

Rowan University

Rowan Digital Works

Theses and Dissertations

8-17-2011

From passive to active learning: contingent faculty collaboratively leading pedagogical change

Thomas Setaro

Follow this and additional works at: <https://rdw.rowan.edu/etd>

 Part of the [Higher Education Administration Commons](#)

Let us know how access to this document benefits you - share your thoughts on our feedback form.

Recommended Citation

Setaro, Thomas, "From passive to active learning: contingent faculty collaboratively leading pedagogical change" (2011). *Theses and Dissertations*. 278.

<https://rdw.rowan.edu/etd/278>

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by Rowan Digital Works. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Rowan Digital Works. For more information, please contact LibraryTheses@rowan.edu.

**FROM PASSIVE TO ACTIVE LEARNING: CONTINGENT
FACULTY COLLABORATIVELY LEADING
PEDAGOGICAL CHANGE**

by
Thomas Setaro

A Dissertation

Submitted to the
Department of Educational Leadership
College of Education
In partial fulfillment of the requirement
For the degree of
Doctor of Education
at
Rowan University
April 27, 2011

Dissertation Chair: Kathleen Sernak, Ph.D.

© 2011 Thomas Setaro

Dedications

I dedicate this dissertation to my wife Kathy who continually encouraged and supported me from the start of the doctoral program through graduation. Also to my children, Nicolas and Emily, who have the innate ability to know when a hug is needed; and who continually teach me how to view life from the correct perspective.

Acknowledgments

I would like to acknowledge Dr. Kathleen Sernak for helping me find the meanings of care and respect which made my leadership connect. I would also like to acknowledge Dr. John Robinson and Dr. Robert Campbell for their understanding and patience.

I have a special appreciation for the entire adjunct faculty who work with me. Our students truly benefit from their special talents, dedication, and caring.

I would be remiss if I did not acknowledge the power of my Rowan cohort. Together we pushed and pulled each other, making lifelong professional and personal friendships.

Finally, I would like to acknowledge my colleagues, Dr. Beth Boylan and Dr. Jayne Edman, whose stimulating conversations and keen navigational skills expedited the journeys to our shared dissertation meetings.

Abstract

Thomas Setaro
FROM PASSIVE TO ACTIVE LEARNING: CONTINGENT
FACULTY COLLABORATIVELY LEADING
PEDAGOGICAL CHANGE

2011

Kathleen Sernak, Ph.D.
Educational Leadership

A paradigm shift is underway in higher education where the role of the college instructor moves from a pure disseminator of knowledge to a facilitator of collaborative knowledge creation. Successful active learning strategies are gaining prominence through proven empirical research. Most recently, active learning strategies utilizing emerging collaborative software such as Web 2.0 technologies have furthered advanced cooperative and collaborative learning.

The research points to the far reaching benefits that active learning can have across an institution and the affects that it can have upon faculty and students alike. Better retention and deeper learning are just two outcomes derived from employing active learning. These types of outcomes can ultimately have a profound impact upon institutions and individuals within the educational community.

Through a mixed methods approach, this action research study examines how adjunct faculty can not only contribute to deep and meaningful pedagogical change, but how they can become empowered to lead that change. This dissertation examines how a change from passive to active learning transpired in a single course through an academic year. Through three iterative action research cycles, data were collected, analyzed, and acted upon with the goal of making that successful change.

Table of Contents

| | |
|--|----|
| Abstract | v |
| List of Tables | ix |
| Chapter 1: Introduction to the Dissertation..... | 1 |
| 1.1 Information Technology | 2 |
| 1.2 Computer Science Department | 4 |
| 1.3 Awareness | 5 |
| 1.4 Organization of the Dissertation | 8 |
| 1.5 Goals | 10 |
| Chapter 2: Leadership Platform | 12 |
| 2.1 Introduction..... | 12 |
| 2.2 Community | 13 |
| 2.3 The Past Influences the Future..... | 16 |
| 2.4 Personal Ethics..... | 19 |
| 2.5 Caring and Justice | 21 |
| 2.6 Respect..... | 23 |
| 2.7 Power | 24 |
| 2.7 Primary Leadership Theories | 26 |
| 2.8 Challenges and Shortcomings..... | 34 |
| 2.9 Summary | 36 |
| Chapter 3: Literature Review..... | 37 |
| 3.1 Colleges are Communities | 39 |
| 3.2 Active Learning | 41 |

Table of Contents (Continued)

| | |
|--|-----|
| 3.3 Making the Change from Lecture to Active Learning..... | 52 |
| Chapter 4: Change Theory | 57 |
| 4.1 Recognizing the Need for Change | 57 |
| 4.2 Change within Academia..... | 60 |
| 4.3 The First Four Steps..... | 63 |
| 4.4 Implementing Change within the Project | 74 |
| Chapter 5: Cycle One: Validating the Need for Change | 77 |
| 5.1 Research Questions..... | 78 |
| 5.2 Methodology..... | 78 |
| 5.3 Analysis | 84 |
| 5.4 Research Questions Answered..... | 95 |
| 5.5 Reflection and Action | 96 |
| 5.6 New Questions | 97 |
| Chapter 6: Cycle Two: Collaborating for Change | 98 |
| 6.1 Research Questions..... | 99 |
| 6.2 Methodology..... | 99 |
| 6.3 Data Collection and Analysis | 101 |
| 6.4 Research Questions Answered..... | 117 |
| 6.5 Reflection..... | 118 |
| 6.6 New Questions | 120 |
| Chapter 7: Cycle Three - Part I: Assessing Impact Upon Faculty | 122 |
| 7.1 Research Questions..... | 123 |

Table of Contents (Continued)

| | |
|---|-----|
| 7.2 Methodology | 124 |
| 7.3 Analysis | 129 |
| 7.4 Research Questions Answered..... | 143 |
| 7.5 Reflection..... | 143 |
| Chapter 8: Cycle Three - Part II: Assessing Change within the Classroom | 145 |
| 8.1 Research Questions..... | 146 |
| 8.2 Methodology..... | 146 |
| 8.3 Analysis | 149 |
| 8.4 Research Questions Answered..... | 166 |
| Chapter 9: Cycle Three - Part III: Leadership Revisited | 171 |
| 9.1 Methodology..... | 172 |
| 9.2 Analysis | 173 |
| 9.7 Limitations and Future Actions | 200 |
| List of References | 202 |
| Appendix A Preliminary Student Survey | 211 |
| Appendix B Spring Student Survey..... | 214 |

List of Tables

| Table | Page |
|---|------|
| Table 1 Mean scores for survey questions 1-27 | 85 |
| Table 2 Mean scores for survey questions 1-30 | 162 |

Chapter 1

Introduction to the Dissertation

This study had a dual purpose and both were rooted in change. The primary purpose was to adopt and assess a pedagogy grounded in active learning utilizing collaborative technology. The second purpose was to examine how I changed and grew as an academic leader. It intimately involved me as a researcher, as an insider. The change effort was approached through my leadership and supported through my subscription to a specific change theory.

Since my personal leadership platform is grounded in both democratic educational and servant leadership, this research centers on empowerment and collaboration (Dewey, 1944; Greenleaf, 1998). The need and the propulsion for change were supported and implemented through Kotter's (1996) systematic change process where communal effort is also a requirement. This action research study progressed through three iterative cycles, which were simply based upon evaluating the need for change, making the change, and evaluating the change.

For protection and privacy, the institution and all participants in this study, besides me, have been fictionalized. Prior to embarking upon this study, Internal Review Board permission was granted by both Rowan University and the institution under study. All participants have signed appropriate consent forms, and all data, including a participant key, are kept in a secured environment.

Information Technology

This action research study took place within Shorelands Community College, a large community college by academic standards. This study specifically examined the pedagogy utilized in a single technology course and explored possible avenues for pedagogical change. Implementing and evaluating active learning, specifically utilizing collaborative software, is the main focus. Since the study examined change, an integral portion of the study analyzed the people involved in making the change as well as those impacted by the pedagogical change.

Students enrolling in degree programs at Shorelands are required to fulfill general education requirements as specified by the state's general education model. The model requires students to complete three to nine credits in the math, science, and technology categories. The course entitled Information Technology is an eligible course that students may take in order to satisfy three credits from this category.

Currently, this course consists of two distinct components. The first component teaches students current software concepts using a hands-on format. The students are actively engaged during the class as they apply computing concepts using a personal computer. Topics include the proper and effective use of word processing, spreadsheet, and database software. Faculty refer to this component as the lab section. The second component is termed a lecture, where the students learn relevant technological and ethical issues as well as computing terminology. Topics include data representation, hardware, storage, and the Internet. Students are also required to examine specific issues that relate to ethical topics concerning technology, and respond by writing a paper. Time spent on

the lab portion accounts for approximately two thirds of the three-hour total class time. Comparatively, time dedicated to the lecture amounts to approximately 50 minutes.

Because the lecture component of the class is still given in traditional lecture format, there is limited active learning during those 50 minutes. Historically, the course had developed into this style because of limited resources. An instructor would normally have 20 students during the lab component. At the end of the lab session, the instructor would be moved to a lecture hall that seats 40 students. There, another 20 students would join the class as a combined section. The reasoning behind this strategy was to free up the lab classroom while the instructor was covering the lecture material. Due to the large class size, fulltime faculty perceived the traditional lecture as the only viable method for teaching the material. This conception is consistent with the research concerning faculty beliefs as they pertain to active and passive learning strategies in large classes (Bonwell & Eison, 1991; Messineo, Gaither, Bott, & Ritchey, 2007).

Although the material taught in the lecture component is important, learning tended to be passive. Students were not actively participating in class by asking questions, applying their knowledge to their own personal situations, or working with their peers. There was also a lack of personal contact between the students and the teacher as well as between students during this lecture.

A large volume of students enrolls in this course each semester. Approximately 5,000 students register for the Information Technology course each year. Each semester, the Computer Science department offers over 100 sections of the course. The course is also taught by a large number of adjunct faculty. Over 35 adjunct faculty teach approximately two thirds of those total sections. With these two factors in mind, the

Computer Science department standardized the course content. Every instructor is provided with a standardized set of instructional materials and tools. The course syllabus, content, and tests are created by one fulltime faculty member who oversees the course. This content includes prepared PowerPoint presentations for each of the eight chapters that are covered within the lecture component textbook.

While the lectures are given in classrooms that are technologically enhanced, the technology was not being used to its fullest extent. The college defines technology enhanced classrooms as those having an instructor's personal computer that is wired to a data projector. The instructor basically utilizes the projector to display those department issued presentations.

Computer Science Department

The Computer Science Department at Shorelands is comprised of six full-time faculty who are responsible for teaching and maintaining 23 different courses. One faculty member assumes the role of department technology coordinator whose duties include overseeing hardware and software issues as well as taking ownership of the Information Technology course. That faculty member acts as the lead in making decisions on course content, textbook selections, and creating standardized tests for the Information Technology course.

The department chair position is elected and is rotated among the fulltime faculty. The term lasts for three consecutive years and faculty may only serve as chair for two consecutive terms. In reference to academic leadership, the chair holds little formal power, which can challenge the chair's leadership skills; especially when attempting to

implement change. For all intents and purposes, the chair has an equal voice among all department members.

Although the department chair's basic duties are outlined by the college, the roles still may vary from department to department. In the Computer Science department, the chair acts as a facilitator. He hires and evaluates adjunct faculty, approves curriculum development and changes, and acts as conduit between fulltime faculty and administration. The chair also works closely with the department's technology coordinator.

The chair's most important role is monitoring the satisfaction of the students who are enrolled in the department's courses. This is accomplished by administering student satisfaction surveys to classes taught by all adjunct instructors every year. The chair also must also perform a classroom evaluation once per year for each and every adjunct faculty.

Awareness

My desire to inspire pedagogical change came from two separate sources: students and political forces. Students tended to complain about the lecture component on the course surveys mentioned above. Additionally, faculty would often complain about the lack of participation and the increasing drop in attendance (Reflective Journal, March, 2009). Students enroll in the course because it satisfies the technology requirement stipulated by the general education mandate, but it is unsure as to how many students would voluntarily enroll in the course if it was not mandated, or if they had other ample selections to choose from.

A drop in students selecting this course would dramatically impact the department. Besides the Information Technology sections, approximately 30 other different computer science course sections are offered each semester. With fulltime faculty being required to teach five sections each to cover their contractual obligations, there would be little if any flexibility in scheduling or the opportunity to teach extra sections.

Concern for students. As chair of the Computer Science Department, I felt compelled to change a stagnant pedagogy for several important reasons. As an academic leader, I believed that student learning was being negatively impacted by the teaching methodology utilized, and it was obvious to me that the students were concerned as well.

My commitment to the college community, as a whole, further propelled my desire for change. While this specific course was only a small segment of a student's overall education, it still had the potential to impact the student at a deeper level. Retention issues are more of an institutional concern, but the student's decision to stay in college is based upon a summation of experiences (Braxton, Milam, & Sullivan, 2000; Kuh, 2009; Pascarella & Terenzini, 1980; Tinto, 1975). Since nearly all students entering Shorelands will enroll in this specific course, it has the potential to play a role in the retention equation. I would rather have my department be part of the retention solution rather than part of the retention problem.

Academic politics. Fulltime faculty possess supplementary obligations that go beyond teaching. For example, in addition to teaching and performing the duties associated with the department chair, I have additional responsibilities and leadership roles, which include serving on college wide committees. For the past five years, I have

been an active participant on the college's general education committee. I served on the committee as the state migrated to a unilaterally accepted general education model. The new model had the ability to negatively impact departments where courses focused on technology, and I resolved to act as an advocate for the college's technology departments. As both department chair and representative to the college's general education committee, I was also aware of the political actions that had the potential to significantly reduce enrollment in the Information Technology course.

Two internal yet separate political forces emerged, both refuting and challenging the course's existence. While the Information Technology course satisfies the technology requirement within the state's standardized general education model, there exists an underlying sentiment within the college, and specifically within the general education committee, that the course will no longer be needed in the near future. Opponents of the course feel that students entering the college will have already acquired the necessary skills during high school. This group advocates for either having students test out of the course or allowing components from a collection of other courses satisfy the technology requirement.

The second force arose from senior academic leadership who viewed the course as a basic skills course. This group believed that students should be given a pre-admission test, similar to those administered for math and reading. Only the students who did not pass the test would be required to take the Information Technology course. The course would then become a remedial, skills based course. As I became aware of the need for change, I initiated this study to collaboratively seek a solution as detailed in the chapters that follow.

Organization of the Dissertation

Chapter 2 describes my leadership beliefs as I began my journey into discovering educational leadership in the fall of 2007. Although already serving in a leadership capacity in academia, I enrolled in a doctoral program that concentrated on leadership specifically geared to the unique community college environment. This program enabled me to launch a study into my own personal leadership, beginning with the exploration of my individual leadership theory. Through the initial coursework, I was able to look at past events that shaped my definition of leadership, and ultimately me as a person. The leadership platform that I created specifically outlines my leadership as I defined it at the onset of this study. An integral part of this action research study was examining how I perceived myself as a leader as the project and the coursework concluded. Although I initially created the groundwork for my leadership platform early on, I continually honed it throughout my studies in the program.

Chapter 3 synthesizes the research literature on active learning and illustrates how technology can be utilized effectively in implementing active learning strategies. The literature is rich with studies and theories on active learning as well as strategies that can be implemented to complement those strategies. The research literature also allows for a solid view into the people, the unique nature of community colleges, and the relationship that exists between the people and the organization.

Chapter 4 explains the change theory that I subscribe to and how that theory directly relates to this study. The rationale for change is based upon theories supplied by Kotter (1996) and Argyris (1990). The actual change process is then vetted through Kotter's (1996) eight step process and supported through Bolman and Deal's (2003)

organizational frames. This chapter also explains how change within the study occurred through these theories.

Chapter 5 defines the first cycle in this action research study. The purpose of the first cycle was to gather opinions on the current status of a specific course. The aim was to utilize the voices of both faculty and students alike to evaluate the need for change and explore possible and acceptable active learning strategies as viable solutions. The first cycle was implemented as a pilot study for the applied field study segment of the doctoral program. Permission from internal review boards at Rowan University as well as the college under study was granted in January, 2009. Data from student surveys and qualitative data derived from a faculty focus group were collected in the spring of 2009. The analysis of the data provided the rationale for moving forward with the study.

The sixth chapter defines the second cycle in which specific changes were adopted. This cycle began in the late summer of 2009 and lasted throughout most of the academic year. The purpose behind this cycle was to allow faculty to collaborate on changes, institute those changes, share their experiences, and reflect upon the changes between semesters. This cycle also accounted for the majority of Kotter's (1996) change process.

The third and final cycle was devoted to collecting and analyzing data. The data were utilized to assess the impact upon faculty, the classroom, and my leadership. This cycle is broken out into three distinct chapters.

Chapter 7 probes the attributes and motivating factors behind the people who stepped forward to implement the change. This chapter represents a major revelation stemming from the action research study. I became intrigued by the people who stepped

forward, who became a guiding collation. I realized that they had become an integral part of the study. They too were being affected by the study and I needed to know how and to what degree. This event was unexpected and raised several questions. Since my leadership is grounded in community building and listening, I felt compelled to extend the study so that I may better understand the people that played such an important role in becoming part of the college community.

Chapter 8 involves an analysis of the data to assess the study's success in the eyes of both faculty and students who were involved. This chapter represents the final phase of the change process as it relates to pedagogical change. One again, I utilized a mixed methods study for this final cycle.

Finally, Chapter 9 looks at how this study affected my leadership. Through the analysis of qualitative data contained within a reflective journal, interviews conducted with faculty, and comments from online postings, I was able to clearly see how I demonstrated my leadership through this study. I was also able to see how I changed as a leader since I first began studying my leadership in the fall of 2007.

Goals

My primary goal for this study was to utilize an action research paradigm to address and remediate the deficiencies caused by passive learning by implementing a communal and collaborative change initiative. This study sought to invigorate a course through active learning, empowering both faculty and students to assume the responsibility for making sound educational choices.

Action research also has the potential to impact those who participate in the study, including the researcher. My secondary goal was to examine how successfully I exercised my leadership in achieving a change and how I changed through the process.

Chapter 2

Leadership Platform

Introduction

I picture my leadership platform as the front wheel on a bicycle. The leadership is the hub and the spokes are the “followers.” In this type of arrangement, it is hard to differentiate between who is leading and who is following. The hub is in charge of equity. Its job is to see that each spoke is distributed the appropriate amount of energy or responsibility. The hub is continually in charge of balance. By doing this, the entire bike, or organization, is able to move forward. When the hub starts to make noise, it is an internal sign that it needs oil, or intellectual growth and stimulation. Nobody really notices the hub as the bike goes by. They pay more attention to the bike or are mesmerized by its spokes.

This research study represents the culmination of a very specific, yet important segment of my life. This chapter represents a sketch that details my leadership beliefs before the study commenced. The final chapter within this study affords me the opportunity to reflect upon how well I exercised those beliefs, and also how I changed.

