community Engagement
Embedding mechanism	**General Themes: (in order of strengths)**	**Comments Related to the Public Affairs Pillar**
What Leaders Pay Attention to, Measure & Control	-Numbers (Budgets + Enrollment) -Student Needs -Faculty -Identity of MSU	*-Institutional Connection with Community* *-Staff Community Connection* *-Community Engagement & Tenure*
Reaction to Organizational Crises	-University Administrators Resigning -Financial Uncertainty	*-Strength of relationship with community challenged*
Role Modeling	-Honesty/Transparency/Trustworthy -Open-Minded/Objective/Analytical -Friendly/Enjoyable/Sense of Humor -Respect/Equal/Approachable FG-Encourage to Grow & Develop	*-Leader Exemplifies by Modeling Behavior*
How Resources are Allocated	-Cost Center Budgeting -Funding Historically	*-Faculty Share Knowledge with Community* *-Collaboration Among Staff & Leaders with Community*
Allocation of Rewards	-Economy/Reduction in Budgets -Overall Benefits Package -Annual Service Recognitions -Opportunities for Travel/Prof Dev.	*-GEP 101* *-Service Learning*
Recruitment Selection & Dismissal	Recruit -Advertise On-line -Reach Personal Contacts -MSU Diversity Process Selection -Search Committee -Faculty: Only Faculty -Staff: Across Campus Dismissal –Faculty: Not Tenured, No Contract Renewal, Tenured Would Have to Break the Law -Staff: Long Process with Lots of Paperwork	*-Expertise in Contributing to Their Field and Community*

Figure 8. Data Analysis: Themes from all of the embedding mechanisms in comparison

with the public affairs component community engagement.

Research Question Two - Cultural Competence

How are the embedding mechanisms in MSU's faculty/staff culture reflective of the cultural competence component of the public affairs mission?

a. What Leaders Pay Attention to, Measure, and Control

b. Reaction to Organizational Crises

c. Role Modeling

d. How Resources are Allocated

e. Allocation of Rewards

f. Recruitment, Selection and Dismissal

In reviewing the data to better understand how the embedding mechanisms of MSU's faculty/staff culture are reflective of the cultural competence component of the public affairs mission, there were limited connections. The answers to the specific questions regarding the six embedding mechanisms rarely connected directly with the pillar cultural competence, except for Recruitment, Selection and Dismissal. The Diversity Hiring Process was mentioned in 40% of the leader interviews. Many seemed to understand the reason for the policy, but several mentioned their frustration with the extra time it added on to an already long process when hiring new people.

In Figure 9 below, everything listed under General was mentioned by at least 40% of the participants. This provided the themes for this section. On the other hand, the items listed under cultural competence were less apparent and more likely to be noted by only one or two participants. These items are to act more as a guide for the leaders of the organization to see how these embedding mechanisms could be better integrated.

Overall List of Embedding mechanisms Themes		Cultural Competence
Embedding mechanism	**General Themes: (in order of strengths)**	**Comments Related to Public Affairs Pillars**
What Leaders Pay Attention to, Measure & Control	-Numbers (Budgets + Enrollment) -Student Needs -Faculty -Identity of MSU	*-Policies & Resources*
Reaction to Organizational Crises	-University Administrators Resigning -Financial Uncertainty	*-Local area in struggle to be more diversified*
Role Modeling	-Honesty/Transparency/Trustworthy -Open-Minded/Objective/Analytical -Friendly/Enjoyable/Sense of Humor -Respect/Equal/Approachable FG-Encourage to Grow & Develop	*-Faculty: Curriculum Should Include Diverse People in Field* *-Staff: Encourage Participation in Activities* *-Leaders: Role Model & Help Areas Move Forward*
How Resources are Allocated	-Cost Center Budgeting -Funding Historically	*-Current-ADP Process* *-Leaders Need to be Supportive of Policies, Resources & Recruitment of Underrepresented*
Allocation of Rewards	-Economy/Reduction in Budgets -Overall Benefits Package -Annual Service Recognitions -Opportunities for Travel/Prof Dev.	*-ADP* *-Rewarded to Bring In/Hire Diverse Candidates*

Recruitment Selection & Dismissal	Recruit -Advertise On-line
	        -Reach Personal Contacts
	        -MSU Diversity Process
	Selection -Search Committee
	        -Faculty: Only Faculty
	        -Staff: Across Campus
	Dismissal –Faculty: Not Tenured,
	        No Contract Renewal,
	        Tenured Would Have to
	        Break the Law
	        -Staff: Long Process with
	        Lots of Paperwork
		-Diversity Hiring Process

Figure 9. Data Analysis: Themes from all of the embedding mechanisms in comparison

with the public affairs component cultural competence.

Research Question Three - Ethical Leadership

How are the embedding mechanisms in MSU's faculty/staff culture reflective of

the ethical leadership component of the public affairs mission?

a. What Leaders Pay Attention to, Measure, and Control

b. Reaction to Organizational Crises

c. Role Modeling

d. How Resources are Allocated

e. Allocation of Rewards

f. Recruitment, Selection and Dismissal

In reviewing the data to better understand how the embedding mechanisms of MSU's faculty/staff culture are reflective of the ethical leadership component of the public affairs mission, there were limited connections. The answers to the specific questions regarding the six embedding mechanisms to some extent connected with the pillar ethical leadership in several ways. The embedding mechanism What Leaders Pay Attention to, Measure, and Control demonstrated the most common themes of being a role model for ethical leadership and demonstrating transparency were noted most important for how our leaders should demonstrate it in their behavior. Demonstrating transparency was also mentioned (b) Reaction to Organizational Crises in regard to the sharing of information in both the University Administrators Resigning theme and the Financial Uncertainty theme.

When the leaders were asked to think of a role model they have at MSU and what traits they exhibit. The strongest theme was Open-minded/Objective/Analytical. The other three themes were evenly ranked: Honesty/Transparent/Trustworthy Friendly/Enjoyable/Sense of Humor and Respect/Equal/Approachable. Three of four of these traits could be tied to ethical leadership.

In Figure 10 below, everything listed under General was mentioned by at least 40% of the participants. On the other hand, the items listed under ethical leadership were less apparent and more likely to be noted by only one or two participants except as noted earlier. These items are to act more as a guide for the leaders of the organization to see how these embedding mechanisms could be better integrated.

Overall List of Embedding mechanisms Themes		Ethical Leadership
Embedding mechanism	**General Themes: (in order of strengths)**	**Comments Related to Public Affairs Pillars**
What Leaders Pay Attention to, Measure & Control	-Numbers (Budgets + Enrollment) -Student Needs -Faculty -Identity of MSU	*-Being a Role Model* *-Transparency*
Reaction to Organizational Crises	-University Administrators Resigning -Financial Uncertainty	*-Lack of Information & Transparency*
Role Modeling	-Honesty/Transparency/Trustworthy -Open-Minded/Objective/Analytical -Friendly/Enjoyable/Sense of Humor -Respect/Equal/Approachable FG-Encourage to Grow & Develop	*-Struggle with Making Accommodation with International Students*
How Resources are Allocated	-Cost Center Budgeting -Funding Historically	*-Be Good Stewards of Resources* *-Past leader Contracts felt Unethical, but Being Corrected*
Allocation of Rewards	-Economy/Reduction in Budgets -Overall Benefits Package -Annual Service Recognitions -Opportunities for Travel/Prof Dev.	*-Past Leader Contracts felt Unethical, but Being Corrected*
Recruitment Selection & Dismissal	Recruit -Advertise On-line -Reach Personal Contacts -MSU Diversity Process Selection -Search Committee -Faculty: Only Faculty -Staff: Across Campus Dismissal –Faculty: Not Tenured, No Contract Renewal, Tenured Would Have to Break the Law -Staff: Long Process with Lots of Paperwork	*-Being Responsible with Influence you Have Over Peer Hire and Promotion Process*

Figure 10. Data Analysis: Themes from the all of the embedding mechanisms in comparison with the public affairs component ethical leadership.

Discussion

During the study of Missouri State University's faculty and staff organizational

culture, many connections were made between the embedding mechanisms and the public

affairs mission. Discussion of the three major pillars community engagement, cultural

competence, ethical leadership will be explored and the conceptual framework

transformational leadership.

Research Question One - Community Engagement

The leaders who were interviewed were able to give very specific examples of

community engagement within the faculty, staff, and leaders. Many had excitement in

their voices when talking about this component of the public affairs mission. Even though

the connection was not as clearly related to the six embedding mechanisms, this pillar

seemed to be the most understood by the participants. There seemed to be a buy-in

among the faculty, staff, and leaders in this area of the University. The next level for the

organization may be to work to integrate it into the culture of how it makes decisions and

help the members to understand this intention.

Research Question Two - Cultural Competence

The participants in both the interviews and focus groups mentioned several

initiatives throughout related to increasing cultural competence at MSU. The most

common was the Diversity Hiring Process related to meeting certain expectations from

Equity and Compliance in the recruitment of candidates. There was also mention to staff

of the newly initiated section of the Appraisal and Development Plan (ADP) in which all

staff members were expected to a specific goal related to diversity/cultural competence.

At the time of the research being conducted, this was a newly implemented policy, and

there seemed be a little confusion on how it was going to look in the end. A strong case could also be made for Role Modeling which included the theme of Open-Minded, Objective/Analytical to be connected with this pillar. The challenge is that when the participants discussed these areas, they rarely, if ever, mentioned terms such as culture or race as being important specifically. The opportunity for group think (Janus, 1972) and lack of difference in perspective or opinion may be an issue.