At no point in time did I ever recall thinking to myself, “I am a leader.” Roles in leadership have occurred in my life, but never by me directly seeking them. Like the hub on the bicycle wheel, I never longed to be out in front.

Up until I started this leadership journey, I had a solid idea of who I was as a person. But I never formally addressed my beliefs that made me that person or connected them to my role as a leader. I was led to believe that all leaders needed to be in the front with followers lined up behind them. But as I progressed through my journey, I quickly learned that leadership comes in many forms. So many times throughout my life I had acted as a leader without being in front, and at times, not even recognizing that I was leading.

The perception of leader varies from individual to individual. Couto (1995) believes that a widely accepted image of a leader is one where a person is portrayed as possessing power, money, and prestige. However, Couto (1995) challenges this perception through his description of a citizen leader. He believes that a leader does not need to possess those elements. Instead, Couto (1995) states a leader can effectively achieve results through collaboration and awareness of human relationships. Additionally, a citizen leader provides a transactional basis that fosters that collaborative effort.

This research study proves that effective results can be achieved through collaboration when the participants are empowered, supported, and supplied with the resources through effective leadership.

Community

Although my belief in the community is at the heart of my leadership platform, I must lead while balancing the symbiotic relationship that exists between the individual person and the community as a whole. According to Walling (2007), “Communitarianism

suggests that everyone needs to shoulder responsibilities for the common, or community good” (p. 36). This ideology assumes that individuals will assume collective responsibilities and act in a manner that promotes a healthier community.

My leadership platform is based upon inclusion and responsibility. For me, leadership means motivating and inspiring people to work together in order to promote both individual and communal growth. This type of leadership requires listening, forging relationships, and promoting collaborative work. It means not just respecting the individual person, but being able to convey the importance of the community as a whole to each individual.

My leadership is rooted in these values and is executed through the tenets found within both democratic educational leadership and servant leadership theories. I believe that both leadership theories foster change that promotes inclusion and growth without sacrificing the individual or the community. All too often, people attempt to place a label on leadership. It is too convenient to say, “I am a servant leader,” or “I am a democratic leader.” I believe that it is impossible to subscribe to a single leadership theory while retaining your individual beliefs and values. Instead, I draw elements from each of these leadership theories where they help me strengthen my belief in the culture, values, and importance of the community.

At the beginning of my journey into the discovery of leadership theory, I made the mistake of thinking that my leadership would be able to change under different circumstances. I now realize that I have intrinsic personal beliefs and values that consistently guide me through various circumstances. For instance, I possess the same set of values and beliefs when acting as a father, a teacher, or the department chair. While I

may use different tactics to motivate and persuade diverse audiences, I still attempt to achieve the same end result. This is the reason why I must lead according to what I believe in, rather than having a specific leadership style dictate my actions.

As learned early on, my managerial style may be situational, but my leadership, as expressed by my values and beliefs, will not fluctuate. For me, leadership is the end result and management represents the transactions that get me there. I utilize different strategies to motivate my adjunct faculty and my students. But the goal, or outcome, that I desire to achieve is the same for both: to foster a sense of community.

For example, I continually encourage faculty to have students participate as active learners through collaboration with their peers on group projects and presentations. This fosters both individual growth and a builds a stronger sense of community. At the same time, I encourage faculty to collaborate with each other to produce a better educational experience. Working in this manner results in a community defined as inclusive and yields a stronger sense of belonging.

Couto (1995) describes a citizen leader as one who can recognize the existence of a community and the special bonds that it entails. A citizen leader demonstrates an understanding of both human dignity and the worth of the community at the same time. Oddly enough, at first I did not picture myself as a citizen leader, even though Couto (1995) defines him as a person who generally does not seek out or choose leadership. However, as I more closely examine my past, this concept clearly emerged from within me. I do not believe that people are born as leaders. Rather, leadership qualities emerge as people adopt methods in reaction to events that they become exposed to throughout

their lives. How we lead, interact with other people, and what we believe in are shaped throughout our lives by memorable events.

The Past Influences the Future

Cronin (1995) states that people are divided between believing that either leaders are born or that leadership can be taught. I firmly believe that leadership can be learned, but also that how a person leads is shaped by influential events that have occurred throughout the individual's life. By examining past events, I can easily see how I evolved as a leader and how I can successfully utilize my unique leadership attributes. In a way, leadership within an individual evolves in much the same way as a culture evolves in an organization. A person, like an organization, will tend to respond to events and learn to adopt methods that prove successful. Culture, like leadership, is not innate, but developed over time. Schein (2004) defines culture as a set of shared basic assumptions. These assumptions are adopted by a group, because they have proved to successfully solve problems in the past. Leadership works the same way. An individual's leadership evolves as the person accepts the methods that have proved successful for them while rejecting those that have not (George, 2007).

I recall in my childhood how I reacted around other people. The years between late grammar school and early middle school are an intense period in a child's social life. Friendships are often formed and solidified in grammar school. Those relationships are often tested in middle school as new people enter each student's life. And for me personally, that transition was very difficult. At that particular time I was extremely self-

conscious of my weight. I usually felt uncomfortable around people new to me. I became quiet. I resolved to be part of the background and never put myself out front.

Although I seldom spoke, I became a good listener. I can recall longing to contribute to class discussions or to discussions among friends, but I felt unsafe. I felt that a wrong answer or mistake in conversation would inflict further damage upon me because I was already being defined by my physical appearance. I knew that I had something worthy to contribute, but it seldom came out. I also tended to feel guilty at times for not contributing to the group through conversation, but I continually looked for other ways to contribute without being noticed.

In a paradoxical manner, I was fearful of participating but, at the same time, needed to feel part of a group. I always felt the need to have the security of a close community where I could feel comfortable while being around people who would not wrongly judge me.

As middle school progressed and I entered my high school years, I became more athletic and the weight was shed. However, the damage was already done. I still did not feel comfortable being out in front, leading conversations, and seldom contributed to conversations when new people were around. But I still actively listened and also developed an appreciation for people in the same situation as mine. Based upon these events, I came to appreciate the need for respect, but I also came to admire people who stood up for the rights of others. In examining common leadership traits, Kirkpatrick and Locke (1995) found that successful leaders need a strong sense of self-confidence in order to easily make difficult decisions. As my self-confidence was slowly restored, I

emerged from the background and became willing to take on more active roles, but it was a slow process.

From my memorable past experiences, I now realize that I highly value personal development, responsibility, trust, commitment, a concern for others, a sense of belonging, solid relationships, teamwork, and equality. From these values, I believe I have assembled a leadership platform that outlines how I approach achieving desirable outcomes through respect, listening, and the appreciation for community.

Various people are responsible for helping me shape my leadership platform. My parents are responsible for my work ethic and my strong belief in communitarianism (Bell, 2009) and my admiration for servant leadership (Greenleaf, 1998; Spears, 2010). After all, parenthood is the ideal execution of servant leadership. Both parents quietly and selflessly developed their children, only to joy in their children's individual successes. In turn, I am now helping to lead my family as I teach my children values with the hope that they will grow into leadership roles of their own.

I am influenced by my wife, who continually reinforces the ideals behind servant leadership, which include fostering a sense of community, synergy, and trust. For strong and consistent leadership we cannot divorce our personal experiences from our work, so I carry these values wherever I go.

These and other people, in conjunction with my past experiences, have helped me develop and adopt a platform that includes the values of respect, trust, and caring. All of these attributes are found within the ethics of social justice and caring. For leadership through democratic educational leadership and servant leadership to persevere, however, we must care about the growth and health of both the individual and community alike.

Personal Ethics

“We have seen that a community or social group sustains itself through continuous self-renewal, and that this renewal takes place by means of the educational growth of the immature members of the group” (John Dewey, 1944, p. 10). Leaders have the potential to affect both the community and the individual, therefore, leaders should shoulder the responsibility to act in a manner that protects and fosters the growth of both entities (Hellmich, 2007). For this growth to occur, people must have faith that leaders will act fairly, consistently, and ethically in the best interest of the community and individual.

I understand that as a leader, I will be forced to make decisions for which there are no simple or easy answers. I understand that it is my responsibility to give due diligence to the process by which I lead and make decisions, for my actions and decisions have the potential to impact the lives of other people. Myran, Zeiss, and Howdyshell (1995) elaborate on the need for leaders to establish a code of ethics. They also call for leaders to examine that code and to make sure that it is in sync with those of the community, which in my case, are the personnel of a community college. Established ethical codes are necessary to provide a basis of trust between the leader and the individual and among all community members.

What follows is my personal code of ethics. This code ultimately guides the decisions that I make. They are not arbitrary sentences based upon the ideals of others; rather, they have been carefully assembled by reflecting upon my life's experiences, including my most memorable incidents and people. This code is based upon my belief in both the individual and community alike.

As a leader, when I need to make difficult decisions, I will remember that:

1. I believe that the community is just as important as the individual.
2. I believe that all people are free to make their own choices and belong to their community of choice.
3. I believe that it is the responsibility of the community to help all individuals grow intellectually, socially, and psychologically.
4. I believe that each person is responsible for the growth and health of their community.
5. I believe that no individual should gain at the undue expense of others.
6. I believe that the needs of all individuals in the community must be met without the sacrifice of the community's integrity or viability.
7. I believe that I must put the needs of others first.
8. I believe that my decisions and actions must be fair and consistent.
9. I believe that I will not always have the answers and will need to seek collaborative input.
10. I believe that power should never be abused and used for self-gain.
11. I believe that the failure to act is unethical.
12. I believe that the success of a community is judged by how well it takes care of those who need the community's support the most.

According to Benner (2007), "a virtue is identified as an admirable character trait, freely chosen and habitually acted out in a manner that benefits others as well as oneself" (p. 4). I believe that in exercising leadership, it becomes impossible to ignore those virtues as leadership roles change. For example, whether I assume a leadership role

within my family, my church, my college, or my community, I will continue to lead by those same virtues. In each and every role, there exists a relationship between the individual and the community that has to be respected. My personal code of ethics is derived from those virtues and my belief in the ethics of justice and care, and is enacted within a framework of communitarianism.

Caring and Justice

As educators, we all too often concentrate on the individual by identifying and focusing on what is best for the individual person or student. We often lose sight of the community and the fact that every person desires a sense of belonging. When we leverage decision making in favor of the individual, we lose the necessary symbiotic relationship between the person and the community. There must be a balance between the two in order for individual and community growth to occur (Bell, 2009). Writing about the type of leader who subscribes to a communal ideology, Couto (1995) states, “Their goal is to raise the floor beneath all members of society, rather than to enable a few to touch its vaulted ceiling” (p. 12). Neither should prosper at the expense of the other, but both should look to strengthening each other. Theoretically, this extends the concept of transformational leadership where the leader transforms the followers, but the effects that the community or followers have on the leader are not as strongly valued (Couto, 1995).

I believe that extreme caution needs to be exercised when evaluating ethical ideologies. Just as attempting to subscribe to a single leadership theory seems impractical, the same is true for any single ethic. The principles found within the ethics of

care and justice complement and strengthen one another when taking into account the importance of the community.

In a communal sense, ethical decision-making must go beyond utilitarianism (Ciulla, 2003). Communitarianism states that the utilitarian's favor of the self, or individual, can compromise the community as a whole (Bell, 2009). While the notion of utilitarianism favors the greatest good for the greatest number of people, it lacks concern for the good of the community. Walling (2007) agrees that communitarianism can balance competing decisions that are either based upon favoring the individual or even the greatest number.

The greatest good for the greatest number of people is not always practical or even possible within the workings of every community. Decisions could result in the alienation or marginalization of a few specific community members. From a community perspective, caution must be used when attempting to simply lead by the ethic of justice alone. Likewise, focusing on only specific populations and the inequities and injustices that affect them could potentially weaken the community and the individuals alike.

The ethic of justice highlights the problems caused by a lack of equality. Each member of the group must be treated equally and afforded the same opportunities (Shapiro & Stefkovich, 2005). But this ethic does not take into account inequities that may marginalize community members within a specific segment. From a perspective that is grounded in community, it becomes incumbent upon leaders to find ways to care for individuals and achieve equity through the community itself. In other words, leaders, through an ethic of care as well as justice, leverage the community by forging relationships among members to reduce the inequities. Shapiro and Stefkovich (2005) say

that if an individual is properly helped through an ethic a care, the person would think to themselves, “If someone helps me today, what should I do in the future about giving back to society or the individual” (p. 18). This, in effect, creates a powerful and recursive action that strengthens the community.

Kouzes and Posner (1993) state that the leader who makes decisions that continually favor individuals will jeopardize the community at large. The community must become part of the solution without being compromised or discredited. Additionally, the student must be willing to work with and contribute back to the larger educational community. In the end, the questions that must be answered are: Did I help the individual grow? and, did that individual’s growth further enhance the community?

Respect

Successful leadership in a community is dependent upon respect. According to Shapiro and Stefkovich (2005), “Leaders must take into account multiple voices when making decisions if we care about the individual” (p. 18). Respect implies that each person is equally worthy of contributing to the organization; and it is the leader’s responsibility to encourage each person to do so. Respect weighs the opinions offered by each individual and gives each one due diligence. Lucas (2007) adds, “Showing respect is reflected in listening and trying to empathize with the feelings and thoughts of others” (p. 90). Empathy and listening are also critical attributes required of a servant leader. People must feel that they are equally valued, that their opinions count, and that they can make a difference.

I try my best to foster respect within my department and classroom by eliminating a sense of disrespect (Pocock, 1976). I attempt to convey a sense of equality through informality and by eliminating unnecessary titles and other obstacles that imply a hierarchy. I understand that hierarchies exist, but making your position in the hierarchy transparent can be beneficial. My desire is to have people genuinely feel that they are as important as the next person in any given situation. This can be difficult in organizational cultures where people routinely use artificial titles as a method of demanding respect.

Several years ago, a representative from a publishing company came to my class to witness how we were teaching the material in their textbook. After class, she approached me and asked why the students in my class called me by my first name and not “Professor.” For her, this was the first time that she witnessed that level of informality in a classroom. I simply responded that everyone in the classroom has a first name and we are all equal participants in that community. Nobody objected to my calling them by their first name rather than using their surname. I need students to contribute and not be intimidated by a title that only serves as a method of segregation.

Power

Communities and individuals alike need to change in order to grow. As a leader, it is my duty to foster respect through an inclusive process. I do not believe that change can successfully occur through coercion, but must be accomplished through mutual respect and collaboration.

While leaders may not yearn for power, they do need to exercise power to secure resources that are required to promote growth. It is important for a leader to understand

how the power system within the institution functions (Mabey, 1995). Hughes, Ginnett, and Curphy (1995) state that leaders all have a need for power, but certain leaders satisfy this need through socialized power. While exercising power through this construct, leaders express a concern for individuals and the community. This concern is achieved through empowerment rather than force as leaders show a willingness to share power among their constituencies. In the light of servant leadership, Wallin (2007) states, “Leaders whose major interests are in promoting themselves quickly lose the respect of their followers” (p. 37).

By looking at an organization through the appropriate lens, whether political, symbolic, or structural, the power structure within an organization becomes obvious (Bolman & Deal, 2003). I realize that I will hold leadership positions where I have no legitimate power, such as department chair, so I must approach my leadership platform knowing that I can always control my own source of power. I can still obtain power that will help influence people and secure needed resources through expert and referent power. Expert power is the power of knowledge and referent power is derived from the strength of relationships (Hughes et al., 1998; Kotter, 1996).

From a leadership perspective, expert power can be extremely beneficial when attempting to institute a change (Kotter, 1996). Providing expertise on a subject matter, especially at a local level, can provide people assurance that a change is needed. Of course, leaders must also respect the expertise of the people that they are working with and acknowledge those contributions. Leaders must be aware that followers have and can exercise power also, and harnessing that power can be beneficial to the organization or community (Hughes et al., 1995).

In the absence of legitimate power, a leader can harness referent power to build strong working relationships. Referent power is achieved through respect and by becoming a role model for what one believes in (Hughes et al., 1995). Kotter (1996) writes that in order for change to occur, leaders must demonstrate that they care for their peers through leading by example. In a community setting, strong coalitions can be built through harnessing referent power.

Primary Leadership Theories

Servant leadership. “Rather, they [followers] will freely respond only to individuals who are chosen as leaders because they are proven and trusted as servants” (Greenleaf, 1998, p.17).

Servant leadership is the backbone of my leadership platform. Servant leadership allows me to address the needs of the individual so that individual can further the community. I see it as developing early on in my past and continuing through the present. Empowerment and personal growth are at the heart of servant leadership. As a leader I strive to foster personal growth through intense listening and respecting the individual’s needs. It is also about personal sacrifice and creating future leaders. Walling (2007) points out that ethical leadership requires caring for people, serving them, and trying to put their needs above your own.

According to Batten (1998), servant leaders can learn from, teach, serve, and empower others. Greenleaf (1998) defines a servant leader as one who chooses to serve first, has other’s needs as a top priority, and strives to help individuals grow healthier, wiser, and freer. The goal is to develop the individual as a future servant leader. In a

humorous manner, people often comment that they wish that they had my job. “You can have it,” is my response. I do not say this entirely in a humorous manner; I mean it. I would be more than happy to mentor a person in order to help them become department chair. The process is inevitable, and I would prefer that the person taking my place learn all that they could from me before they started.

Empowering others to lead is essential. Without empowerment, people become too dependent on leaders (Mabey, 1995). As problems and the need for change arise, people will look to leaders for answers, and this reliance fosters complacency (Argyris, 1990; Mabey, 1995).

While the individual prospers, servant leadership simultaneously protects the overall community by securing a source of continued leadership. Leadership comes from within the community where there is an established understanding of the culture, values, and beliefs. This is so important in community college leadership, where outsiders rarely have a solid understanding and appreciation for the unique culture and student needs. I believe that academia is vastly different than industry. I become annoyed when administrators in education attempt to compare practices in academia with those of industry. Community colleges are in the practice of helping individuals grow and strengthening communities. This type of practice requires leaders with traits that can readily foster those outcomes.

Spears (2010) identifies 10 characteristics of a servant leader: Listening, empathy, healing, awareness, persuasion, conceptualization, foresight, stewardship, commitment to growth of people, and building community. Although I can readily find examples that demonstrate each of these qualities within me, several are important as they relate to my

leadership and its relationship to my sense of community. Listening, awareness, persuasion, commitment to growth, and community building are attributes that I can readily identify with and use as a community college leader.

The power of listening. Listening is essential to any type of leadership, but it is something that I have developed from my past. I found that one can quickly learn about people and situations just by intensely listening and observing. This is even truer now. I listen intently to my peers at meetings to find what it is that they truly desire. From an educational perspective, listening to your students is at the center of learning. Listening is a way to ascertain the individual's needs and goals. This is also an important aspect of democratic leadership. Listening, when substantiated through action, provides a solid foundation for caring, respect, and healthy relationships.