Cultural competence by far seemed to be the most misunderstood. The answers tended to be much shorter when directly asked about the pillar. Some even asked for clarification in what was meant, as though they were not familiar with the language. Many answers were given in a future, ideal tense referring to what MSU should look like, rather than giving specific examples of how it is happening on campus like the previous pillar community engagement.

Research Question Three - Ethical Leadership

As mentioned numerous times throughout the study, MSU has recently gone through two major crises: (a) two major university administrators resigning, and (b) a financial crisis. As the level of insecurity increases so does the preference for involvement in the decision-making process for stakeholders (Grint, 2005). It is no surprise that being a role model of ethical leadership and transparency were so evident in the responses. Leaders often underestimate the importance of communication in helping members cope and learn new information as it happens (Amy, 2008). As the new administration has come in, many participants noted how much they appreciated the feeling of transparency from the Interim President, Clif Smart.

Transformational Leadership

Transformational leadership, a post industrial leadership theory (Komives, Owen, Slack, & Wagner, 2011), is aimed at leadership being collaborative to create change for the common good (Northouse, 2010). James MacGregor Burns, in his influential book *Leadership* (1978) presented this concept of leadership as a values-based process between both the leader and follower. In his book *Leadership in Organizations,* Yukl (2006) compared and contrasted transformational and charismatic leadership to show how the situational variables may increase the likelihood that transformational leadership will occur or may enhance the effect of such leadership on followers. Yukl suggested transformational leadership is likely to be more important in a dynamic, unstable environment that increases the need for change, and such leadership is more likely when leaders are empowered and encouraged to be flexible and innovative. Higher education has regularly been presented as a dynamic environment that is changing constantly. This become apparent in the data as the participants talked about the current culture and changes at MSU: I think the new leadership really did focus and say this is what we need to do to get this back on track. Everybody that could contribute really did help pull it together. (AIS-7)

Another leader added:

Well, I think of last June, when we had two resignations in a very short period of time, and I have no idea what happened behind closed doors, but I thought we stayed calm on the outside. I thought we were smart about finding interim people to step up to the plate right away so that there was no lapse in anything that at least on the outside everyone stayed really calm, and that they moved on, and kept

139

doing their jobs. And because we have an adopted long-range plan, because we

have a vision for this university, it means anybody can step in and do what needs

to be done. And there's no need for us to panic because we have a vision and we

have a mission and we know what we're going to do. People do come and go, and

this place has got good qualities, and good people will step up and good things

will happen. (L-9)

The three pillars certainly lend themselves to a leader using transformational

leadership in his or her approach, but it was even more clear in the current situation at

MSU that this theory was evident by responses like the ones shared in this section.

<center>Limitations</center>

Some limitations to the study were that only one university was studied, there is

only one year of data, and purposeful sampling was used. Purposeful sampling (Mertens,

2005) was used to determine who the participants would be in the focus groups and

interviews. Due to the nature of the population being researched (faculty and staff

members) and the desire to have focus groups and interviews, participants had to self

select themselves and volunteer (Mertens, 2005) to be a part of the study. Only one

university was selected for the research due to the researcher's focus on connecting the

data to MSU's public affairs mission. The research timeline only involved one year of

data. Only faculty and staff members at MSU were asked to provide their perceptions of the

organizational culture at MSU. Students, alumni, members of the Board of Governors and

other stakeholders were not invited to be study participants.

Another limitation of this study is researcher bias (Creswell, 2009). The

researcher is an employee at the institution being studied and has some job

responsibilities related to the public affairs mission. Special attention was given to ensure

<center>140</center>

participants understood the difference between the researcher's position at the university versus the role in this research project. The researcher also had three other researchers look over the coded data to ensure the researcher's bias didn't negatively affect the results.

<center>Implications for Practice</center>

This research of MSU faculty and staff members' perceptions of leader behavior provided MSU a profile of itself to stimulate a deeper analysis of the organizational culture (Schein, 2010). The study was not meant to be a complete picture of the entire organization, rather information to provide insight for further work on how to integrate the public affairs mission more effectively into the organization. It is important to know more about how the faculty and staff members describe the organizational culture at MSU to know how the public affairs mission affects the culture, if at all. Given the importance the university has placed on the public affairs mission, how are the embedding mechanisms in MSU's culture reflective of the mission should be a question the MSU leaders ask themselves.

This research can contribute information on how leaders at a college or university can better understand whether its faculty and staff members' perceptions of university culture, reflect their mission statements, and in what ways. In tough economic times when it seems as though every university is being asked to do more with less, this research can help organizations work smarter. This research will inform leaders and administrators at colleges and universities about what is influencing faculty and staff perceptions to better understand what is needed to impact change. Specifically at MSU this research can make a great contribution. As the public affairs mission continues to be

embedded into major goals and curricular changes, understanding the faculty and staff members' perceptions is essential for administration. The public affairs mission is rooted in transformational leadership theory grounded in the idea that getting an education at MSU will contribute to the greater good. There are expectations from the stakeholders of MSU to run an effective organization and live up to both the University's Long Range Plan (MSU, 2011b) and the Missouri Coordinating Board of Higher Education plans (MDHE, 2008).

On a larger scale, this study will inform university administrators across the country in how their every day behavior of the leaders affects their organizational culture related to their mission. Staff members at other universities may replicate the study using Schein's embedding mechanisms as a guide to evaluating how their university mission is reflected in their own faculty and staff members. This study could also be replicated by business leaders who want to interview their employees and managers in the same way. Any organization can benefit from having information from its members related to both culture and mission. Considering the importance of the faculty and staff members' perspective, the expectations of the Missouri's Coordinating Board of Higher Education (MCBHE, 2008) for MSU, and the key tactics in the University's Long Range plan (MSU, 2011b), this research was instrumental in holding MSU accountable to its stakeholders. Universities emphasize the importance of their organizational goals and strategic planning connecting with their mission statements. Yet, there is very little research to reflect effective ways to implement it.

Transformational leadership theory (Burns, 1978) complements the public affairs mission at MSU by providing a practical way for both the follower and leader to

approach the process together. Utilizing the transformational leadership theory through the public affairs mission keeps educators grounded in the leadership process yet focused on the educational purpose. It can offer a shared vision to organization members for the greater good. This theory can help leaders acknowledge the politics surrounding the issue while finding a shared reason to work together. Transformational leadership encourages university leaders to provide an environment where others feel empowered and encouraged to be flexible and innovative to deal with the inevitable conflict. People want to find a shared goal for the common good, especially when the expectation is given to them. This theory should be further explored as the new leadership builds trust and transparency.

<div align="center">Recommendations for Future Research</div>

The current study only included the perspective of faculty and staff on campus. Future possibilities could include asking students and various stakeholders within the university community such as: alumni, members of the Board of Governors, or community members. Also, within any qualitative research, one is limited in the number of people included. Future research may include quantitative surveys or questionnaires about the topic to reach a larger number of faculty and staff.

The embedding mechanisms (Schein, 2010) are widely accepted as leader behaviors to change culture in organizations, but little research has been done to understand how the organization would specifically respond to these six areas. This study could be replicated outside of MSU with businesses and organizations. Leaders could not only have the information of how its members perceive the organization related to the six embedding mechanisms, but the information could be compared from leader to

leader to develop best practices. Changing the culture of an organization can be overwhelming and slow for leaders. Having research and information to offer options could help leaders in organizations immensely.

Schein's (2010) embedding mechanisms are designed as tools for leaders to better understand the culture of the organization and then how to influence the climate. He also has a set of secondary articulation and reinforcement mechanisms: (a) Organizational design and structure, (b) Organizational systems and procedures, (c) Rites and rituals of the organization, (d) Design of physical space, facades and buildings, (e) Stories about important events and people, and (f) Formal statements of organizational philosophy, creeds and charters. Future research could include using the secondary mechanisms as additional pieces of information to consider about the organization. Both the primary embedding mechanisms and the secondary articulation and reinforcement mechanisms are excellent resources for leaders to evaluate how they are managing what they communicate to the members.

The three public affairs pillars are a recently new addition to the public affairs mission. There are countless opportunities for MSU to better understand how they are utilized at MSU and on other campuses. Learning outcomes for students, faculty and staff should be explored. Many universities have similar ideals to MSU and can be used as a comparison to see how their organization embeds the mission into the culture. This could include both qualitative and quantitative research. Bolman and Deal's (2008) four frame model for an organization: structural, human resources, political and cultural frame could offer a larger view of the organization when studying the public affairs pillars to better understand how the mission is reflected in the various facets of the university. If this is

144

what the university values and is guiding our choices, it should be evident in all four frames of the organization.

This research was completed within only one semester. Replicating the study each year to understand how the culture is changing could be beneficial to having a more comprehensive picture. It is important for MSU to establish a level of knowledge of the campus in its current state to have any true understanding if the implementation and resources being put into the public affairs mission are making an impact.

References

Amy, A. H. (2008). Leaders as facilitators of individual and organizational learning. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal, 29*(3), 212-234.

Agnew, M., & VanBalkom, W.D. (2009). Internationalization of the university: Factors impacting cultural readiness and organizational change. *Intercultural Education*, *20*(5), 451-462.

Awbrey, S. M. (2005). General education reform as organizational change: Integrating cultural and structural change. *The Journal of General Education*, *54*(1), 1-21.

Baldridge, J. V. (1983). *The dynamics of organizational change in education*. Berkeley, CA: McCutchen Books.

Barley, S. R., Meyer, G. W., & Gash, D. C. (1988). Cultures of culture: Academics, practitioners and the pragmatics of normative control. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *33*(1), 24-60.

Bass, B. M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*. New York: The Free Press.

Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. (1990). From transactional to transformational leadership: Learning to share the vision. *Organizational Dynamics*, (Winter), 19-31.

Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. (1993). Transformational leadership and organizational culture. *Public Administration Quarterly*, *17*(1), 112-121.