But listening enables empowerment. It becomes a method for leadership to convey a sense of caring and respect for the individual by letting them know that their views are appreciated and make a difference. Listening develops a sense of inclusion, which is important in a community setting. All people need to feel welcomed and free to make meaningful contributions. Listening is important when an extreme differentiation in perceived power between individuals exists. This can exist between a teacher and their student or even between department chairs and their adjunct faculty.

Again, listening is fundamental to change. Kotter (1996) says that leaders need to both listen and be listened to. In order to establish buy-in, listening gives people a sense of security. It provides a forum to voice their concerns, and to become an integral part of the change equation. People are less likely to feel threatened and resist change if they are

part of the change process. If you want people to listen to you, you must listen to them first.

Being aware. Awareness is paramount in institutions that are exposed to frequent change. For our department, we must be continually aware of changing technology and the needs of industry and of our students. But awareness must always be accompanied by communication and honesty. Leaders must be able to convey what they see and convey the need for people to respond. Kotter (1996) elaborates on the importance of avoiding happy talk and focuses on the importance of conveying the truth. Being in tune with external forces is just a single aspect of awareness. Leaders need to be aware of the people within. As a leader, I need to be aware of the individual's needs, the community's needs, and the relationships that exist between people. As people drift into complacency (Argyris, 1990), they need to be made aware of the need for change. Community health is supported through individual growth. If the individual remains stagnant, the community cannot grow either.

Change through persuasion. Having the need to persuade assumes that someone is attempting to change and another is resisting that change. The manner in which this transaction occurs is extremely important. Persuasion, as a servant leadership trait, means to be convincing in an intellectual manner. I believe that it is necessary to help people understand the current situation and how a change could potentially benefit them and the community. But persuasion must be accompanied by respect and listening. Persuasion needs to take into account the concerns and fears of the people with whom one is dealing.

After listening, it also means being able to reevaluate one's own position in light of those concerns and inputs solicited through reflection. This takes courage. It is more

than just evaluating outcomes; it means evaluating the impact that suggested change could have or did have on the individual. Reflection requires honesty and it requires taking responsibility for things that may have gone wrong. In servant leadership, it also means allocating appropriate credit to individuals who have carried out the transactions rather than oneself.

Growth. Commitment to growth is the heart of servant leadership. I am responsible for my own intellectual and spiritual growth, but, as a leader, I recognize that it is my responsibility to also help others achieve their goals. As department chair, it means promoting professional development, encouraging venues for continued learning through conferences and seminars, and enrolling in classes that teach new technologies. It is paramount that this type of encouragement takes place throughout the entire department. That means adjunct faculty should be treated like fulltime faculty and be given the same type of opportunity to experience personal growth. This is accomplished by having an intimate knowledge, through listening and observing, of each person's abilities and needs. This applies to both the way I lead my classes and my department. The growth of every employee is just as important as the growth of each student, and the growth of the educational community must parallel the individual's growth.

Community building. Community building is paramount. While each of the preceding qualities addresses the individual, I believe that the individual needs to be continually made aware that they need to promote the community through their individual growth.

Teamwork is synonymous with community. It is my job as a leader to build and sustain a functional team that can openly communicate, share ideas, and support each

other. Additionally, it is my duty as a leader to make sure that individuals feel comfortable in voluntarily taking on responsibilities that will help them grow personally. As Lencioni (2002) illustrates, successful teams start with a high level of trust. Kotter (1996) adds that the work needed to be accomplished by a team can begin only when trust is present. It is my job as a leader to build and sustain teams where members trust each other, and trust me as well. I believe that I garner trust by remaining true to my beliefs and values while openly serving my followers. But trust is also earned by demonstrating your beliefs consistently through behaviors and actions (Senge, 1999).

When referring to the term equality, the assumption is that we are talking about equal rights between individuals. However, I envision the term equality also meaning an equal sharing of duties and responsibilities. I am easily annoyed when people take advantage of others in the group and shirk their duties and responsibilities. If there is going to be an equal sharing of the rewards for success, there must be an equal sharing of the work that gets the team there.

In true servant leadership form, I need to develop my colleagues so that someone can take my place and I can move on. Leadership needs to evolve and I need to grow as an individual as well. Servant leadership allows for new leaders to emerge and current leaders to seek new positions and challenges (Greenleaf, 1998; Spears, 2010). My goal is to always leave my current leadership position while instilling a message that servant leadership works.

Democratic educational leadership. When I first encountered the term democratic education, I immediately thought of an educational system that closely resembled a democratic government. I confused it with governance. That is, each person

is involved in making decisions through the principle of one person, one vote. Foster (1986) depicts democratic education where the individual receives personal services generated from his or her own particular needs and contexts. But democratic education implies much more. It is about freedom and equality in education. Fundamentally, it is the freedom for individuals to participate and to be assured that each voice is equally important.

As previously stated, I believe that respect must resound within any successful organization. The principles found within democratic educational leadership provide a means for insuring that respect is valued. In reference to democratic education, Dewey (1944) states, “In order to have a number of values in common, all members of the group must have an equitable opportunity to receive and take from others” (p. 84). This implies that leadership must value members of the community not only as individuals, but as equals. In turn, the worth of the community is then judged by how well individual interests are shared among all the community members. The converse is also true. An undesirable community “creates barriers to free intercourse and communication of experiences” (Dewey, 1944, p. 99).

Dewey further states that democratic education attempts to break down any inequities such as race and class. Adhering to a hierarchy implies a distinction between classes, and those organizations then run the risk of allocating resources to educate just one segment of that community. When this occurs, Dewey (1944) states, “the influences which educate some into masters educate others into slaves” (p. 84). In order to maintain a healthy level of respect, leadership is required to provide a forum where individual

thoughts are equally valued. It then becomes the leader's responsibility to recognize this discourse and initiate efforts to readjust the organization.

Leaders of educational institutions must be able to have the vision to bring their institutions forward while balancing the needs of all individuals involved in the learning process. Growth of the individual and growth of the institution must be mutually beneficial. Democratic educational leadership insures that individual interests are not being pursued at the expense of the community (Reitzug & O'Hair, 2002). To this end, leaders become the conduit to funnel and direct the efforts of all.

In democratic educational leadership, the people in charge listen and act as the students say, "This is what I need in order to become educated, to become a better person, to live a better life. Help me achieve my goals." While leaders guide the organization, the process becomes collaborative, involving school personnel, students, and faculty. Democratic leadership is a facilitative process that enables individuals or groups to develop their own goals and directions (Reitzug & O'Hair, 2002). The focus is on the individual, but there is also a focus on improving education.

The final tenant of democratic educational leadership rests within the relationship of the individual to the community. Dewey (1944) states in order for societies to grow, they must utilize a progressive educational system. That is, they must teach the next generation of students better and more than the previous generation. If not, then society becomes stagnant. The solution is to have the students in the educational community not only become an active and integral part of the community, but also, to give back to the community whenever possible. It is fine for an individual to grow through the

community, but in order for the community to grow it needs the returning help of the individual.

Challenges and Shortcomings

My biggest challenge with servant leadership is the need for a strong commitment to communication. I feel most comfortable with this form of leadership largely because I can quietly work in the background. I do not desire the spotlight. However, a lack of communication will cause me to fail. Listening is important, but communicating one's ideas and goals to others is too. Teamwork is important and it cannot be done silently. In addition, to be an advocate for one's people, one must speak frequently to people above in order to secure needed resources.

Communication is also an important aspect of team building. People need to be praised for successes and contributions, as Whitney and Trosten-Bloom (2003) point out in their explanation of appreciative inquiry. By accentuating the positive attributes of people and the organization, positive change can flourish and teams will become stronger.

Servant leadership may seem like a lofty and selfless proposition, but we sometimes fail to observe the more selfish side. We are serving people's needs for personal enrichment. They may move on, or in some circumstances, may replace us. We hope that we can move on and that our future interaction with these people will be productive.

The most difficult part of servant leadership is seldom seeking recognition in an institution where recognition is necessary for promotion. It goes against the very ideal

behind servant leadership, but is necessary for professional advancement. For people who do not understand the concept of servant leadership, they may view it as non-leadership. My fear is that people above me will fail to see how I inspired, persuaded, and empowered people to change, grow, and strengthen the community.

Servant leadership is also challenged by the way in which bureaucratic systems approach evaluations. When I evaluate my instructors and subordinates, it is done in a transactional way. It hinders individual development, and needs to be overcome by good servant leadership. Evaluations look for deficiencies in individuals and highlight accomplishments. However, they do not focus on the needs or goals of the individual. Instead of asking what is done correctly or not, the servant leader needs to ask how the person can grow and develop.

One problem with democratic educational leadership is attempting to implement it outside your domain. Within a structured or political organization, people will need to hold on tightly to their rank in the hierarchy. For those, position is a formal, legitimate source of power that they may not want to share. So by creating an environment where each person has an equal voice may seem disrespectful. This may inadvertently cause ill feelings or even resentment, which could negatively impact relationships.

Finally, we need to trust our students. We often think that faculty and administrators know best. But as caretakers, we need to let go and have faith in our students, believing that they will make the right decisions, participate, and give back. Cronin (1995) writes that students can be the masters of their own destinies. We just need to help them with what they need.

Summary

My leadership platform is grounded in relationships and how those relationships are managed in order to foster growth. My ethical code clearly defines the important relationship between the individual and the educational community. Aided by a firm belief in respect, equality, and listening, that relationship is fostered through the principles of both democratic educational leadership and servant leadership.

The following chapter reviews the research literature on active learning. This pedagogy ties directly into my leadership beliefs. It involves strengthening a community by strengthening the individual. In active learning, respect is paramount as each individual is expected to not only participate on an equal playing field, but is also expected to contribute back to the class in some manner. Disrespect is removed as the teacher is no longer a rank above the students in some artificial hierarchy. Instead, the teacher becomes an equal part of the functioning group. The instructor's role changes from the head of the class to the side of the class, alongside the students. The instructor becomes a caretaker, making sure that the students have an equal opportunity to participate while supplying them with what they need to succeed.

Chapter 3

Research Literature Review

"Learning should not be a spectator sport" (Chickering & Gamson, 1987, p. 4).

As community colleges are called upon to educate an increasingly larger segment of the country's population, they are simultaneously confronted with higher expectations for quality of instruction and dwindling resources (Mellow & Heelan, 2008). Community college leaders are required to seek innovative educational methods that increase learning, bolster retention and completion rates, and more efficiently manage their reliance on part-time faculty. The educational research literature delineates a clear path for successful teaching that starts with active learning. Active learning increases social integration and builds higher order thinking skills. Social integration leads to increased levels of satisfaction. Increased levels of student satisfaction lead to higher retention rates.

The Community College Survey of Student Engagement [CCSSE] (2010) calls for community colleges to improve the factors listed above while simultaneously challenging both students and instructors alike to aspire to a cooperative and better learning experience. The research literature seems to converge on a common theme: utilize the community college classroom to intertwine social interaction with academics.

Community colleges were founded to serve societal needs that differed from the designed role of their bachelorette degree-granting counterparts (Bergquist & Pawlak, 2008). Although the community college mission has evolved to now serve the needs of

their community, it cannot be equally argued that a true sense of community dwells within these institutions. The communal environment is challenged because students spend less time within the campus community and more time in their own natural community.

We tend to view education as a process apart from daily life when it should be considered as a parallel event to everyday life. McKinney, McKinney, Franiuk, and Schweitzer (2006) argue that college educators need to concentrate efforts that develop a culture that embodies a sense of community. People readily see the advantages of a community as seen through the communal effects of living in a close-knit neighborhood. They postulate that educators can reap the same benefits by changing the academic culture and approaching education in the same manner. As community college leaders embark upon change, it is imperative that they become familiar with, and well versed in, learning and teaching research findings (Mellow & Heelan, 2008).

"Teaching quality is an essential link between improved college completion and improved learning" (CCSSE, 2010). Several questions arise from this statement. What is improved learning; what is the current instructional deficit; who is responsible; what paths should be taken to arrive at this status; and what are the benefits derived from pedagogical reform?

The research literature provides clear and strong evidence that community college leaders need to respond to the call for pedagogical change. The research points to a pedagogy that is grounded in active learning, fosters a stronger sense of community and belonging, is technology enhanced, and promotes higher cognitive skills. Barr and Tagg (1995) claim that a paradigm shift in education is underway. In order for colleges to

flourish in the future, they must adapt and change from instructional institutions to institutions of learning. This may sound like a subtle, if not benign difference, but the underpinnings are dramatic. The shift is from a pedagogy that is teacher centered to one that is student centered. Simply stated, active learning techniques where the student is placed in the forefront of the classroom have the potential to create a substantial impact.

Colleges are Communities

Mission, funding, faculty, and student composite make community colleges vastly different from their 4-year counter parts (Bergquist & Pawlak, 2008; Cohen & Brawer, 2008; Mellow & Heelan, 2008). One significant difference is the role that the classroom plays within each type of institution. In other words, the manner in which the material is taught plays just as an important role as what material is taught. As commuter institutions, community colleges lack the social environment that research routinely points to as an important factor in student persistence and retention. In fact, social integration can be a strong predictor of persistence starting from the time the student walks through the doors (Bank, Slavings, & Biddle, 1990; Braxton et al., 2000; Pascarella, Duby, & Iverson, 1983; Pascarella & Terenzini, 1977, 1980; Sanders, 2000; Strauss & Volkwein, 2004; Tinto, 1975). With this in mind, the instructor is then compelled to structure a class that can functionally overcome this social deficit.

According to Tinto (1997), this is possible if instructors treat their classrooms more as a community than as a teaching arena. When the students become involved in learning that simultaneously links and bonds them with their peers and their teacher, the students will have a better chance at succeeding. They learn while forging new and

important relationships, producing a reciprocal effect where the students become more socially involved in their class as they become more academically involved (McKinney et al., 2006; Tinto, 1997). This interaction widens their social support system, which improves their academic integration. This is proved to be successfully implemented within the classroom through class discussions and higher order thinking activities (Braxton, Jones, Hirschy, & Hartley, 2008).

With this knowledge, the instructor may choose to create a classroom through a pedagogy that is focused on cooperative learning rather than instruction based upon lecturing. Cohen and Brawer (2008) view the concept of curriculum design as a technology unto itself. They elaborate on the importance of faculty within the community college realm recognizing that as commuter institutions, community colleges lack the community environment. They charge the faculty with exercising the technology of curriculum design so that classrooms may exert the powerful community effects upon community college students. This approach is in line with the paradigm shift from passive learning to active learning where the instructor sheds the sage on the stage mentality and assumes the role of coach on the sideline (Barr & Tagg, 1995).

According to Dewey (1944), this socialization is an educational necessity. Without the social element that is developed within the classroom, learning becomes drudgery. Active learning strategies foster this needed socialization by drawing students into the educational process. Chickering and Gamson (1987) outline seven principles that they believe can foster this type of environment. At the heart is active learning where students become more responsible for their education and rely more on their peers than their instructor.

Active Learning

Active learning addresses the all-important aspect of social integration while simultaneously elevates learning. In a passive learning environment, the instructor disseminates information and the students are receptors. There is little interaction between the students and faculty or between the students themselves. In a sense, the social element is removed from the classroom in totality. Bonwell and Eison (1991) characterize active learning as any learning activity where students are involved in more than just listening to their instructor. The research literature is rich with evidence and rationales as to why college leadership should concentrate on fostering a college culture that embraces this pedagogy.

Through his work on the National Survey on Student Engagement [NSSE], Kuh (2009) elaborates on the importance of colleges being able to engage students. The CCSSE parallels the work of the NSSE and provides colleges with benchmark questions on student engagement. Students are surveyed in order to gauge their perceptions on how well they feel their colleges engage them across various categories. Questions pertaining to classroom engagement ask students how often they participate in class discussions, make presentations, and if they work with students on class projects outside class time. This allows for institutions to compare their current state of engagement and make pedagogical adjustments and changes as necessary.

Why active learning. Active learning enables faculty to bring the social element into the classroom, increases both student and faculty satisfaction, and requires that students demonstrate higher cognitive skills (Bonwell & Eison, 1991; Kight & Wood, 2005; McKinney et al., 2006; Michel, Carter, & Varela, 2009). Student satisfaction and

success then lead to better retention and graduation rates (Braxton et al., 2008). Developing an environment where students not only participate actively, but cooperatively work alongside their peers, effectively extends the concept of active learning. Black (2005) found that students reported interaction as one of the key components to learning. From this research, it can then be argued that the classroom experience is vital to learning. Students need to be consistently in class if they are to develop social connections and interact with their peers. Active learning strategies have been found to increase attendance (Bonwell & Eison, 1991). Effectively, classroom dynamics change through active learning. The traditional role of the instructor and the individual learner evolve beyond disseminator and receptacles of knowledge as these interactions occur.

As faculty require students to work interactively in a cooperative fashion, they naturally foster relationships between students. This in turn produces a more engaging classroom environment while positively impacting the individual (Umbach & Wawrzynski, 2004). The student benefits and grows both personally and academically by interacting with his peers (Astin, 1993). The perpetuated myth that is that students must learn from a teacher where the reality is that learning is amplified when students have the opportunity to learn from each other (Kraft, 1985). Through learning in a socially centered environment, students adapt important social behaviors including communication skills and conflict resolution, all of which are necessary traits required beyond graduation (Kraft, 1985).

Active learning strategies extend the learning process and foster intellectual growth within the individual beyond the capabilities of passive learning. A passive

learning pedagogy concentrates on lower level cognitive skills associated with memorization of facts (Bloom, 1956; Bonwell & Eison, 1991; Chickering & Gamson, 1987; Krathwohl, 2002). Active learning enables faculty to reach the students and challenge them to invoke higher cognitive skills. A pedagogy rooted in active learning has students reach beyond demonstrating that they know the material to actually creating knowledge (Bloom, 1956; Krathwohl, 2002). This newly created knowledge can be shared with their peers.

The use of active learning strategies ultimately affects educational performance. Ullah and Wilson (2007) showed that active learning strategies increased students' grade point averages. Likewise, Powner and Allendoerfer (2008) demonstrated that active learning techniques such as open discussions and role-playing raised test scores within a course. Yair (2000) added that classes delivered strictly through lecture have the tendency to be boring to students, and that boredom allows the student to become distracted by turning their focus to events that are occurring in their personal lives. Active learning keeps the student focused on the material at hand.

However, not all classes respond equally. Results from implementing active learning techniques depend upon the course and the type and complexity of the material covered (Reinsch & Wambsganss, 1994). Faculty need to know their students and make adjustments accordingly.

Strategies. Active learning techniques can take on numerous forms (Bonwell & Eison, 1991; Chickering & Gamson, 1987). Good educational practices can be woven through existing practices, extended beyond the classroom, involve individuals, or utilize teams (Chickering & Gamson, 1987). Faculty need to assess their current pedagogy and

ask themselves how the students are responding. If an instructor lectures for the entire class with zero interaction from the students, there is plenty of room for improvement. Any move from passive to active learning will show gains in student performance (Kight & Wood, 2005). For example, the simple use of questions promotes active learning (McKeachie, 1999).

Questions can be incorporated into any type of classroom regardless of the instructional method being used. However, the correct type of question will only increase participation. For example, a question that requires a show of hands will not typically elicit a verbal response (Napell, 1978). Teachers need to get the class into a regular habit of asking questions. As an added benefit, students will tend to prepare better for class when they believe they may be called upon to answer questions (Dallimore, Hertenstein, & Platt, 2004). The opposite is also true. Students who prepare more for class will be the ones who are most likely to participate (Weaver & Qi, 2005). Assigning readings to the class beforehand will help them prepare and will increase engagement (Yazedjian & Kolkhorst, 2007). McDougall and Granby (1996) suggest the use of random oral questioning over voluntary oral questioning. They find that random questioning better helps students prepare for class through increased class participation and engagement.

Students can also be enticed into engagement. In research conducted by Dallimore et al. (2004), students cited that professors can increase the quality of participation by making it a required part of their grade. Students will also participate more actively when there is a reward involved (Boniecki & Moore, 2003). However, according to Bean and Peterson (1998) class performance can only be improved if the instructor implements consistent and clear standards for measuring and assessing class participation.

Again, the blame for lack of engagement should not always fall on the student. Boniecki and Moore (2003) found that in some instances, instructors are at fault and will tend not to ask questions due to what they call the “silence.” This awkward moment between the question and the lack of an answer will cause the instructor to continue to lecture without interaction, fearing that the question will go unanswered. Of course, student reaction to questions may be affected by the relationship with the instructor. It is incumbent upon the instructor to create a democratic educational atmosphere where students feel free to answer questions. Instructors need to show that they have a mastery over the subject matter, but also need to convey to the students that they also have something to add (Weaver & Qi, 2005).

As outlined by McKinney (2008), there are alternatives to straight lecturing, or even lecturing with substantial questioning. Activities include think-pair-share, collaborative learning groups, student-led review sessions, games, analysis and reaction to videos, debates, student generated exam questions, projects, case studies, journals, newsletters, and concept mapping. However, she also cautions that in order for this to work, students need to be prepared for active learning. The objectives need to state that active learning will be used in the course.

Berry (2008) adds that the chosen activities must be relevant to the student. Furthermore, team equity is an important consideration when implementing activities that place students in a competitive environment. He also adds that even though activities can primarily take place in a team, individual contributions need to be recognized.

Knowing the Student. As community college classrooms start to see a migration towards younger students, age will start to play a greater role in classroom participation.

For example, Strage (2008) found that older students prefer a teacher who is organized and a class that is well organized, while younger students also like a well-organized professor, but also leaned towards those that are enthusiastic and funny. Younger students also preferred a course that was engaging. Numerous research studies have found that certain student characteristics such as gender and age influence classroom dynamics and levels of participation (Fritschner, 2000; Howard & Henney, 1998; Howard, Short, & Clark, 1996; Weaver & Qi, 2005). Older students, those classified as non-traditional college age students, tend to participate more. Older students feel less threatened by instructors and also have more experience from which to draw.

In addition to age, experience seems to count. According to Messineo et al. (2007), experienced students will resist active learning activities more than newer students when enrolling in classes where enrollment is expected to be large. For instructors and academic leadership, this means that a culture of engagement needs to be established so that as students enter the institution, they will be accustomed to active learning.

Gender plays an important role when deciding to implement different active learning strategies. While promoting relationships in class is necessary, the outcomes will vary depending upon gender. Male academic performance decreased when peer relationships improved while female academic performance increased when relationships with their peers improved (Ullah & Wilson, 2007). So the selection of learning techniques, like peer groups, needs to be evaluated in light of the class population.

Not all students respond equally to every instructional technique. In their study, Meera and Karau (2008) state that in order to effectively reach the greatest number of

students, instructors need to be tuned into the needs of their students. Their motivations for learning need to be realized and understood. They identified three different profiles of academic motivation: engagement, avoidance, and achievement motivation. Students who are in the engagement class will respond to all types of classroom techniques, but those students who are in the achievement class will still be hold-outs and will tend to prefer lectures. This provides a rationale for introducing active learning early in the students' college career so they may become acclimated to and accepting of those strategies.

Because of the numerous and complex factors that influence participatory education, researchers such as Fassinger (1995) advocate concentrating on developing a more communal and supportive classroom environment through cooperative learning and group exercises. The interaction between students proves invaluable in crossing barriers that prevent classroom participation.

Misusing technology. Advocates for increasing active learning and student engagement reiterate the need to move from the teacher-centered class to a student-centered class. In the teacher-centered class, the instructor lectures and passive learning occurs. In an active learning environment the role of the instructor changes where the teacher becomes a facilitator. Teachers have the illusion that by keeping up with technology and using it in their classroom, they are implementing new instructional techniques and are, in effect, changing their old method of teaching.

Technology is becoming a staple in classrooms. Internet access, slideshow presentations in PowerPoint (slideware), and videos are just a few of the venues being used to increase the vitality of courses. However, the incorrect or ill-timed usage of

technology can decrease student engagement. Since PowerPoint presentations are the most prevalent use of technology, the literature is rich with studies on its effectiveness and impact upon engagement. According to Klemm (2007), there are several issues involving using PowerPoint presentations in a classroom. These issues tend to originate either from the faculty, the student, or the environment.

First, the instructor is inclined to look at the screen, reading off of the slide rather than lecturing from experience. Faculty who use PowerPoint presentations tend to increase the amount of information that they expect the student to comprehend (Klemm, 2007). At the same time, this increase in information is being broadcast at a faster pace. Although there is a population of students who prefer slideshows, negative comments from students indicate that they tend to be boring and there is too much information presented too quickly (Frey & Birnbaum, 2002). The instructor still has the same amount of time, but attempts to cover more information. This action also has another negative side effect. To get through the information, the teacher will stop asking questions. Prior research has shown that questions can promote active learning by provoking discussions.

Hashemzadeh and Wilson (2007) find that technology can actually limit the spontaneous interaction between the student and the instructor. The student, rather than taking notes on important topics, will tend to use the printed slides as a crutch (Klemm, 2007).

The use of PowerPoint presentations changes the environment. Often, for better viewing, the lights are dimmed. This lulls the student into a more passive environment. When the light switch is either located a distance away from the instructor or is in an

awkward location, the instructor will tend to keep the lights off for a longer period than is necessary (Frey & Birnbaum, 2007; Klemm, 2007).

There is a consensus in the research indicating that several actions may be implemented to increase the potential use of technology. For slideshows, the increased use of pictures helps (Frey & Birnbaum, 2002). Rather than using the slides as a primary method for delivering the class, they may be used to subsidize the content. Incorporating activities such as games and quizzes into the show may cause an increase in engagement. In fact, any type of activity that is interjected into any lecture format will not only increase engagement but will also help students remember more content (Klemm, 2007; Prince, 2004).

In the end, the instructor's teaching skills will become the most dominant factor affecting participation and learning. Hashemzadeh and Wilson (2007) point out the fact that presentation skills are the most important asset available when delivering a class. The research even goes as far as to prove that lecturing skills may be more important than the technology being used. To this end, the technology must be utilized to augment the lecture, not replace it. Research indicates that perhaps a more effective utilization of technology is to enhance cooperative learning rather than using technology as a lecturing aid. Gier and Kreiner (2009) found that even the effective use of PowerPoint presentations within lecture can be beneficial when coordinated with active learning techniques.

Web 2.0. A common definition of Web 2.0 that is routinely accepted throughout the research literature is the "read/write web." It is a collection of web based applications

that promote collaboration by trusting people to act as co-developers and the belief that a collective intelligence is more powerful than a single person (O'Reilly, 2005).

According to Kennedy et al. (2007), Web 2.0 technology includes podcasting, blogs, wikis, and social networking. Google®, Facebook®, and Wikipedia® are all examples of relatively new Web 2.0 applications that offer services to help collaborators produce, store, and share information (O'Reilly, 2005). While Kennedy et al. (2007) found that students are comfortable around technology, it was also shown that there is a great disparity between how frequently each of these elements are used and understood. They concluded that there are inaccurate assumptions regarding students' actual knowledge and proficiency with this technology, which can have a profound impact on how it is used in the classroom.

Educators need to look beyond the assumptions that allow for stereotyping generations of students; presumptions that assume all students are equally adept and willing to use certain technologies. Instead, they must look at how well the technology is ingrained within society as a whole. Once faculty establish that the technology is routinely accepted and used by society, it becomes imperative that the technology be used in education or else the gap between the real world and education will only further expand (Collis & Moonen, 2008)

However, faculty must be cautious and mindful when adopting and integrating some form of technology into the curriculum. Change should not be dictated by technology. When doing so, educators must be sure that the technology has a purpose, and that in order to be beneficial, it must promote active learning (Collis & Moonen, 2008; Mellow & Heelan, 2008).

McLoughlin and Lee (2007) do not dispute the claim of Kennedy et al. (2007), but rather look at the possibilities of using Web 2.0 to foster collaborative learning. They see technology as a vehicle for students to learn beyond classrooms and to break free from antiquated curriculums designed solely by teachers and administrators. The argument being that the people who are in charge of curriculum development need to be in touch with how accepting society is of using technology in the classroom. Faculty need to create classroom environments that promote collaborative learning, and technology has the potential to enhance that environment (Prince, 2004).

Research indicates a trend where faculty are starting to become more accepting of curriculum designed and carried out in a cooperative manner. Ajjan and Hartshorne (2008) found that most faculty support integrating some form of Web 2.0 technology into the classroom environment. Studies also show that utilizing this technology increased interaction between students and between students and faculty. It proved to be a cost effective educational tool, as many Web 2.0 technologies can be accessed free of charge (Ajjan & Hartshorne, 2008; Magolda & Pratt, 2009). Since the students were involved and participated in active learning, they retained the knowledge better than if they were involved in passive learning. In fact, the students went beyond the lower cognitive domain category of just knowing to the category of creating knowledge (Krathwohl, 2002).

Kanter (2001) sees the careful balance of traditional communities and online communities as a powerful force. The combination, when utilized correctly, can unleash powers derived from cooperative human energy. Learners are not alone, but rather dwell within a collective learning community that has the ability to produce a synergistic effect.

Web 2.0 technology has the ability to create and maintain these communities of learners (Magolda & Platt, 2009).

Utilizing Web 2.0 technologies additionally adds to the democratization of education. It has the potential to lend an active voice to all students who are participating in the class. Students who would normally shy away from participating in classroom discussions open up and feel empowered to contribute, create, and share knowledge (Collis & Moonen, 2008; Magolda & Platt, 2009).

Making the Change from Lecture to Active Learning

Resisting change. In the qualitative research study conducted by Michael (2007), it was shown that faculty response on resisting active learning could be broken down into three groups or categories: student characteristics, teacher characteristics, and pedagogical issues.

When faculty perceived the students as the barrier to implementing active learning, they mainly stated that students simply do not know how to do active learning. Teacher generated concerns created statements such as active learning requires too much prep time and that teachers have no control over their classes. Finally, when the response to resisting change was pedagogical, issues of wrong classroom style, activities taking up too much time, and not being able to cover required materials were the predominate themes (Michael, 2007).

In their qualitative case study, Owen and Demb (2004) highlighted the issues surrounding the change dynamics specifically involved in implementing technology related active learning strategies. They stratified key elements or concerns into the four

categories of faculty, funding, students, and support issues. The faculty category received the greatest attention. Common to both studies is the concern that student computers need to be present in order for technology to be implemented as an interactive learning strategy.

In order to change from lecture-based, instructor-centered teaching methods, Michael (2007) agrees with Argyris (1990) in that there is no quick fix. Teaching by the lecture method has been instilled in teachers because it is the method used by the teachers who taught them (Gappa & Leslie, 1993). Michael (2007) states that an increase in faculty development programming such as seminars and workshops, which can teach applying active learning, will not work by themselves. They do not produce long lasting results. There needs to be a more profound change in the culture of teaching. It is difficult to break the cycle quickly. Historically, institutions of higher learning tend to resist cultural change more than other organizations (Bergquist & Pawlak, 2008).

Leadership's responsibility. Engagement through a pedagogy based in active learning requires a cultural shift, and that shift may start within a single department, but must eventually spread across the institution. Schein (2004) defines culture as a set of unquestioned behaviors that an organization adopts and accepts based upon their success. It is then incumbent upon leadership to demonstrate to the organizational members that those behaviors have a less positive outcome than an alternative set.

Leadership must demonstrate, through the educational research, that active learning strategies are far more beneficial than the passive ones currently in use. The process must start with faculty. Leadership must expose faculty to viable active teaching strategies, supplying them with alternatives. Leadership must persuade faculty members

to develop and employ new teaching strategies. Leadership must concentrate on removing barriers, actual or perceived, to active learning. Leadership must perpetuate and spread the changes from their locale throughout the institution. However, a change from passive to active learning is a cooperative endeavor that only begins with faculty. While the support for the change must come from school administration, improving the educational process is the responsibility of both faculty and students (Chickering & Gamson, 1987).

Faculty are only part of the change equation. Students are the other integral part. They arrive at college with certain predispositions. Their accustomed preferences for learning are developed before arriving at college, and if they have been taught using lectures, then they will tend to resist active learning strategies (Kight & Wood, 2005). However, in their study they showed that student satisfaction with active learning can be positively influenced if faculty demonstrate that they themselves are comfortable using those strategies in class.

Active learning clearly offers a bountiful array of benefits over traditional lecturing. So to a person who is an outsider to the educational environmental, it may seem puzzling as to why faculty do not adopt this teaching and learning style universally and without administrative pressure. In order to clearly see the reasoning behind the resistance, people need to be cognizant of the historical developments that have given rise to community colleges.

Bergquist and Pawlak (2008) identify six organizational cultures that can be found throughout academia. While not every institution fits perfectly into a single description, the characteristics of certain cultures tend to dominate within each

institution. In opposition to the collegial culture, community colleges developed as institutions where faculty focused on teaching rather than research (Bergquist & Pawlak, 2008; Cohen & Brawer, 2008).

Paradoxically, faculty in community colleges teach more classes, but those same colleges also employ more adjunct faculty. In order to more effectively utilize a larger contingency of adjunct faculty, the managerial culture dominated the community college genre. Administration within that managerial culture found that efficient managerial processes derived from business were required over the traditional academic practices found in other cultures such as the collegial culture. These streamlined managerial processes included using prepared and packaged materials that could easily be handed to adjunct faculty in order for them to quickly and efficiently deliver a class (Bergquist & Pawlak, 2008). This historical perspective helps explain why faculty in community colleges are more prone to use the standard lecture.

In an environment where tenure and promotion are directly linked to quantifiable results, faculty could respond to administration by adopting a tangible culture. Here, faculty protect themselves by teaching for recordable periods of time. Having been cultivated within the tangible culture, faculty will resist change. They will feel compelled to remain in charge of the classroom pace with continual oversight of the class. The consensus is that that faculty will adopt the use of PowerPoint presentations as a method of appeasing pedagogical change advocates while simultaneously keeping their control (Bonwell & Eison, 1991; Cohen & Brawer, 2008). Even if faculty are given lesser teaching loads, they still would not deviate from their learned teaching patterns.

Once in this pattern, faculty and administrators are resistant to the emerging virtual culture that fosters innovation. The virtual culture more readily embraces the use of technology where time and space become irrelevant (Bergquist & Pawlak, 2008). Students can utilize technology to learn outside of class time, and they can form communities beyond the physical boundaries of the college. The educational benefits derived from utilizing collaborative technology are immense. However, entrenchment in the managerial or tangible culture is in direct opposition to these concepts (Bergquist & Pawlak, 2008; Kanter, 2001).

The answer for change seems to lie in the institutional support mechanisms. Chickering and Gamson (1987) write that faculty and students are responsible for changing, but the support and initiative must come from the college leadership. While a move to active learning must be systemic, the academic department chair is in a desirable position to launch the effort locally. Through clear and open communication channels, the department chair can enlist, motivate, and guide both fulltime and part-time faculty towards a cultural shift that embraces active learning (Gappa & Leslie, 1993; Roueche & Roueche, 1996).

Chapter 4

Change Theory

Recognizing the Need for Change

I believe that my approach to change is fairly straight-forward: listen to people, pay close attention to your community's surroundings, be honest, and communicate the need for change. The need for change should be based upon improving the community's health through improving the individual. Make the change initiative inclusive and cooperative, taking into account the opinions of multiple stakeholders within the community. Then, empower and support people to implement change.

An organization falters when participants steeped in complacency are unaware of the necessity for change (Argyris, 1990). They are too comfortable with the status quo and see no valid reason for investing the time and energy to behave differently. However, this stagnation makes this seemingly comfortable existence vulnerable to external forces that have the power to ultimately threaten departmental operations. Herr and Anderson (2005) see action research as a perfect solution for breaking the malaise that organizations become trapped within. Action research allows for exploration and exposure of the culture and norms that keep an organization from growing and learning. Effectively, it allows the participants to see the need for change. Departments that truly care about their students and education as a whole will be willing to embrace a

culture that welcomes discussion about all elements surrounding pedagogy (Gappa & Leslie, 1993).

My personal ethics code has become a strong weld within my leadership platform. Leadership cannot be arbitrary, but should be consistently driven by a code of ethics (Myran et al., 1995). I believe, that as a leader, I must act in the best interest of the individual and community. Decisions affecting the community should not be made in a vacuum, but should take into account the input and concerns of the community members. The need to act may start with leadership, but needs to be validated by others. I believe that failing to take action when I have the ability and power to act is unethical. As department chair, I felt that pedagogical changes were necessary based upon classroom observations that I carried out in the fall 2008 and spring 2009 semesters. I also asked to have this view validated by others.

In addition to the classroom observations, data gathered from student surveys and a focus group held during the spring 2009 semester further reinforced my belief that a change was in order. In a healthy educational environment, students must be able to extract the highest value from any course that they take. They should be active participants, not bystanders who tend to become bored. The course should be student-centered where the material relates to the personal interests of the students. I also felt a professional obligation to both my full-time and part-time faculty. As a leader, it is my responsibility to maintain a healthy and functional department, and continue to provide a democratic and participatory educational environment.

According to Kotter (1996), the majority of change initiatives prove to be unsuccessful because leaders fail to create a sense of urgency; they did not see or convey

the necessity to change. Establishing a sense of urgency, creating a guiding coalition, developing a vision and strategy, communicating the change vision, and empowering broad-based action are the initial steps in Kotter's (1996) plan for change. Personally, I also view them as the most critical elements when considering a first order change in academia.

When I first embarked upon my leadership journey, I was asked to depict my leadership style through a drawing. The rudimentary etching pictorially described my then current leadership style as a collection of characters scurrying about, dodging bombs from the sky. I was trying to convey how I envisioned my department as I first took over as department chair. I felt that, as a unit, we functioned in a reactionary mode. Problems came to us and we needed to quickly mobilize and address those problems. I was uncomfortable with that type of environment, so the etching's second frame depicted the leader that I aspired to be. The characters were assembled around a table, planning, visioning, and anticipating the problems before they emerged.