Bolman, L. G., & Deal, T. E. (2008). *Reframing organizations: Artistry, choice, and leadership* (4th ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York: Harper & Row.

Bush, T. (2003). *Theories of educational leadership and management* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Cameron, K. S., & Quinn, R. E. (1999). *Diagnosing and changing the organizational culture*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Cook, S. D., & Yanow, D. (2005). Culture and organizational learning. In J. M. Shafritz, J. S. Ott, & Y. S. Jang (Eds.), *Classics of organization theory* (6th ed., pp. 311-320). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishers.

Cox, T. Jr. (2005). Creating the multicultural organization: The challenge of managing diversity. In J. M. Shafritz J. S. Ott & Y. S. Jang., *Classics of organization theory* (6th ed., pp. 469-475). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishers.

Creswell, J. M. (2007). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Deal, T. E., & Kennedy, A. A. (1982) *Corporate cultures: The rites and rituals of corporate life,* Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Del Favero, M. (2003). Faculty-administrator relationships as integral to high-performing governance systems. *American Behavioral Scientist*, *46*(7), 902-922.

Denison, D. R. & Mishra, A. (1995). Toward a theory of organizational culture and effectiveness. *Organization Science, 6*(2), 204-223.

Dugan, J. P. (2006). Involvement and leadership: A descriptive analysis of socially responsible leadership. *Journal of College Student Development*, *47*(3), 335-343.

Emerson, R. M., Fretz, R. I., & Shaw, L. L. (1995) *Writing ethnographic fieldnotes*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Fincher, C. (1986). What is organizational culture? *Research in Higher Education*, *24*(3),

    325-328.

Folch, M., & Ion, G. (2009). Analyzing the organizational culture of universities: Two

    models. *Higher Education in Europe*, *34*, 143-154.

French, J. R., & Raven, B. (1959). The bases of social power. In J. M. Shafritz & J. S. Ott

    (Eds.), *Classics of organization theory* (5th ed., pp. 318). Pacific Grove, CA:

    Brooks/Cole Pub. Co.

Fugazzotto, S. J. (2009). Mission statements, physical space, and strategy in higher

    education. *Innovative Higher Education*, *34*, 285-298.

Gibson, S. K. (2006). Mentoring of women faculty: The role of organizational politics

    and culture. *Innovative Higher Education, 31*(1), 63-79.

Grint, K. (2005). Problems, problems, problems: The social construction of leadership.

    Human Relations, 58(11), 1467-1494.

Grix, J. (2004). *The foundations of research*. The types and uses of theory in research.

    New York: Palgrave Publisher.

Heffron, F. (1989). *Organization theory and public organizations: The political*

    connection. Upper Saddle River, N.J.; Prentice Hall.

Hoskisson, R. E., Hitt, M. A., Johnson, R. A., & Grossman, W. (2002). Conflicting

    voices: The effects of institutional ownership heterogeneity and internal

    governance on corporate innovation strategies. *Academy of Management Journal*,

    45(4), 697-716.

Janis, I. (1971). Groupthink: The desperate drive for consensus at any cost. *Psychology*

    Today, 5, (43-46, 74-76).

Jongbloed, B., Enders, J., & Salerno, C. (2008). Higher education and its communities:

      Interconnections, interdependencies and a research agenda. *Higher Education*,

      3(56), 303-324.

Kanter, R. M. (1983). *The change masters: Corporate entrepreneurs at work*. New York:

      Simon and Schuster.

Kezar, A. (1998). Exploring new avenues for leading community colleges: The paradox

      of participatory models. *Community College Review*, *25*(4), 75-87.

Kezar, A. (2001). Investigating organizational fit in a participatory leadership

      environment.　*Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, *23*, 85-101.

Knight, P., & Trowler, P. (2000). Departmental-level cultures and the improvement of

      learning and teaching. *Studies in Higher Education*, *25*, 1, 69-83.

Komives, S., Dugan, J., Owen, J., Slack, C., & Wagner, W. (2011). *Handbook for student*

      leadership development (2nd ed.). San Francisco: John Wiley & Sons.

Kotter, J. P. (1982). *The general managers.* New York: Free Press.

Kotter, J.P.(1985). *Power and influence:beyond formal authority.* New York: Free Press.

Krueger, R. A., & Casey, M. A. (2009). *Focus groups: A practical guide for applied*

      research. (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Kuk, L., & Banning, J. (2010). Student organizations and institutional diversity efforts: A

      typology. *College Student Journal*, *44*(2), 354-361.

Martens, S., & Salewski, A. (2009). Transformational leadership program at the

      University if Minnesota. *The Journal for Quality & Participation*, *32*(1), 34-38.

Mavrinac, M. (2005). Transformational leadership: Peer mentoring as a values-based

      learning process. *Libraries and the Academy*, *5*(3), 391-404.