I had just completed my first term as department chair when I enrolled in the leadership doctoral program. I was well aware of my community college culture and envisioned what I wanted it to be. I craved to establish and work within an environment that was rooted in listening, mutual respect, and a strong sense of community, the attributes I would attempt to instill in my department. According to Schein (2004), leaders create new culture. From my perspective, I believed that working within the same organization for a significant length of time could prove advantageous if leveraged appropriately. Argyris (1990) looks at the first step in change as taking the time to look at the organization and how the members approach problems.

As a leader decides to create a significant change, he must have a solid understanding of why the organization is in its current status and the forces that work within it before deciding on a method of change. To assist in my understanding and analysis of the organization, I relied on the combined work of Bolman and Deal (2003) and Bergquist and Pawlak (2008). I chose to use both Kotter (1996) and Argyris (1990) to guide me in the actual change process. The methodical change strategy defined by Kotter (1996) and accompanied by the analysis of culture as elaborated by Schein (2004) provide a complete and thorough framework that leaders can utilize in order to successfully approach change. While Argyris (1990) can help leaders understand the necessity for and the resistance to change, Kotter (1996) provides the technical method for achieving an end.

Change within Academia

Colleges are steeped in tradition (Bergquist & Pawlak, 2008). Their culture differs vastly from industrial organizations. Because the people who work in community colleges attended 4-year colleges before teaching, they are more likely to embrace a culture similar to the one they experienced. This preconceived notion of an acceptable culture makes change difficult, as community colleges have their own unique culture within academia.

Mellow and Heelan (2008) postulate that community colleges came about not to educate the growing middle class society, but rather to provide a skilled workforce to supply the needs of the powerful elite. They needed to educate the masses who had a wide spectrum of prior skills and abilities. The volume of students combined with a

degree of under preparedness and sparse funding established the community college culture from the very beginning.

Community colleges did not evolve into the collegial institutions that their 4-year counterparts did. Instead, these demands caused them to adapt a more managerial culture that better leveraged scarce funding (Bergquist & Pawlak, 2008). Uniformity in teaching, reliance on more contingent faculty, and a core focus on classroom efficiencies such as maximum classroom occupancy established a culture where education was controlled from outside and above the faculty ranks. For this reason, any change became slow to implement.

Bolman and Deal (2003) give leaders a method for instituting cultural change by allowing them to look beyond the organizational facades. By understanding the organization's culture, changing it becomes more realistic. Often colleges are considered steeped in traditions (Mellow & Heelan, 2008). This may lead to an assumption that community colleges could best be understood by looking at them through what Bolman and Deal (2003) describe as a symbolic lens. However, by understanding how community colleges evolved, Bergquist and Pawlak (2008) inform us that the traditions are superficial. Community college cultures are best examined through structural and political lenses. The separation of labor and management make this obvious. Traditions such as the graduation ceremony with the cap and gown have little impact upon how the college functions the remainder of the year.

Through the political lens, leadership can readily view power and conflict, hidden agendas, and interdepartmental politics. Through the structural lens leaders can be in tune

with how change can be challenged and limited as defined by the set structural environment that separates teachers from administrators (Bolman & Deal, 2003).

By understanding the institution through the appropriate lenses, leaders can more accurately define their own behaviors and roles within the institution in order to maximize their chances at successfully implementing change. For example, leaders within a political organization need to understand the power structure and build coalitions that consist of the correct balance of people. Kotter (1996) is adamant about creating a guiding coalition that is comprised of people who have the necessary level of institutional power and influential skills. The coalition must contain the correct balance of management and leadership. While leaders can supply the vision and drive the change, people with management skills are required to accomplish the necessary tasks. The coalition must also contain people who have the power and clout to remove obstacles and secure resources. Leadership must fully understand the organizational culture that they are operating within to accurately identify those participants.

Elements seen through the political and structural lenses often cross each other. For example, in order to understand the political power within the institution, it is often necessary to understand the formal structure. The effective leader needs to understand who has the capacity to help him, and who has the power, both formal and informal, to create barriers to change.

Schein (2004) elaborates on the importance of understanding organizational culture before any change initiative is undertaken. Only by understanding culture does a researcher gain an accurate assessment of the collected data and what it means in the context of the organization. As I became immersed within my leadership role, I quickly

became more attuned to the political mechanisms within the institution. The forces created by this political environment then caused me to foresee the necessity for change by looking ahead and anticipating the possible effects that they could ultimately impose. Change for the sake of change is never practical and ultimately imposes more harm than intended good. I have always been bothered when someone informs me that something needs to change without explaining to me the rationale behind the change. I need to see how I will be affected by either rejecting change or by buying into the change.

Leadership needs to define a clear vision and path on which to embark in order to achieve that vision. But before embarking upon that journey, leaders need to understand where they are currently located. By understanding the root causes of organizational malaise as defined by Argyris (1990) and the organizational structure through Bolman and Deal (2003), a leader has the ability to successfully develop a change plan utilizing a purposeful methodology such as the one defined by Kotter (1996). Argyris (1990) also advocates for a change process that is based upon social virtues. These virtues closely align with my beliefs defined within my leadership platform and personal code of ethics. According to Argyris (1990), help and support, respect for others, strength, honesty, and integrity need to be the foundation of all change initiatives.

The First Four Steps

Complacency. Essentially, change must occur for a purpose, and the underlying foundation for this study is rooted in the necessity for change. Kotter (1996) is very clear when he states that one cannot underestimate the role that creating a sense of urgency plays in the change process. It is the task of the leader to explore the need for change and

then communicate that to the people with whom he works. I found that creating a sense of urgency was not just a one-dimensional process. It required repetitive and continual processes designed at reaching multiple contingencies (Kotter, 1996).

The managerial culture (Bergquist & Pawlak, 2008) is responsible for institutionalizing organizational behaviors as seen through Bolman and Deal's (2003) structural frame. In community colleges, the primary focus is on teaching rather than research. As faculty progress through the academic ranks and reach the pinnacle of full professor, there is no room for advancement or motivation for involvement. Since this process occurs slowly over time, people are often not aware of how they changed. As people slowly drift into their current work habits, it is often difficult to break them out with just a quick and superficial remedy (Argyris, 1990). Without change, a level of complacency is likely to set in as seasoned faculty become removed from the general college community. By removing themselves from general college functions, they isolate themselves and become oblivious to the politics and agendas that are working unexposed throughout the institution.

Without complete participation in organizational functions, there becomes a need for leaders who can decipher the politics and hidden agendas and assess their potential impact. It is imperative that leadership not only understand that impact, but have the ability to convey it to the people who unknowingly will be impacted. It is the clear lack of a realistic crisis that fosters complacency (Kotter, 1996).

Another level of complacency is derived from the bureaucratic structure that is institutionalized through a strong managerial culture. Management becomes a stronger force than leadership. As Kotter (1996) points out, the arrogance of complacent

management leads to poor listening. Management learns how to cover-up superficial problems rather than addressing their root causes and accepting the fact that solutions can emerge from within the community (Argyris, 1990). Leadership then is responsible for developing and fostering a renewed sense of openness and trust that has been overcome by poor management skills.

Creating a sense of urgency. The impetus for this study derived from my understanding the need to create a sense of urgency among the faculty with whom I work. It was about breaking out of complacency in order to better serve the students in the academic community. It was about understanding politics and how those politics impact an academic department. It was also about accepting responsibility rather than shifting blame. Interestingly, Kotter (1996) and Argyris (1990) differ on positive and negative attitudes within the organization, some of which can stem directly from political agendas.

Argyris (1990) states that individuals will tend to magnify organizational deficiencies in order to lessen their own personal inadequacies. At the same time, they will downplay the organization's positive attributes. Kotter (1996) says to beware of organizations where happy speak is the norm. Community college leaders need to assume responsibility for their colleagues by having the courage to convey bad news. Sheltering people from the truth enables them to continue doing what caused the problem to begin with. This ultimately leads to complacency, continually accepting the status quo.

Leaders must walk a fine line between keeping their faculty happy while avoiding complacency. What leaders truly need to do is expose the need for change while continually conveying the positive elements that have either the potential to be realized or already have been achieved.

Leaders must be continually aware of how people are affected. Faculty may resist others who adopt pedagogical change because of fear, and they may put barriers in place that undermine change initiatives. They may fear that as others adopt and utilize better teaching strategies, they, themselves, may begin to appear inadequate or irrelevant. In essence, they are protecting themselves from embarrassment (Argyris, 1990).

Maslow's (1954) theory on motivation provides a solid rationale for explaining factors that motivate people within the workplace. This theory is particularly useful when examining the motivational patterns of faculty within the community college setting. Faculty progress through ranks, starting at the instructor level and progressing to the assistant and associate professor ranks before reaching the pinnacle of full professor.

Faculty are eligible to apply for promotion every five years and promotions to the next rank are competitive. Faculty need to demonstrate their contributions to the college through portfolios and interviews. These contributions include creating and adopting better instructional techniques, assuming leadership roles, and serving the college community through various governance capacities. A college wide promotion committee numerically ranks all faculty seeking any type of promotion and then submits that ranked list to the president's office. Only a portion of the faculty on the list will receive promotions, and that number depends upon budgetary constraints. Faculty who are not granted promotions are again eligible to apply the following year.

Faculty are motivated to reach the next level by the necessity to fulfill the higher level of needs. When faculty are promoted to the next rank, they receive a salary increase which satisfies or reinforces their physiological and security needs. Progressing beyond the level of instructor with the granting of tenure is motivated by seeking to satisfy

security and belongingness needs. Seeking further promotions may be motivated by esteem needs.

As faculty reach the rank of full professor, however, their actions can be motivated by their need to reach self actualization, or they could become comfortable within their rank and retrench backwards and take on a self-preservation role. They no longer need to demonstrate innovation or participation. Instead, they may tend to look to preserve the status quo (Argyris, 1990). Any threat to disrupting the status quo could be interpreted as a threat to their basic needs. Rather than progressing upward through Maslow's (1954) hierarchy of needs, they retreat.

Spears (2010) states that a key servant leadership attribute is the ability to inspire personal growth. This can often be difficult. Leaders want people to feel comfortable and safe, but at the same time must prevent them from becoming stagnated and falling into a dangerously complacent state. By conveying a strategy that promotes growth, people will be in a better position to understand, accept, and respond to a sense of urgency. Leaders also need to beware of the dangers associated with raising a level of urgency.

People need to see the crises, but not fall into a state of panic that paralyzes them and keeps them from functioning and contributing. Worse yet, these newly generated fears could become obstacles to change. The first social virtue defined by Argyris (1990) involves help and support, and figures prominently in Kotter's (1996) first change phase; it also involves personal growth. According to Argyris (1990), leaders need to "increase the others' capacity to confront their own ideas, to create a window into their own mind, and to face their unsurfaced assumptions, biases, and fears by acting in these ways to

other people” (p. 106). Leaders need to help people see that they are part of the problem, take responsibility, and help them grow.

Creating a guiding coalition. As I established an action plan, my goal was to transform the course into one that students would choose to take rather than be required to take. My next step was to find people who were interested in changing the way that they taught. I wanted to include people who were not afraid to experiment and who shared my vision for a better course. The focus group’s primary task was to gather teachers together in order to share concerns about the course, as well as share ideas for possible solutions.

Once a sense of urgency is conveyed, a group of people who have the desire and drive to break through the complacency needs to be assembled. When looking at the organization through a structural frame (Bolman & Deal, 2003), this means looking for people who are willing to work outside the bureaucracy that has fostered stagnation (Kotter, 1996). The task of leadership is not only finding the right people, but making those people feel that their voices are heard and that they feel safe in their willingness to participate in change.

It is important that a group attempts the change rather than just a single person. A democratic educational leader understands the importance of including people in the process (Dewey, 1944). Without a collaborative effort, the change may be seen as a move that is being forced from the top. This could further lead to resistance and also undermines the sense and purpose of democratic education (Kotter, 1996). When viewed through a structural frame, change attempted by a single person is seen as the work of a

tyrant. When the organization is viewed through the political lens, work by a single person could be misconstrued as an attempt to gain power (Bolman & Deal, 2003).

Kotter (1996) finds that assembling the right people is just as important as making sure that the wrong people are not included. Undesirable people are defined as those who have their own agendas and will put forth efforts to destroy change. Their participation has the ability to demolish the all-important trust that team members must possess. In academia, people have the tendency to serve on committees not to produce change, but to protect their own turf. Leadership must also be cognizant of the power structure within the organization (Bolman & Deal, 2003; Kotter, 1996).

Leaders must assemble a team that can work well together, but also knows that they can trust and rely on each other without fearing that the work will be compromised because of personal or political agendas. Kotter (1996) says, “when trust is present, you will usually be able to create teamwork” (p. 61). Teams with high levels of trust will be very successful. Argyris (1990) elaborates on the need for respect and trust among team members, “High trust also has no ending. It feeds on itself and increases and expands” (p. 111). For change to be successful, leaders need to continually monitor team dynamics to ensure that high levels of respect are present.

For a coalition to be effective, the group assembled to lead the change effort must include the correct balance of attributes. Kotter (1996) finds that a group with a balance of position power, expertise, credibility, and leadership is essential. For a change initiative that focuses on improving pedagogy, assembling a group with adequate position power, expertise, credibility, and leadership is easily done within an academic department in a community college.

When viewing the community college through a structural lens (Bolman & Deal, 2003), the decision-making and power structure is clearly visible within the organization. For example, while faculty have the power to make decisions on instructional methodology, deans control access to resources that include funding for training and technology. Deans also have the ability to affect learning through class scheduling and class sizes. The successful leader needs to know the power structure and have the ability to influence decisions on factors that impact the classroom.

Faculty are usually experts within their fields. They are required to have a Masters Degree in their teaching field. However, they are often unfamiliar with sound teaching practices. Additionally, community colleges utilize a large volume of adjunct faculty. Leadership must decide if those faculty can effectively become part of the guiding coalition. If so, will including them increase or decrease the group's credibility?

Finally, the group must include leadership. Kotter (1996) explicitly uses leadership in the plural sense. The vision for change can begin with a single person, but Kotter (1996) further elaborates that the assembled coalition may consist of people who possess varying degrees of leadership qualities. Being able to accept the fact that leadership can be shared is specifically important in democratic educational leadership as well as servant leadership. Through the change process, new leaders can emerge. In servant leadership, the ultimate goal is to identify and produce future servant leaders.

Developing a vision and strategy. People who are assembled to institute change must subscribe to a common goal (Kotter, 1996). Spears (2010) lists awareness and foresight as key attributes found within a servant leader. A servant leader must have the ability to see the organization's current status. Servant leaders must also possess the

ability to envision a better future. While the need for change may come about through the awareness of a single individual, the vision to a better future should come about through a collaborative effort. In democratic educational leadership, input from varied constituencies is valued and respected, especially when the change will impact many community members.

In academia, leaders can utilize educational research to help them better understand what is happening and what should be happening in the classroom community. Through action research, a plan of action can be developed that may help the organization move off its current path to one that will produce a more desirable future that will help strengthen the community and individuals alike. Kotter (1996) grades the success of a vision on how imaginable, desirable, feasible, focused, flexible, and communicable it is.

When securing buy-in, people must easily see what the future will look like. By accurately describing the current environment, all people who are going to be affected by the change need to see the rationale behind its implementation. Plans for change can be simple or elaborate, but in the end they must be feasible. Describing a future based upon unobtainable goals will be counterproductive, diminish credibility, and endanger future initiatives. So the leader is charged with exposing a problem and then preparing a clear and focused path on how to arrive at a solution. The participants who are willing to devote the time and energy to create a successful change must be able to see a clear and focused path, and assured that actions and decisions are tied to achieving those desirable goals (Kotter, 1996).

Action research is an iterative process that involves reflection and flexibility. If action research is used as a tool to implement the strategy, it must be paired with a vision that allows for flexibility also.

Communicating the change vision. Easily communicable is the final characteristic of a solid vision. The next step in the plan is to then effectively communicate the plan to a guiding coalition. Faculty in community colleges have non-traditional schedules. Faculty are rarely all simultaneously convened for department meetings; so meetings may not be routine. Additionally, adjunct faculty are on campus only when they teach. In order to address this problem, Kotter (1996) advocates utilizing as many forums as possible.

The use of emails, focus groups, meetings, and online discussions were all implemented within this specific study. The combination of all methods helped reach every faculty member, whether full or part-time. They also provided repetition. I was able to get the same message out across all forums multiple times, and when combined, faculty got the same message through different mediums.

Utilizing all forums, especially the online discussions, secured that the communication flow was multidirectional. On my part, listening was just as important as speaking. Communication also took place between people. The forums also enabled me to communicate my passion for the change and share with the faculty the things that I was trying in my classroom. Leadership should not underestimate the concept of leading by example (Kotter, 1996; Senge, 1999).

Communicating the vision is not a terminal phase. Not only is it repetitive, it is continual. As new faculty are hired each semester, it is imperative that they are made

aware of the vision immediately. If not, they will become vulnerable to adopting patterns from people who are contrary to the vision.

Empowering people. Empowering others is another key to servant leadership (Spears, 2010). A servant leader truly leads by having others develop as leaders. The servant leader inspires others to lead and finds ways that allow them to take on responsibility and address change. Empowering others means allowing them to be creative and make decisions while at the same time assuming responsibility for those actions. Leaders need to trust that their teammates will make decisions that benefit the community and will not be self-serving.

Kotter (1996) sees organizational structures as the largest barrier to empowerment. When looking through the political and structural lenses (Bolman & Deal, 2003), one can see the power structures that are in place within the institution. But empowerment needs to be viewed throughout the academic institution. If academic leaders are serious about pedagogical change, they must be willing to be empowered and, at the same time, be willing to empower others. Fulltime faculty must be willing to empower adjunct faculty, allowing them to contribute to departmental functions. This includes making decisions on how courses are taught. In turn, all faculty must be willing to empower their students. Faculty must be willing to charge students with being responsible for their education and allow them to contribute to the educational process. This is the heart of democratic educational leadership (Dewey, 1944).

Implementing Change within the Project

Prior to embarking upon this study, I was exposed to a situation that I felt compelled to address. This particular action research study became a vehicle for implementing Kotter's (1996) principle for change. The study enabled me to commence a change initiative that began with a pilot study and progressed through implementation and assessment. Each of the steps can be found within various chapters, but not in defined, discrete segments.

While Kotter (1996) reiterates the importance of following the steps in specific order, action research allows for reflection and the room to address concerns and questions as they arise. So while the intent was to align each cycle with a step in the change process, the study was not fully completed in that manner.

As Kotter's (1996) process proved valuable, the steps were carried out through a framework based upon the principles found within servant and democratic educational leadership. Awareness, as an attribute of servant leadership, brought about the need to establish a sense of urgency. As the department chair, I was far greater exposed to events, opinions, and agendas held by multiple constituencies across the campus than the other faculty in the department. I could easily see forces external to the department at work far better than my colleagues. It was my role to make them aware of those forces and how those forces could potentially impact them. To create the sense of urgency within the department, I continually made all full-time faculty aware of changes that were unfolding at the state and college level by reporting back during monthly department meetings (Reflective Journal, 2009). After each college general education meeting, I utilized time at department meetings to inform faculty about what had transpired and how I thought

that it would ultimately affect us. In essence, I felt that the proposed changes in the model would result in a reduced enrollment and that would have repercussions on the flexibility in faculty scheduling.