Merriam, S. B. (1998). *Qualitative research and case study applications in education* (Rev. ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Mertens, D. M. (2005). *Research and evaluation in education and psychology: Integrating diversity with quantitative, qualitative, and mixed methods* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Meyer, J. W., & Rowan, B. (2005). Institutionalized organizations: Formal structure as myth and ceremony. In J. M. Shafritz, J. S. Ott, & Y. S. Jang (Eds.), *Classics of organization theory* (6th ed., pp. 505-520). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishers.

Mintzberg, H. (1979). *The structuring of organization*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Missouri Coordinating Board for Higher Education (2011). *Imperatives for Change 2011 Performance Report*. Jefferson City, MO: Missouri State Department of Higher Education, Retrieved February 1, 2012, http://www.dhe.mo.gov/files/IFC2011.pdf

Missouri Department of Higher Education. (2008). *Imperatives for change: Building a higher education system for the 21st century*. Retrieved February 17, 2012, from http://dhe.mo.gov/files/CoordinatedPlan.pdf

Missouri Department of Higher Education. (2010). *P-20 Initiatives in Higher Education*. Retrieved July 16, 2010, from http://www.dhe.mo.gov/p20.html

Missouri Govenor, Jay Nixon. (2009). *Gov. Nixon details agreement to freeze tuition for second year in a row*. Rerieved February 20, 2012 from http://governor.mo.gov/newsroom/2009/Details_on_Tution_Freeze

Missouri State University. (2011a). *Public affairs mission statement*. Retrieved on July

    28, 2011, from http://publicaffairs.missouristate.edu/mission.htm

Missouri State University. (2011b). *Long range plan*. Retrieved on October 23, 2011,

    from http://www.missouristate.edu/longrangeplan/

Missouri State University. (2011c). *Clif's Notes: Vol.1, No. 8*. Retrieved on February 12,

    2012, from

    http://blogs.missouristate.edu/president/2011/11/18/clif%E2%80%99s-notes-vol-

    1-no-8/

Missouri State University. (2012a). *Appraisal and Development Plan Process*. Retrieved

    on February 20, 2012, from

    http://www.missouristate.edu/human/training/ADPTraining.htm

Missouri State University. (2012b). *Information about MSU*. Retrieved on February 12,

    2012, from http://www.missouristate.edu/about/

Missouri State University. (2012c). *Clif's Notes: Vol.1, No. 12*. Retrieved on February

    20, 2012, from http://blogs.missouristate.edu/president/2012/02/14/clifs-notes-

    vol-1-no-12/

Missouri State University. (2012d). *Course Descriptions.*.Retrieved on April 1, 2012,

    from

    http://www.missouristate.edu/FirstYearPrograms/2837.htm

Morgan, G. (1997). *Images of organization*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Nadler, D. P., Miller, M. T., & Modica, J. (2010). Organizational performance through

    staff governance: Improving shared governance in the higher education

    environment, e-*Journal of Organizational Learning and Leadership*, *8*(1) 76-85.

Northouse, P. (2010). *Leadership: Theory and practice* (5th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA:

Sage.

Pennington, P., Townsend, C. & Cummins, R. (2003). The relationship of leadership

practices to culture, *Journal of Leadership Education*, *2*(1) 27-41.

Pfeffer, J. (1981). Understanding the role of power in decision making. In J. M. Shafritz

& J. S. Ott (Eds.), *Classics of organization theory* (5th ed., pp. 291-292). Pacific

Grove, CA: Brooks/Cole.

Ravasi, D., & Schultz, M. (2006). Responding to organizational identity threats:

Exploring the role of organizational culture. *The Academy of Management

Journal, 49*(3), 422-445.

Roethlisberger, F.J. (1941). The Hawthorne experiments. In J. M. Shafritz & J. S. Ott

(Eds.), *Classics of organization theory* (5th ed., pp. 166). Pacific Grove, CA:

Brooks/Cole Pub. Co.

Schein, E. H. (2005). Defining organizational culture. In J. M. Shafritz, J. S. Ott, & Y. S.

Jang. (Eds.), *Classics of organization theory* (6th ed., pp. 334-341). Belmont, CA:

Wadsworth Publishers.

Schein, E. H. (2010). *Organizational culture and leadership*. (4th ed.). San Francisco:

Jossey-Bass.

Thompson, M. D. (2005). Organizational climate perception and job element

satisfaction: A multi-frame application in a higher education Setting. *E-Journal of

Organizational Learning and Leadership, 4*(1) 1-15.

Thorton, C. H., & Jaeger, A. J. (2007). A new context for understanding civic

   responsibility: Relating culture action at a research university. *Research in Higher*

   Education, *48*(8), 993-1020.

Tierney, W. G. (1988). Organizational culture in higher education: Defining the

   essentials. *Journal of Higher Education*, *59*(1), 2-21.

Tinto, V. (1993). *Leaving college: Rethinking the cause and cures of student attrition*,

   (2nd ed.) Chicago: The University of Chicago Press

Wood, M., & Johnsrud, L. (2005). Post-tenure review: What matters to faculty. *The*

   Review of Higher Education, *28*(3), 393-420.

Yukl, G. (2006). *Leadership in organizations* (5th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice

   Hall.

APPENDIX A

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

Please read to interview participants before starting:

Thank you for participating in the interview today. As noted in your invitation, I am a

doctoral student in the Educational Leadership program through University of Missouri

Columbia. The goal today is to learn more about organizational leadership and this

culture of the faculty and staff at MSU. The results of this research will be shared with

the administration to better inform future decisions. All of the names will be removed,

and backgrounds will be as generalized as possible in the findings to ensure

confidentiality. As noted on the consent forms, you can request a copy of the results.

While there are some prepared questions to ask today, I hope this can be a conversation

among us to get the most information possible in short time together.

Are there any questions before we get started?

Interview Questions

1. Tell me your name, your role at MSU, and how long you have been with the
   University.

2. What stands out as a strength of MSU?

3. Can you tell me what you feel the leaders pay most attention to at MSU? How are
   these things measured? Controlled?

4. How are resources allocated for faculty/staff?

5. How are faculty and staff rewarded?

6. How are faculty/staff recruited? Selected? Dismissed?

7. What does their behavior look like when the organization is in a crisis?

8. Think of a role model you have at the University and what types of traits he/she exhibits. Without naming the person, can each person share a little about those traits and what makes them a role model to you?

9. What does "community engagement" look like in behavior as an (insert) at MSU?

    a. Faculty

    b. Staff

    c. Leaders

10. What does "cultural competence" look like in behavior as a (insert) at MSU?

    a. Faculty

    b. Staff

    c. Leaders

11. What does "ethical leadership" look like in behavior as an (insert) at MSU?

    a. Faculty

    b. Staff

    c. Leaders

12. If you had a chance to give advice to faculty/staff that you work with about how to be successful at MSU, what advice would you give?

13. Is there anything we have missed? Anything you came wanting to share and have not had the change to say?

TENTATIVE IDEA: (Consider having the participant draw a diagram or flowchart of how MSU culture looks for them during the interview).

APPENDIX B

FOCUS GROUP QUESTIONS

Please read to focus group participants before starting:

Thank you for participating in the focus group today. As noted in your invitation, I am a

doctorial student in the Educational Leadership program through University of Missouri

Columbia. The goal today is to learn more about culture of the faculty and staff at MSU.

The results of this research will be shared with the administration to better inform future

decisions. All of the names will be removed and backgrounds will be as generalized as

possible in the findings to ensure confidentiality. As noted on the consent forms, you can

request a copy of the results.

While there are some prepared questions to ask today, I hope this can be a conversation

among the group to get the most information possible in short time together.

Are there any questions before we get started?

Focus Group Questions

1. Tell me your name, your role at MSU, and how long you have been with the
    University.

2. What stands out as a strength of MSU?

3. Can you tell me what you feel the leaders pay most attention to at MSU? How
    are these things measured? Controlled?

4. How are resources allocated for faculty/staff?

5. How are faculty and staff rewarded?

6. How are faculty/staff recruited? Selected? Dismissed?

7. What does their behavior look like when the organization is in a crisis?

8. Think of a role model you have at the University and what types of traits he/she exhibits. Without naming the person, can each person share a little about those traits and what makes them a role model to you?

9. What does "community engagement" look like in behavior as an employee at MSU?

10. What does "cultural competence" look like in behavior as an employee at MSU?

11. What does "ethical leadership" look like in behavior as an employee at MSU?

12. If you had a chance to give advice to faculty/staff that you work with about how to be successful at MSU, what advice would you give?

13. Is there anything we have missed? Anything you came wanting to share and have not had the change to say?

TENTATIVE IDEA: (Consider having the focus group member on their own draw a diagram or flowchart of how MSU culture looks for them during the focus group).

INTERVIEW FIELD NOTES WORKSHEET

Date_____   Name of Interviewee_____

Position at MSU_____

Start Time_____AM   PM   End Time _____ AM   PM

Location of Interview_____

Notes re: setting _____

Recorder turned on ____   Recorder turned off_____

Notes to remember:

Initial impressions:

Key events:

Public Affairs:

Miscellaneous:

APPENDIX D

FOCUS GROUP FIELD NOTES WORKSHEET

Names of Participants

_____

_____

_____

Date_____

Start Time_____AM   PM   End Time _____ AM   PM

Location of Interview_____

Notes re: setting _____

Recorder turned on ____   Recorder turned off_____

Notes to remember:

Initial impressions:

Key events:

Public Affairs:

Miscellaneous:

APPENDIX E

DEMOGRAPHIC QUESTIONS ON REGISTRATION FORM FOR FACULTY

Thank you for signing up to participate in a focus group. To ensure that we have a diverse group of participants, please take a few minutes to answer a few questions about your background.