My goal was to try to persuade faculty that we needed to position ourselves for this change by viewing the course from one that the students are required to take to one that they would freely elect to enroll in. At the time, I was the only faculty performing adjunct evaluations. I had the opportunity to witness, first hand, the effects that the standard lecture was having upon our students. My position was that if the course was to become optional for students, then it must be made attractive. Students must hear that the course is interesting, challenging, and contains information that is relevant. As I set out with this purpose during the department's March, 2009 meeting, the full-time faculty listened to my concerns. I then asked how they perceived the course's current status.

The consensus was that attendance was down in just the lecture portion (Reflective Journal, March, 2009). I then put forth the idea that we try to introduce a new and dynamic way of conveying the material to the students utilizing some form of Web 2.0 technology. A senior member of the faculty objected because he felt that we were making numerous changes to the lab portion for the coming fall semester and that changes to the lecture would complicate matters (Reflective Journal, March, 2009). Towards the end of the meeting, I solicited permission to hold a focus group for faculty with the intent of seeking out teachers who had a willingness to experiment with alternate methods of teaching besides lecturing. The full-time faculty had no objections (Reflective Journal, March, 2009).

Democratic educational leadership relies on community effort in order to foster a better educational environment (Dewey, 1944). It is based upon inclusion and knowing that each person in the educational community has a responsibility to further education. Because of this belief, I felt the necessity to extend the sense of urgency to adjunct faculty, since 66% of the Information Technology sections are taught by part-time faculty.

Although adjunct faculty teach the majority of sections, they are not responsible for developing course content. This is not unique to Shorelands, as the majority of community colleges do not assign that specific duty to part-time faculty (Gappa & Leslie, 1993). Additionally, adjunct faculty are not invited to the regular department meetings and are not aware of the political forces that could impact their section assignments. The department only communicates course changes to adjunct faculty through training sessions held right before the start of each semester. I utilized the training sessions to convey the same sense of urgency to the adjunct faculty. The level of urgency was more dramatic with this group, since they would be the first to lose course sections once the drop in enrollment occurred.

Throughout the change I continually adhered to the principles defined in my leadership platform that embraced, listening, respect, and growth of community and the individual.

Chapter 5

Cycle One: Validating the Need for Change

My desire for change was stimulated before this study began. As an action researcher, I developed the study in response to a problem that I observed while conducting my normal duties as department chair. I clearly envisioned the need for change, but I wanted to validate my concerns. I needed to explore the concerns and opinions held by others who were an integral part of the learning process, not only faculty, but students as well.

My initial solution involved incorporating the use of technology into the traditional lecture with the hopes of increasing student engagement and active learning. However, I was not sure how the students and faculty would embrace its usage. Driven by my commitment to listening and cooperative change, I felt obligated to solicit input and concerns from the learning community as they pertained to just the lecture portion.

My goal for this cycle was to bring people together who were interested in becoming an active and integral force in implementing a change. The process would allow people to share their opinions about the course and freely explore alternatives that would provide for a course that would not only be more engaging for the students, but more satisfying for the instructors to teach. This primary cycle began the action research by identifying the problem and searching for possible solutions.

Research Questions

Data were collected in both quantitative and qualitative forms in order to address the following three basic research questions:

1. To what degree do students view current classroom practices as influencing their engagement within the course?
2. To what degree will students accept the use of Web 2.0 and other technology as methods for increasing classroom engagement?
3. What are faculty's attitudes regarding the use of technology as an instrument to enhance active learning?

Methodology

Change through action research. "Paradigms change when the ruling paradigm loses its capacity to solve problems and generate a positive vision of the future" (Barr & Tagg, 1995, p. 26). My leadership is steeped in fostering personal growth for the betterment of both the individual and community alike. Motivated by my leadership and personal ethics code, I was moved to conduct this study through an action research paradigm rather than through a traditional, positivist paradigm. While the methodologies utilized within this study vary across cycles, the action research paradigm acts as an overarching framework to guide it. Utilizing varying methodologies across cycles allows the interpretation of data to drive the next cycle.

Action research implies change, change that makes a difference in the lives of those in my educational community. After all, the goal of action research is aimed at solving problems through change. According to Herr and Anderson (2005), "The idea is

that changes occur either within the setting and/or within the researchers themselves” (p. 4). So when referencing change, this study is as much about changing educational practices as evaluating changes that impact me as a leader.

In response to this study’s dual purpose, elements of both practical and emancipatory action research emerged. According to Hinchey (2008), “Practical action research is a process in which practitioners identify a local, practical problem they want to address and then systematically work to identify action strategies for improvement” (p. 39). As a leader within my institution, I identified a pedagogical practice that I felt needed to be addressed. Specifically, I saw a need for improvement in the way teachers were conducting courses.

However, this study is as much about empowerment as it is about making a significant educational change. Deeper and more meaningful change occurs when people become responsible and empowered to make that change rather than having a change imposed upon them. In reference to emancipatory action research, Hinchey (2008) adds, “More specifically, it is about freeing people from limitations they’ve unconsciously accepted because they aren’t in the habit of asking if things must be the way they are” (p. 41). As the researcher, I chose action research as the vehicle to “empower and bring about organizational change” (Herr & Anderson, 2005, p. 29).

I refused to embark upon a significant change initiative alone. My belief in democratic educational leadership persuaded me to approach educational change through a community effort. Action research is the most pragmatic approach since it is best done through collaboration with people who have a significant stake in the outcome (Herr & Anderson, 2005).

Hinchey (2008) makes an important distinction when contrasting various research paradigms. He states that action researchers are not outsiders. Action research is performed by those who are intimate with the problem and the organization, and that the goal of action research is to pursue “improvement or better understanding in some area the researcher considers important” (Hinchey, 2008, p. 4).

From a positional perspective, I approached this study in just that manner. I am an insider, the department chair within the academic department under study. Although I am technically the lone researcher, the change initiative was performed through a collaborative effort focused on community. “Insider researchers often collaborate with other insiders as a way to do research that not only might have a greater impact on the setting, but is also more democratic” (Herr & Anderson, 2005, p. 36). From an insider perspective, the researcher sees the need for change within his organization and then attempts to find and apply a solution through empowerment and community effort.

Appropriateness of methodology. The initial phase of this study is a single instrumental case study (Creswell, 2009). Research methodologies on student engagement and class participation tend to be either quantitative or a mixture of quantitative and qualitative, and Creswell (2009) sees mixed method approaches gaining popularity in the educational field. He views the advantage of utilizing a mixed methods approach as being able to gain insight into the problem from more diverse perspectives.

Since my leadership is grounded in both servant and democratic educational leadership, I strived to involve as many relevant stakeholders as possible. The faculty provided qualitative input through a focus group, and surveys accounted for the

quantitative data as voiced by the students. I approached the data collection in this manner cognizant that student opinion weighed equivalently with that of the faculty.

Quantitative studies on student engagement are often driven by the data supplied by the Community College Survey of Student Engagement [CCSSE] (2008) and similar instruments. Since 2001, survey data relating to engagement issues in community colleges have been collected and analyzed by a research team led by members of the Community College Leadership Program at the University of Texas at Austin (CCSSE, 2008). However, Tinto (1997) successfully deviated from the pure quantitative methodology by implementing a mixed method study as he examined the role of classrooms in student persistence. Additionally, Michael (2007) was able to successfully categorize faculty responses to changing from passive learning techniques to active learning techniques solely through a qualitative study. This portion of the study represents a mixed methodology, bound case study, as it was conducted around a single academic course, isolated to a single geographical campus.

The qualitative and quantitative data were analyzed utilizing concurrent triangulation to assess whether a convergence of opinions between groups existed (Creswell, 2009). I wanted to compare the opinions voiced by the instructors with those of the students when evaluating possible solutions. I did not want to proceed with a solution unless I was able to validate that both constituents felt that it would be beneficial.

Setting. The research took place within the Computer Science facilities at Shorelands Community College. The specific course studied is entitled Information Technology. The lectures for this particular course are given on the college's main

campus, as well as the five associated Higher Educational Centers spread throughout the county. However, this case study is confined to classes held only on the main campus. The classrooms where this specific course is taught are all considered to be technology-enhanced classrooms, where there is access to an instructor's computer and data projector.

Participants and data collection.

For the quantitative data, the survey sample consisted of 91 students enrolled in the Information Technology course. As a cross sectional survey, the data were only collected during the spring 2009 semester (Creswell, 2009). The purpose of the survey was to gain an understanding of engagement from a student's point of view. The data provided a quantitative or numeric description of the students' opinions as a sample of that specific population (Creswell, 2007). Of the 90 valid responses, 50 (56%) were male and 40 (44%) were female. Seventy-three (80%) were full-time students, and 17 (19%) were part-time students.

Qualitative data were collected from a focus group composed of eight faculty who were currently teaching the Information Technology course in the spring 2009 semester. Seven participants were part-time instructors and one, Professor Baily, was a full-time professor from the Computer Science department. There were five female participants and three males. Seven of the participants were approximately between 50 and 55 years of age and one was about 35 years old. Teaching experience ranged anywhere from one semester to six years. One female participant had just begun teaching at Shorelands. The others had been teaching between two and six years. The younger female participant was

a high school teacher. All participants have only taught college level courses at Shorelands.

The rationale for utilizing a focus group was to bring together people to share a broad range of opinions on a single subject (Hinchey, 2008). “Focus groups are advantageous when the interaction among the interviewees will likely yield the best information, when interviewees are similar and cooperative with each other” (Creswell, 2009, p. 73). The focus group was more advantageous than individual interviews as it supplied spontaneous and thoughtful dialog among participants.

For this segment of the study, a convenience sample was used to administer the survey (Patten, 2001). Five different instructors were asked to administer the survey to one of their course sections. The surveys contained an alternative informed consent phrase at the top that informed the students that their answers were completely anonymous. The survey specifically addressed the course content and how the content related to the student as affected by gender, age, course material, and instructional method. The research literature finds that several variables come into play in reference to active learning, including class size, gender, age, the student’s experience, and the nature of the material (Fritschner, 2000; Howard & Henney, 1998; Howard et al., 1996; Messineo et al., 2007; Weaver & Qi, 2005).

To address these variables, the survey contained a total of 20 Likert scale items, in addition to nine other questions that obtained demographic and time usage data (see Appendix A). Valid responses ranged from one through five where one represented strongly agree and five represented strongly disagree.

Participants in the focus group consisted of volunteers identified by responses to an open email invitation sent to all instructors, both full-time and part-time, currently teaching Information Technology in the spring 2009 semester. The invitation included a date when the focus group would be held. In order to accommodate the greatest amount of people, the focus group was conducted on the main campus during the week and in the evening. The invitation informed the instructors that the purpose of the study was to discuss the use of technology as a possible means to increase interactive learning and student participation in the lecture portion of their course. Each participant signed a consent form and was informed that their participation would be kept anonymous and confidential.

The focus group was recorded using a laptop computer running RecordPad software. A microphone was placed in the center of the table. The software yielded a media file, which I then personally transcribed, analyzed, and coded. Themes emerged and were recorded as multiple participants offered reoccurring statements. Each participant was given a pseudonym that is utilized in the analysis from this point forward. For confidentiality and security, the file and the key to the pseudonyms were secured in a locked file within my office.

Analysis

Student surveys. After all of the surveys were returned, the results were entered into my office desktop computer running SPSS software version 17.0. Using the software, a descriptive analysis of the data produced a mean, variance, and standard deviation for each question, as shown in Table 1. In addition to the descriptive analysis,

several Pearson Correlation tests and *t*-Tests were carried out to test for statistical significance.

Table 1

Mean scores for survey questions 1- 27

| Question | Mean | Standard Deviation |
|--|--------|--------------------|
| Participate in class discussions | 2.79 | .925 |
| Regularly answer questions | 2.78 | .969 |
| Regularly ask questions | 2.90 | .967 |
| Offer opinions on ethical topics | 3.02 | .874 |
| Offer opinions on current topics | 2.89 | .897 |
| Prepare by reading text | 3.02 | 1.043 |
| Participate when prepared | 2.29 | .922 |
| Discuss personal experiences with Tech. | 2.40 | .842 |
| Participate when material is personally relevant | 2.12 | .800 |
| Participate when material is work related | 2.40 | .893 |
| Room configuration influences my participation | 3.08 | .946 |
| The way the teacher phrases a question | 2.63 | .867 |
| Required assignments would make me participate | 3.13 | 1.114 |
| Working in groups would make me participate | 2.82 | 1.121 |
| Graded participation influences my participation | 2.53 | 1.051 |
| Participate when teacher uses the whiteboard | 3.18 | .902 |
| Participate when teacher uses PowerPoint | 2.92 | .877 |
| I feel comfortable with technology | 1.89 | .657 |
| Hours per week using social networking | 1.88 | 1.182 |
| Social networking can be beneficial in class | 2.59 | 1.037 |
| Web 2.0 items should be embedded in class | 2.34 | .941 |
| Hours per week on the computer | 2.81 | 1.280 |
| Hours spent studying | 1.99 | 1.016 |
| Age | 1.26 | .743 |
| Credits earned | 2.81 | 1.150 |
| GPA | 2.5443 | 1.43 |
| Enrollment status | 1.19 | 3.94 |

Pearson correlation tests were executed against all possible combinations of questions that had ordinal data in an attempt to find a correlation between factors that induce engagement. A significant correlation was only obtained between two sets of questions.

A Pearson correlation coefficient was calculated for the relationship between the students perceiving themselves as participating in class against their perception of regularly asking questions. A strong positive correlation was found ($r(89) = .751, p < .001$). This indicated that students who saw themselves as participating in class also saw themselves as regularly asking questions in class. The assumption would lead us to believe that if we can increase the frequency that students ask questions, as well as the number of students who ask questions, the overall level of participation in the class will be elevated.

From this relationship we can focus on increasing student participation by finding methods that prompt students to ask questions, possibly through incorporating technology into the lecture as a means for helping the student prepare. Students who are better prepared for class will tend to ask more questions (Weaver & Qi, 2005). Faculty need to be aware of the students who ask questions and why they ask them. They might ask questions to further clarify what the material the instructor is attempting to convey, or because they yearn to know more about the material. The goal would be to elicit questions because students find that the material somehow is relevant to their lives.

The second Pearson correlation coefficient was calculated for the relationship between offering opinions on current events and on ethical topics. A strong positive relationship ($r(87) = .796, p < .001$) was found indicating that students who participate by

offering opinions on ethical topics also participate by offering opinions on current events (Cronk, 2006). Students seem interested in ethical or controversial topics and this could possibly be the focus for future assignments.

The course recently added an ethical component where students respond to ethical matters through a written paper; but there seemed to be room to incorporate ethics into more interactive scenarios. There may be an advantage of utilizing ethical topics by tying them into current events. This makes ethics important, but also at the same time, relevant. Students seem interested in ethics in technology, but only in relationship to current events.

Age matters. An independent-samples *t*-test was performed to compare the means of two age groups. Since community college demographic data portray a trend towards classroom populations with a more traditional college age, the need to explore whether or not age is a factor in participation is critical. The use of *t*-tests provides for a comparison between two groups or categories. A significant difference indicates that the two groups responded significantly different on a specific question (Cronk, 2006). The first group represented students of traditional college age that this survey defined as being between 18 and 25 years of age. The second group represented all students above the age of 25 years. A significant difference of means between the two groups was found to exist in seven of the survey questions. The research shows that there are several known differences in perceived engagement between age groups (Fritschner, 2000; Howard & Henney, 1998; Howard et al., 1996; Weaver & Qi, 2005).

Class participation is an important factor in student engagement. The first independent-samples *t*-test showed a significant difference in means between the two age

groups when asked if they frequently participate in class ($t(89) = -3.94, p < .001$). The mean for the traditional age students ($M=2.94, SD = .873$) was significantly higher than that of the older students ($M = 1.92, SD = .760$). This indicates that younger students are less likely to participate in class discussions.

Again, the interaction between the faculty and student is critical. Students must engage with faculty and other students in dialog, either by asking or answering questions. The second independent-samples *t*- test showed a significant difference in means between the two age groups when asked if they answer questions in class ($t(88) = -2.409, p < .05$). The mean for the traditional age students ($M=2.87, SD = .945$) was significantly higher than that of the older students ($M = 2.17, SD = .937$). Again, the older students are the ones who are participating by answering questions that faculty pose in class.

An independent-samples *t*- test showed a significant difference in means between the two age groups when asked if they regularly ask questions in class ($t(89) = -2.801, p < .05$). The mean for the traditional age students ($M=3.01, SD = .933$) was significantly higher than that of the older students ($M = 2.23, SD = .927$), revealing the fact that older students ask more questions in class.

An independent-samples *t*- test showed a significant difference in means between the two age groups when asked if they regularly offer opinions on ethical topics ($t(88) = -2.275, p < .05$). The mean for the traditional age students ($M=3.10, SD = .847$) was significantly higher than that of the older students ($M = 2.50, SD = .905$) meaning students who are older tend to more freely offer their input into ethical topics.

Students are showing a difference between the way they prepare for class and preference for learning. An independent-samples *t*- test showed a significant difference in

means between the two age groups when asked if they read the textbook ($t(89) = -2.133$, $p < .05$). The mean for the traditional age students ($M=3.12$, $SD = 1.044$) was significantly higher than that of the older students ($M = 2.46$, $SD = .877$). Younger students read less. Either they are coming to class less prepared or they are finding ways other than the book to prepare for class.

An area for exploration in preparedness may come from the following test. An independent-samples t - test showed a significant difference in means between the two age groups when asked if they believe that the use of social networking sites can be effectively used in class to collaborate with teachers and classmates ($t(88) = 2.436$, $p < .05$). The mean for the traditional age students ($M=2.49$, $SD = .990$) was significantly lower than that of the older students ($M = 3.25$, $SD = 1.138$). The more traditional age students saw a value in using social networking sites in an educational setting.

Finally, an independent-samples t - test showed a significant difference in means between the two age groups when asked if they could learn more if Web 2.0 technologies were built into the course ($t(87) = 3.486$, $p < .001$). The mean for the traditional age students ($M=2.21$, $SD = .864$) was significantly lower than that of the older students ($M = 3.17$, $SD = 1.030$). This signifies that younger students also see the value of collaborative software within a classroom.

Qualitative results. After transcribing the interviews, I parsed the data looking for specific, recurring themes. The process revealed major themes that could be divided into three major categories: current problems, interactive learning solutions, and interactive learning challenges. I validated the data by extracting instances where multiple people had similar responses.