What classification are you considered? □ Faculty □ Staff

FACULTY

How long have you been employed at MSU? _____ [number of years]

Under which college does your department fall under?

□ College of Arts and Letters

□ College of Business Administration

□ College of Education

□ College of Health and Human Services

□ College of Humanities and Public Affairs

□ College of Natural and Applied Sciences

□ Graduate College

□ Unsure (please list department_____)

Are you tenured?

□ Yes □ No

Thank you for registering to participate in this focus group. You will be notified no later than _____ to confirm if you were selected to participate.

APPENDIX F

DEMOGRAPHIC QUESTIONS ON REGISTRATION FORM FOR STAFF

Thank you for signing up to participate in a focus group. To ensure that we have a diverse group of participants, please take a few minutes to answer a few questions about your background.

What classification are you considered? □ Faculty   □   Staff

STAFF

What classification is your position?

□   Exempt   □   Non-Exempt

□   Unsure (please list your position title_____)

What division does your department fall under?

□   Student Affairs   □ Information and Administrative Services

□   Unsure (please list department_____)

How long have you been employed at MSU? _____ [number of years]

Thank you for registering to participate in this focus group. You will be notified no later than _____ to confirm if you were selected to participate.

APPENDIX G

EMAIL INVITATION TO FACULTY TO PARTICIPATE IN FOCUS GROUP

Dear MSU Faculty member-

I am a doctoral student with the University of Missouri-Columbia. I am writing to request your participation in my research of a study of the Missouri State University faculty and staff organizational culture. I am conducting focus groups on campus and would like to invite you to participate. All participants will be provided a meal during their focus group and will be offered a copy of the results of the study.

I will be sure to protect the anonymity of the participants during my research and will strictly adhere to the University of Missouri's IRB research guidelines throughout the process.

If interested in participating, please go to this link _____ and register by this Friday, March 2.

If you would like any additional information or have questions, please contact me at (417) 576-4223 or marissaweaver@missouristate.edu.

Thank you,

Marissa LeClaire Weaver

APPENDIX H

EMAIL INVITATION TO STAFF TO PARTICIPATE IN FOCUS GROUP

Dear MSU Staff member-

I am a doctoral student with the University of Missouri-Columbia. I am writing to request your participation in my research of a study of the Missouri State University faculty and staff organizational culture. I am conducting focus groups on campus and would like to invite you to participate. All participants will be provided a meal during their focus group and will be offered a copy of the results of the study.

I will be sure to protect the anonymity of the participants during my research and will strictly adhere to the University of Missouri's IRB research guidelines throughout the process.

If interested in participating, please go to this link _____ and register by this Friday, March 2.

If you would like any additional information or have questions, please contact me at (417) 576-4223 or marissaweaver@missouristate.edu.

Thank you,

Marissa LeClaire Weaver

APPENDIX I

INFORMED CONSENT FORM-FOCUS GROUP

I, _____agree to participate in the study of MSU faculty/staff

organizational culture being conducted by Marissa LeClaire Weaver, doctoral student at

University of Missouri-Columbia.

I am aware that my answers will be audio taped during the focus group. I understand that

my answers will be used in relation to a dissertation through the cooperative program at

Missouri State University and University of Missouri-Columbia.

I understand my participation is voluntary; I can choose to not answer any question

during the focus group and that my identity will be protected.

The interview should take no more than 90 minutes.

I have read the information above and my questions have been answered to my

satisfaction. I agree to participate in this activity.

Signed:_____

Date:_____

APPENDIX J

INFORMED CONSENT FORM-INTERVIEW

I, _____agree to participate in the study of MSU faculty/staff

organizational culture being conducted by Marissa LeClaire Weaver, doctoral student at

University of Missouri-Columbia.

I am aware that my answers will be audio taped during the interview. I understand that

my answers will be used in relation to a dissertation through the cooperative program at

Missouri State University and University of Missouri-Columbia.

I understand my participation is voluntary; I can choose to not answer any question

during the interview and that my identity will be protected.

The interview should take no more than an hour.

I have read the information above and my questions have been answered to my

satisfaction. I agree to participate in this activity.

Signed:_____

Date:_____

VITA

Marissa LeClaire Weaver grew up in the St. Louis, Missouri area. She graduated
in 1994 from Southeast Missouri State University, earning a Bachelor of Science degree
in Communication with an emphasis in Public Relations. She then immediately went to
graduate school and completed her Master of Science in Education with a concentration
in College Student Personnel from Eastern Illinois University in May 2000. Marissa
began her first full-time position at Missouri State University in July 2000 as the
Assistant Director of Student Engagement for Fraternity/Sorority Life. In 2005, she was
promoted as the first person to serve as the Associate Director of Student Engagement
which included developing all of the student leadership programming. She completed her
Ed.D in Educational Leadership and Policy Analysis from the University of Missouri-
Columbia in 2012. Marissa has been happily married to her husband Jason Weaver since
November 2008.