Problems. Faculty did see a need for change. They were acutely aware of the problem with the lecture and most were either willing to try new ideas or were already experimenting with some form of teaching that augmented the lecture. Kelly, who is an adjunct faculty member, was quick to point out that she has always seen attendance problems with the lecture, stating, “I have never had the case of reasonably good attendance. It’s always been marginal or down.” Professor Baily pointed out that the lecture has become disconnected from the course, saying, “Maybe some of the reasons they are not showing up is because we are not requiring them to do any homework that is related to the lecture.” She found that as passive participants, the students were never given the chance to apply any of the lecture material to their personal lives or work.

Sally and Professor Baily discussed the current methodology of teaching the lecture material. They both observed that current students are not reading the lecture material and, therefore, are not prepared for class. Matt went directly to the heart of the problem, saying, “The majority of them are there because they have to be there. They don’t want to be there. They are not going to like your book.”

Besides observing problems, during the focus group the faculty also made numerous comments relating to possible techniques that could be employed in lecture with hopes of stimulating participation and increasing the level of interactive learning. The major theme was broken down into two subcategories of traditional techniques and techniques that utilize technology.

New ideas. Traditional techniques included the use of group work, lecturing less, student collaboration on projects, required assignments, asking more questions, making content more relevant, graded participation, and game playing. Techniques that utilized

technology included the use of Web 2.0 elements, student response units (clickers), YouTube videos, creating websites, social networking, Twitter, blogs, and online discussions.

Comments made about the use of technology-based methods over-shadowed those made about traditional methods, as the faculty quickly and eagerly contributed possible solutions that focused upon technology. Joe said, “They love the Internet. When they come into the class with a computer, the first thing they go on is the Internet.” To him, this was a readily accessible solution to which he felt students could relate.

All instructors were required to administer interactive tests through a software package that was supplied by the textbook publishing company. Within the package was an online discussion area, but it was not utilized in the course at that time. However, Molly did experiment with it. She envisioned utilizing technology for a specific purpose. From her perspective, utilizing an online discussion tool could specifically improve engagement, especially between the student and faculty, commenting, “So I mean I learned a lot about my students from just that online discussion tool. I think that it is really good. And they open up a lot for some reason when they are online discussing.” Kelly agreed, saying, “It’s their medium. It’s how they communicate.”

Kelly, who teaches high school, seemed to be more in touch with how the younger students choose to learn. She said, “I have added at least one or two YouTube videos to every one of my lectures. I usually start out with them; that way it gets their interest.” She felt that incorporating this type of technology into the lecture would keep their interest throughout the lecture because the concept is something that they have become accustomed to in education.

Once again, Joe turned back to utilizing some form of technology related to the internet saying, “Simple web design. I would teach them how to do their own websites. You know, it is practical, they can learn something from it. It can be done at a very simple level.”

Whether commenting on traditional methods or those utilizing technology, faculty consistently elaborated on the need to make any activity relevant to the student’s interests. One faculty member said, “Everyone in that class has an interest. Whether it is sports or whatever. It is something.” This comment also pointed out the need to relate the material directly to the students’ personal interests.

Faculty also believed that no matter what techniques were to be used, students still would not respond unless there is a grade involved. In other words, the students have to be motivated by some type of coercion or reward. The faculty felt that both required assignments and graded participation should be used.

Molly felt that even though technology could be utilized, students would still respond more favorably if their grade was impacted. She said, “Make it less lecture and eliminate some of the lecture material and you can grade them on class participation. I think that if there were some assignments they would be more motivated because it does impact their grade.”

Barriers. Faculty concerns regarding impediments to interactive learning could be grouped into two subcategories representing facility and behavioral factors. Faculty most often viewed the lack of computers in the classroom as a major barrier to implementing interactive learning techniques. Since faculty viewed the use of technology as a more viable way of increasing active learning, they felt that computers would need to be in the

lecture rooms. Faculty members summarized this sentiment by saying, “Do we have the resources to do those? I wish the lecture was in a lab class.” Another agreed, adding, “The hard part is in the classrooms where the lecture is in a room with no computers” (Michael, 2007; Owen & Demb, 2004).

Behavioral problems were most often revealed when the use of group work was discussed, including grading issues, lack of cooperation, and participation. Faculty were concerned that it would be difficult to grade students in groups because they would not know who was responsible for doing the work. They felt that students would push the work off on their peers and take credit for it as indicated by the following comment by Jill: "Or one student does all the work, the other person does nothing. Somebody drops the class. They were supposed to do a presentation; the guy didn't show up the day of the presentation. So what happens to the other student's grade?"

It seemed that negative educational habits still would persist. Although faculty often saw problems with group projects, they still wanted to use technology-enhanced projects to utilize groups. Collaborative efforts on website creation, writing blogs in teams, and collaborating on documents through an online collaboration service were seen as possible solutions to using group work while avoiding the problems associated with them. The key discovery was that the faculty saw the benefit in collaboration. Kelly pointed out that collaboration was a necessary skill demanded by industry, and that our students should be exposed to the concept in their academic career. As a high school educator, she was required to work in groups and collaborate with her colleagues. “Because I do group projects too, I was just thinking that somehow collaboration could be a skill.”

Convergence. The data clearly showed that there are both differences and similarities between what faculty and students view as being viable interactive learning techniques that will increase student engagement. There was also a vast difference in opinion between those who are classified as traditional age students and those who are older. Shorelands is experiencing a trend in student demographics depicted by an increasing population of traditional age students. These students are looking for classes that are delivered more interactively and less through the lecture method.

As a whole, the students involved in the survey tended to agree that they are comfortable with technology ($M = 1.84$, $SD = .633$). Also, between age groups the analysis did not reveal any significant difference in their time spent on computers or social networking sites. However, newer students did seem to integrate newer technologies into their life at a higher level. They see the use of traditional techniques of interactive learning as having less of an impact than those that use technology.

The t - tests conducted on the survey data showed that the younger students favored the use of technology based strategies as interactive learning techniques over their older counterparts. They favor the use of Web 2.0, incorporating elements such as blogging, creating websites, social networking, YouTube videos, and wikis into the classroom experience.

Traditional age students also differed on how they participate in class when compared to their older counterparts. The students who fall into the traditional age student group tended to say that they participated less, asked fewer questions, answered fewer questions, seldom read the text book, and contributed opinions on ethical topics less often.

Faculty who are teaching the Information Technology course seem to be aligned with the preferred learning styles of the students who now make up 85% of their classes. Faculty seemed to be drawn to the use of technology enhanced strategies such as creating WebPages and writing blogs as solutions to increase interactive learning.

Faculty do disagree with both groups of students on the matter of graded participation and required assignments. Faculty see both as necessary items in order to increase participation. As a whole, students tend to remain neutral on the subject of required assignments ($M=3.17$, $SD= 1.150$).

Research Questions Answered

As the first cycle concluded, the data provided clues to not only the need to change, but viable solutions as well. From this cycle, I was able to answer the research questions and move forward towards the next research cycle.

As for research questions one and two, it does seem that the use of technology over the use of traditional lectures would be beneficial. Students were not reading the textbooks and faculty were well aware of this. They tended not to respond favorably to the lecture even when the faculty used the whiteboard or even PowerPoint slides.

Research question three was answered in the affirmative. Faculty saw problems with the current method of teaching and were willing to explore the use of technology as a method of producing a class geared towards interactive learning.

It is important for college leadership to monitor the institution's changing demographics as well as their students' learning preferences. Faculty do seem to be cognizant of their students' behaviors in respect to learning, even though they are often

not of the same age. However, institutions need to be able to respond to the faculty's concerns over possible barriers to achieving interactive learning.

Faculty who meet their students on their terms will have a better chance of reaching them and increasing interactive learning. That will increase faculty and student interaction as well as the interaction between students, both of which are factors in increasing retention and fostering a higher level of learning.

Reflection and Action

From the perspective of a leader, I was initially disappointed with the lack of participation from full-time faculty. Adjunct faculty were the overwhelming majority of participants in the focus group. Initially, I felt that my efforts to establish a sense of urgency within the department went unheeded. As a leader, I felt somewhat ineffective in promoting a change effort, that it would stall and the department would maintain the status quo. My biggest fear was that the department would be put into a position that would cause it to react utilizing a stronger defensive mode rather than being proactive.

I decided to carry on with the change initiative when I realized that there were people who did indeed see the necessity for change. They were the adjunct faculty who were accountable for teaching the majority of the sections. The guiding coalition would become comprised of faculty who did have a vested interest in enhancing the course for their own reasons. When looking back at the focus group, I was especially moved by the adjuncts who met in the hallway immediately afterwards. Sally and Jill were discussing ideas and were immediately planning on getting together and collaborating (Reflective Journal, April, 2009).

At several points in the focus group, the idea of having a tool available to share ideas surfaced. Throughout the entire process I was solely concerned with students becoming engaged and was oblivious to the needs of my faculty. If they were to become the guiding coalition, they would require more resources, especially a method for allowing them to collaborate. In order for me to progress toward the next change step, I would also need a method for communicating a vision and implementing the change.

New Questions

Cycle Two not only focuses on changing pedagogy, but speaks to the heart of Kotter's (1996) methodology for creating that change. Cycle One clearly sets the stage for Cycle Two. Community building, empowerment, sharing, and inclusion needed to be addressed in order to collaboratively move forward. For the next cycle, action needed to occur. New questions regarding who would initiate action and how they would accomplish it would need to be answered.

Chapter 6

Cycle Two: Collaborating for Change

“The general fluidity of the action research concept means that a modest first step may lead to a more ambitious project later” (Hinchey, 2008, p. 33).

Cycle One, through a collaborative and inclusive process, gathered data to assess whether a pedagogical change would be accepted by both faculty and students. The data seemed to affirm the assumptions that active learning techniques utilizing collaborative technologies would be beneficial when implemented in the Information Technology course lecture component. While Cycle One answered many questions, it also created new ones, exposing several concerns that needed to be addressed.

My goal was to create an environment where collaborative learning is used as a teaching strategy. My leadership would not allow me to create and force faculty to adopt a new course syllabus. Instead, I wanted faculty to cooperatively accomplish that task. This cycle is executed through democratic educational leadership principles where the faculty make substantial pedagogical changes as active and responsible members of the educational community.

Cycle Two is about making the actual change. It revolves around collaboration, communication, and empowerment. It concerns my leadership and how I can persuade people to join a worthy cause. This cycle commenced in the late summer of 2009 and ran midway through the beginning of the spring 2010 semester in March. The time frame for this cycle is relatively long, time-wise, as it allowed time for instructors to collaborate on

creating instructional changes, to seek approval for implementing changes, and to institute a method for sharing their experiences. The cycle unfolded over two academic semesters as faculty had a chance to try out and then refine their new pedagogy.

Cycle One addressed the first step in Kotter's (1996) plan, which was to convey a sense of urgency. During the second cycle, I continued with conveying that sense of urgency and moved forward with the next steps of creating a guiding coalition, creating and communicating a vision, and empowering faculty to make changes. Most importantly, and in addition to making pedagogical changes, this cycle revealed problems that I needed to react to.

Research Questions

1. What type of changes would faculty readily adopt?
2. How effectively did I communicate the need for change?

Methodology

Cycle Two utilized a strictly qualitative design. I relied on data retrieved from sources that included my reflective leadership journal, notes taken during training sessions, and entries from within a Google groups¹ online discussion area. Findings were also reinforced with data collected through interviews at the completion of the study. When considering the data's validity, I looked for instances where major themes occurred across sources and where participants stated like views.

¹ Google docs and Google groups are registered trademarks of Google Incorporated.

Reflective leadership journal. Throughout this action research study I have recorded entries in a reflective leadership journal. On a weekly basis I would capture situations within the journal that challenged or reaffirmed my leadership. Entries often related to the study, but also included thoughts that were generated through my role as faculty and department chair. Besides recording on a weekly basis, entries were also logged when a significantly outstanding event occurred.

Online collaboration tools. During my second semester in the doctoral program at Rowan University, my teammates and I collaborated on a term paper using Google docs. Hosted by Google Incorporated, the free service allows for multiple users to simultaneously collaborate on documents (Google, 2011). I was impressed with how it allowed four students who lived in various parts of the state to actively collaborate and contribute to an emerging document. Similarly, Google groups is a free online service, but in addition to document collaboration, the site also allows users to communicate, hold discussions, and share information (Google, 2011).

In Google groups, one person acts as the group owner whose responsibility is to create the group and invite and manage group members. I initially created a Google docs area where instructors could post their syllabus for review, but then opted for a Google groups site because of the added benefit of holding discussions. This would become the site that we would use to collaborate, share ideas, and most importantly, collectively create a vision for a more engaging course. It would eventually lead to establishing a core of people acting as a guiding coalition.

Training sessions. At the beginning of each long semester, either in late August or early January, Professor Baily conducts a training session for all faculty who teach the Information Technology course. Both full-time and adjunct faculty are encouraged to attend. During these sessions, the course coordinator goes over all the changes that were made to the course, including any new software. Periodically, the course assessment software utilized within the course changes and faculty need to relearn the new system. Traditionally, the training sessions only involve discussions of the lab portion of the class. Pedagogy is never discussed, nor is the content of the lecture part. If adjunct faculty are asked for their opinions, the request normally pertains only to lab issues.

Since the course goes through substantial changes over the summer months, the August session is usually well attended. The winter session, held in January, generally is attended by newly hired adjunct faculty, unless there was a dramatic change in the course that occurred between semesters.

Data Collection and Analysis

Cycle Two began with a training session held in late August, 2009. My goal was to share with faculty my vision for a better way of teaching, one that involved active learning and collaboration. I wanted to not only share that vision, but, also, wanted to assemble people who would be interested in working collaboratively. I wanted faculty to feel involved and part of the whole educational process. In the end, I wanted faculty to assume responsibility for improving education with the goal of increasing the satisfaction of both teacher and student alike. My goal was to have faculty leave the training session inspired.

The fall training session was well attended by both full-time and part-time faculty since new assessment software was going to be implemented that fall semester. Professor Baily only spoke about changes to the lab, which included the new software and new homework assignments.

As the session ended, I invited all faculty interested in changing the way that the lecture was taught to stay for a discussion. Some of the faculty in attendance did not participate in the focus group from Cycle One where we discussed the lecture and its relationship to active learning techniques. This training session was a chance to reach out to even more faculty and attempt to broaden the buy-in base. However, the entire full-time faculty in attendance chose to leave while 12 adjunct faculty remained. At this point it became apparent that it would be adjunct faculty alone who would lead the change effort. When I witnessed their desire to stay and listen to what I had to say, the fact that the full-time faculty vacated did not disturb me (Reflective Journal, August, 2009). The adjunct faculty in attendance eagerly listened to my thoughts.

To begin the discussion, I outlined the need to make a change to the lecture, citing a need to increase student engagement and active learning. I further emphasized the fact that based upon the literature, the current method of delivering the course content was inadequate. The course needed to evolve from lecture-based and teacher-centered to more student-centered. I elaborated on how a change would positively affect attendance and class participation. Additionally, I conveyed the results of the focus group and gave some suggestions that faculty made as acceptable solutions.

From Cycle One, faculty felt that the lecture component could be enhanced by incorporating some form of active learning utilizing technology. Furthermore, faculty felt

that collaboration between students was important. They realized that there were problems with attendance, students were unprepared for class, and they did not usually prepare by reading the textbook. While the faculty in the focus group did embrace collaborative work, they also demonstrated worries about potential problems that could arise through group work.

I asked that each faculty think about possible changes before the fall semester began. The changes would need to involve utilizing active learning strategies. I specifically requested that faculty consider incorporating some form of collaborative software into their course to spur active learning. I mentioned using various Web 2.0 technologies such as blogs, Google groups, or various social networking sites. I required that any changes to the syllabus be approved by me before the fall semester began. As the session came to a conclusion, the faculty departed. However, two adjunct faculty, Robin and Sally, stayed afterwards and began discussing a possible plan on which they could collaborate on (Reflective Journal, August, 2009).

Making changes. Between the training meeting and the beginning of the fall semester, Robin and Sally communicated via email and collaborated to develop a new syllabus. The new changes incorporated active and collaborative learning and utilized some form of collaborative software. However, the changes proposed by Robin and Sally contained numerous changes and the grading scheme was vastly different.

The original course syllabus created by the department relied upon passive learning where the instructor lectured relying upon department issued PowerPoint slides. Their syllabus clearly detailed a significant change. The instructor was to lecture for no

longer than 20 minutes with rotating groups of students delivering presentations throughout the remaining time.

Students were assigned to groups of four to five people. Throughout the term, each group was responsible for presenting on two ethical topics and two chapters of the lecture book. Students were not only graded for content, but also on how well they persuaded their classmates to participate in class discussions. The students were also required to utilize some form of technology to collaborate. The instructors allowed them to choose from wikis, blogs, Google groups, or Facebook.

They leveraged technology to incorporate active learning techniques into their lecture that Bonwell and Eison (1991) categorize as collaborative learning and peer teaching. They had the students connect with each other, and that connection extended beyond the classroom. I looked over the syllabus and gave permission for the faculty to implement their strategy during the fall term (Reflective Journal, August, 2009). As the semester ended, I wanted the faculty to share their experiences with the other adjunct faculty in the department.

Sharing the vision. While department meetings allowed me to share my concerns and vision among fulltime faculty, the focus group that I conducted in the previous cycle allowed me to reach out to our adjunct faculty. Since adjunct faculty account for teaching 66% of the Information Technology sections, I found that I needed to involve them in the process. Through the focus group, faculty reinforced my notion that change was required, and they also volunteered ideas on how learning in the lecture portion of the course could become active instead of passive. I was able to convey my vision directly to them during the focus group. However, the participants in the group only accounted for a fraction of

the adjunct faculty who were currently teaching that semester. I needed a way to reach all adjunct faculty and sustain the momentum that was created by the focus group.

Persuasion. Myran et al. (1995) call for educational leadership to change education, but they also see a paradigm shift in leadership. The new paradigm creates a vital distinction between managers and leaders in the educational realm. By reinforcing a sense of democratic educational leadership, they see managers as being people who have fixed roles within the college, but leaders as being anyone. This means students and adjunct faculty would lead the way to reform. Much of the research literature focuses on how part-time faculty can contribute to education, including reducing costs, bringing real world experiences to the class, and even implementing pedagogical reform (Cohen & Brawer, 2008; Gappa & Leslie, 1993; Mellow & Heelan, 2008; Roueche & Roueche, 1996). However, the majority of this literature falls short of seeing how adjuncts can step into a leadership role when creating deep and meaningful educational change.

During the January 2010 training session, I asked Professor Baily to allot time for conversation about the lecture segment of the course before she detailed changes to the lab session. Rather than speaking to the instructors myself, I asked Robin and Sally to address them, allowing them to disseminate the details first hand. Through informal conversations I was also aware that Matt had been utilizing a different format and asked if he would mind sharing his experiences.

The session was held in a computer classroom that is configured in a horseshoe shape. The faculty were dispersed throughout the room with Sally and Robin sitting at opposite ends. As the session started, Robin began the conversation by detailing her changes. Upon completion, she was then followed by Sally, and then Matt (personal

communication, January 28, 2010). As soon as the faculty ended their talks, the other teachers in the room began posing questions to the three faculty simultaneously.

One teacher in particular seemed extremely interested. This specific person had received a mediocre evaluation the prior semester, and it was suggested to him that he look for ways to invigorate the lecture session. He apparently saw this as prime opportunity to adopt a strategy that would help him teach better. He even asked Matt if he could sit in on one of his lecture sessions (personal communication, January 28, 2010).

A revelation. After conducting the focus group and training session, I was fairly disappointed that only two faculty stepped forward to propose and implement innovative ideas. I believed that I had effectively communicated my vision for the course. I had firmly believed that the faculty understood that I had empowered them to make any necessary changes (Reflective Journal, October, 2009).

As the semester progressed, I asked Robin and Sally for permission to post their syllabus on Google docs, and they readily agreed. Google docs allows users to share a document with other people simply by inviting them and giving them permission through the Google docs site (Google, 2011). As I began experimenting with the Google docs site, I realized that this specific tool was limited. People could enter the system and look over the document, and if they felt compelled to do so, make changes. My goal was to have people visit the site, look over the document, and perhaps print it out and use it as a reference. However, I had no idea as to how many people were actually doing so.

A disconnect. Kotter (1996) emphasizes the importance of not only creating the vision, but being able to effectively communicate that vision. There were 35 instructors teaching sections of the Information Technology course. For the first cycle, seven

participated in the focus group and 12 stayed on after the training session at the beginning of the second cycle (Reflective Journal, August, 2009). A total of 19 out of 35 were exposed to my vision for change; only a few of them heard it more than once. It was obvious that the message needed to be delivered more consistently and repetitively.

At the conclusion of Cycle One, I failed to interpret the significance of one specific finding. I also failed to act upon that finding which had consequences on the success of the second cycle. During the focus group, it became evident that the adjunct instructors felt that they were disconnected from each other. They were not fully aware of what each instructor was doing, what instructional resources were available to them, and the degree of pedagogical freedom they possessed. Data from the focus group illustrated this point.

At one time during the focus group, the subject of students playing a Jeopardy game surfaced. Professor Baily asked how many instructors were utilizing the Jeopardy game in class. While Molly commented in favor of using it, Jill commented, "I don't know how to access it." Kelly also commented that she had started adding YouTube videos to her lecture in an attempt to promote class discussion. This prompted Sally to say, "I will send you Jeopardy, you send us YouTube." Molly added that, "We can have a common posting area. There are so many of us doing this and there are a lot of people doing different things."

I was impressed that this idea surfaced from the adjunct faculty, and that they saw the need to have a vehicle to collaborate and share amongst themselves. While this supported my hypothesis that going forward with a change would be beneficial and that adjunct faculty could indeed drive a guiding coalition, it was my failure to initiate an

appropriate vehicle to collaborate that may have negatively impacted this cycle's success. I was asking the faculty to collaborate and make changes, but as a leader, I failed to establish a method for them to do so. I wrongly made the assumption that they would take the initiative to do it themselves.

Reconnecting. During Cycle One, the adjunct faculty participated in a focus group that allowed them to meet in person and discuss concerns and share possible solutions. After that point, they became segregated once again. I was trying to leverage Google docs as a means of connecting and sharing. However, I found that a limiting factor of Google docs was its inability to effectively allow for communication among faculty. People could efficiently collaborate on a document, but sharing ideas was difficult. My solution was to move beyond Google docs and utilize the Google groups tool. The added benefit was that Google groups offered a discussion area in addition to the ability to post and collaborate on documents. My goal became to utilize the Google groups to create a sense of urgency, share the vision, and empower broad based actions.

Midway through this second cycle, I created the Google group just for Information Technology instructors as a method for reconnecting the adjunct faculty. This online site would be the focal point for communicating the vision for active learning, and it would be driven by the contributions from adjunct faculty. Towards the end of this chapter, I also elaborate on how I used it to keep the sense of urgency elevated as I retrenched and started reiterating the rationale for change.

Within a week, 10 adjunct faculty had eagerly subscribed to the group (Reflective Journal, February, 2010). To start the process, I posted a discussion topic that conveyed

the primary goal for the change, as well as the rationale for implementing the change.

The post to which I asked the adjunct faculty to respond read as follows:

A long-term goal here at the college is to change the way we teach. The evolution from passive learning to active learning is being stressed throughout higher education across the country. The idea is to spend less time lecturing (passive learning) and more time acting as a facilitator (active learning). This is a course that is scrutinized by a multitude of constituencies across the campus, and we would like to show that not only what we teach, but how we teach, is relevant. Please share with us and your peers what you do, what you would like to do, or changes that we need to make in order for this transformation to actually happen. What are your ideas? (personal communication, February 24, 2010).

Faculty began responding to the post immediately. Six faculty who did not participate in the focus group offered their opinions on changing the lecture from passive to active learning. They also did more than just offer their opinions to me. They began to share ideas among themselves. Dave was the first to participate, and he strengthened my belief that change was necessary, saying, “Folks, this is definitely a course which success depends on our ability to make it interactive. Kids do not read manuals to understand and become experts in playing video games” (personal communication, February 24, 2010). His remark not only supported the need to change, but demonstrated that he was well aware of the changing classroom demographics.

Nina experienced the same type of effects with passive learning techniques. “In general, the students seem bored with the lecture slides, so I use them mostly as a prompt for discussions” (personal communication, February 25, 2010). And Jill added, “The lab part of the class seems okay in terms of students actively learning. This is not true of the lecture” (personal communication, February 27, 2010). Both Nina and Jill had only been teaching for one year. Although not seasoned fulltime faculty, these adjunct faculty were able to see the difference between active and passive learning and how it affected their

students. They were beginning to receive the message and started to open up and entertain options to straight lecturing.

Collaborative beginnings.

The adjunct faculty also began conversing with each other. They began to share ideas, commenting on each other's posts. Matt reported that he had opted for an alternative to the lecture where his students participated in graded classroom conversations. Matt summarized his technique with a posting on the group site:

Starting last fall, I do a series of class participation exercises throughout the semester. These are for grade. If you don't show up, and/or talk; no points. Topics are computer related, ranging from social networking thru computers to buying/selling things, privacy, workplace issues. I allow the conversations to be free flowing, as long as we're talking about computers to some extent. (personal communication, February 25, 2010)

He was using an active learning strategy that Bonwell and Eison (1991) place in the larger category of techniques called the modified lecture. He was lecturing less and having his students contribute more. Students were conversing amongst themselves and with their instructor. According to Chickering and Gamson (1987), quality instruction encourages contact among students, as well as between students and faculty.

Evan posted a substantial comment that revealed how he had already taken the initiative to spur active learning within his sections. He shared his lesson plan on how he required his students to read the scheduled chapter and then email him four statements from the portion of the chapter that is designed to elicit class discussions.

I'm trying something new this semester. Instead of lecturing on the chapters, I'm doing the following: The week before the "lecture" is scheduled, I assign the students to read the chapter and send me, via email, four statements from the chapter; one each from the categories Common Knowledge, Important (useful academically and/or for their career), Interesting (useful to them as a hobby or entertainment), and Forward-looking (the technology could potentially affect their life plans). In class, everyone gets to read one of their statements aloud and

discuss it with the class. At the beginning of class I try to focus the statements on the Important ones with a few Common Knowledge ones. I might survey the students on how many people had the same statement on their list, or whether or not they categorized it the same way, or should the item be on the test. If we (sometimes just me) determine that the statement should be on the test, I copy it from their email directly onto a PowerPoint slide. (personal communication, February 24, 2010)

Bonwell and Eison (1991) describe this as student generated questioning, and they find that students generally embrace this strategy, as Evan had discovered. He actually utilized a form of technology to implement what Paulson and Faust (2008) refer to as the fishbowl method. In this form of active learning, students write down questions on index cards and place them in a fishbowl. The instructor retrieves them and answers the questions or has other students provide the answers. Evan provided a method for directly linking the information to the students' lives. He made the material relevant. He effectively applied what his students had generated, conveying to them that their contributions were an important part of the class and learning. He continued:

After I have 10 statements for the test, then I guide the focus towards the students' Interesting and Forward-looking statements, and we discuss why they chose them and how the technologies make a difference to them. For instance, we spent some time discussing "Are computers intelligent?" Of course, this creates work for me. I have to check the spelling, grammar, and factuality of the statements, and distribute the PowerPoint presentation (to be their study guide) to the class. It is also available for reviewing material with the class, but I haven't used it that way. I make up a "matching"-style test from the statements (each lecture class has a different set that they came up with). The students take the test on paper, currently. I have an Excel template that allows me to randomize the questions and answers (and re-sort them to make answer sheets for grading purposes). That makes it easy to create three different tests for each chapter to help discourage the looking over the shoulder and whispering that otherwise goes on with paper tests. The extra effort helps me be more engaged. Feedback from the first test was positive; the students like having input to the test and like having time to talk about things that are interesting to them personally. (personal communication, February 24, 2010)

Active learning was taking place and students were becoming more responsible for their education. Evan had them contributing not only to the course material, but to the actual course assessment as well. The students were an integral part of the whole learning process. Additionally, he got his students to read the book. Data from the focus group in Cycle One revealed that faculty were concerned about students being unprepared for class. Faculty generally contributed this to a lack of reading the required textbook. Although he made a significant change, it included a limited use of communication technology, relying solely on email. But it was a productive start. Simply by posting and sharing his thoughts, two additional adjunct faculty positively commented on his procedure and asked for him to further elaborate on his methods. Ben responded saying:

I like what Evan is doing, as I would like to try alternatives to the PowerPoint slides for the Lecture component. Unfortunately, trying to work in the technology field nowadays, at least for me, requires that I put in daily 10 - 12 hour days on top of commuting 4 - 4.5 hours per day so my free time doesn't exist. I also have to be available nights and weekends to attend the multitude of releases, incident management issues and normal production coverage. As a result of my limited time, I tend to spend more time and energy on the Lab component during our precious time together each week on campus with my students than on the Lecture component. I would like to incorporate alternative learning situations like Evan has proposed and to involve and engage the students into a more proactive basis during our sessions (personal communication, February 25, 2010).

Ben's comment revealed a potential barrier that many other adjunct faculty may also share. Although he would like to try different teaching strategies, working at Shorelands is a part-time job, and he has little time left to devote to that type of activity. But simply having access to the postings allowed him to see the need for a change, see ideas that others were using, and feel secure in knowing that using those methods is encouraged by the department. Hazel was equally intrigued by Evan's post, adding:

I like what you have done with having the students actually help construct the lecture exams. Could you upload an example of the test you constructed with

student input to this shared group space? I'd be interested in seeing the types of questions that your students proposed that make it to the exam in some form. (personal communication, February 25, 2010)

Robin had already had her new syllabus approved by me and implemented it during the fall semester. Although she had given me permission to post her syllabus on the Google docs site, I did not expect her to interact further with the group. She added a post, however, that not only conveyed the change she made, but specifically added a reference to collaboration and how it can benefit the students. While other faculty were posting creative ideas, she recognized my desire to have faculty incorporate a strategy that required students to interact with each other. Robin outlined her use of collaboration software and conveyed to the group members its benefits:

Teams are required to use collaboration tools for management of their team projects. This semester (after the Blog lesson in the book) I had each team create a team blog and use it to collaborate on their first team project (this replaced Blog HW 2). The following class I demonstrated how to use Google docs, and gave an assignment (for extra credit) to use Google docs to coordinate their team's project summary report. If time permits, I'd also like each team to create a wiki. I don't have a class blog, but I like Nina's idea as it could be very useful for students (who may be timid to speak in class) to express themselves on the blog. One benefit of the team approach is that it gets them working with (and learning from) one another. It assists the ones with no experience when teamed with more experienced students—they tend to help each other. (personal communication, February 27, 2010)

She had realized what Chickering and Gamson (1987) say about the benefits of collaborative learning, "Learning is enhanced when it is more like a team effort than a solo race. Good learning, like good work, is collaborative and social, not competitive and isolated" (p. 3). Through their comments, the adjunct faculty exposed a critical phenomenon. The faculty were beginning to make changes in the same manner that the faculty wanted students to learn. As faculty, they were working like they wanted their students to work in class.

Hazel also demonstrated how the common posting area should be used for the faculty's benefit. She was not going to duplicate the efforts that Evan put forth, but rather efficiently utilized them in her classroom. The faculty were acting as community members. Evan had a willingness to share his ideas and Hazel was willing to borrow them. There were no secrets, hidden agendas, or competition between the two faculty.

Jill quickly recognized what was developing on the site. She was well aware of my concerns. She followed along with the changes that faculty proposed and recognized the potential benefit that a change to the lecture would have on her students:

So the things I'm reading here that involve the students opening their books and reading them have gotten my attention. Also, ways to get them doing more of the talking and increasing participation during the lecture component of the class are what I have been most interested in. (personal communication, February 27, 2010)

Carol utilized a Web 2.0 technology in her effort to spur class participation. She created a class blog. Basically, a blog is an interactive, web-based journal. Students were required to visit the blog before each class, and comment on her entry. Entries about the weekly topic were discussed during the class. Her method resembled Evan's with the difference being that students could see each other's thoughts before class.

The changes made by these instructors required little, if any, change to the course syllabus. Where points were added, as in the case with Matt's changes, a section addendum was simply created and hand distributed to the class. The other two changes were made to encourage activity within the class, but did not alter the grading mechanism.

While the faculty were willing to bring an active learning strategy into their class, they also felt the need to depend on some form of standardization. It seemed that

experimentation would reach a practical limit and faculty would then need to rely on a department-approved syllabus that defined assessment and grading criteria.

Robin acknowledged that faculty should be empowered to creatively adjust their teaching methods based upon the individual faculty and the specific student body within each class. This speaks to the heart of democratic education where students and faculty collaborate and change education based upon individual needs, rather than assuming that one singular learning strategy will equally satisfy all people. She also felt that certain elements need to be consistent across the department. She responded saying,

Here is my 2 cents-- We all agree that the lecture portion should include some form of student interaction. It is apparent that diverse tactics, specific to the class or teacher, will work. Perhaps the syllabus could have a lecture interaction (student discussions groups, team work, student led instruction, etc.) component with requirements for a grade. This allows each teacher to use their own creative talents and adjust to the dynamics of the class. (personal communication, February 27, 2010)

Wayne echoed Robin's view on the need for someone to consolidate the individual contributions into one usable and summarized strategy. He valued the comments and suggestions made by his peers, but needed to see some finalized product, saying:

I trust that we can come up with a standard set of suggestions for the lecture approach, and how we can still get the required material covered, to be able to have the students retain the major points and prove that by successfully completing some measurement device. I am enjoying the contributions and suggestions of my colleagues and hope that it results in a tangible and somewhat uniform syllabus. (personal communication, February 25, 2010)

Spreading a sense of urgency. Ultimately, this study is about change. Kotter (1996) stresses that the majority of change initiatives fail due to leadership improperly conveying a sense of urgency. Only a segment of the adjunct faculty population attended the focus group and heard my rationale for change. Only 12 adjunct faculty attended the

training session. In my opinion, the required sense of urgency did not reach enough people. I reacted to the low response, assuming that people either did not receive the message or did not understand the message's importance. As the faculty began collaborating and sharing their ideas for changes, I felt compelled to reiterate the purpose behind making the changes. My primary concern was for the students, but I also cared about the faculty teaching the course.

Adjunct faculty are not only separated from each other, but I also realized that they are removed from the college's general operations, at least when compared to their full-time faculty counterparts. While political forces are routinely discussed at department meetings, adjunct faculty are not privy to those discussions. I took the time to utilize the Google groups discussion feature to make the adjunct faculty aware of the impact that political forces could have upon the course that they taught. I asked the adjunct faculty to help me challenge those forces by responding to my following post:

The Information Technology course enrolls so many students because it is only one of two classes that satisfy the Technology/Information Literacy requirement within the statewide General Education model. However, there seems to be a movement on campus that would allow other courses that use technology (like English composition or speech) to also satisfy this requirement in its place. We will get a better idea on how this will pan out at tomorrow's college wide forum. But senior academic leadership feels that this course has pretty much run its course (or should be a basic skills course). Their belief is that all students coming into our college know this material; that they are much more technologically advanced. Our department will most likely have some comments to the college community on Tuesday, but since you are in the trenches what would you say to the argument that today's students do not need this course; they are technologically savvy and know this material already? (personal communication, March 8, 2010)

Although only seven faculty responded to this message post, their responses did reveal their passion and concerns for the course. On a positive note, most of those faculty who responded were not at the focus group. After several discussions, there did seem to

be a general consensus that the adjunct faculty understood the impact that could be levied upon the course. They were seeing the need for change. I believe that Wayne summed up the adjuncts' position on the matter, stating:

All in all, this is a well-balanced course, which is continually reviewed and updated for currency, and having aspects that all students can utilize and topics of which they should be made aware. I hope that the department can compile these, along with the full time professor's thoughts, and make a strong case for its retention in the existing context. I was involved recently in a similar discussion and study at another institution with which I am affiliated, and their similar courses to ours were left intact, at least for the time being. (personal communication, March 10, 2010)

Research Questions Answered

The first research question that I attempted to answer in this cycle asked about the types of changes faculty would be willing to adopt. Faculty seemed willing to experiment with a variety of active learning methods. Most of the strategies involved discussion between students during class. Four of the five faculty who made changes did utilize some form of technology to encourage engagement. However, only two faculty were willing to adopt strategies that required collaborative learning among students utilizing technology.

The changes by Robin and Sally were the only efforts that generated collaboration between students during class time as well as outside of class time and beyond the physical limits of the classroom. From the beginning, faculty relayed the importance of having their students collaborate in class. Faculty felt that that collaboration is an important skill that needs to be implemented beyond school. While the other faculty made significant changes in their attempts to foster active learning, their designs still did not require their students to communicate and work collaboratively with each other.

Interestingly enough, Sally and Robin were the only two faculty who collaborated on making a change. The other faculty implemented changes on their own. Apparently, Sally and Robin valued the importance of collaboration and did not need a tool to collaborate. For them, the tool became a means to share their success with others who may have needed some further motivation and sense of empowerment.

The second research question concerned communicating the necessity for change. I wanted to see how readily faculty would understand the need to adopt new teaching strategies and how eagerly they would respond. The answer to the second question was initially disappointing. The response to my plea for change was not effectively communicated. The number of faculty who desired to make changes was relatively low when compared to the overall number of faculty teaching during the semesters within this cycle.

As Cycle Two progressed, I had several concerns. The first was the lack of response from faculty with only 5 faculty responding to my call for change. I needed to know the reasoning behind the lack of participation and what I could specifically do as a leader to establish better buy-in.

Reflection

This interaction demonstrated a critical flaw in the way the department had been utilizing its contingent faculty. The part-time faculty were performing completely within silos. Some adjunct faculty were already taking the initiative to engage their students. However, the other adjuncts, the course coordinator, and the department chair were unaware of these activities.

This disconnect was partially due to the physical arrangement that constrained faculty interaction outside of class. The full-time faculty have a physical meeting place. The faculty office has a conference area. There are regular department meetings and full-time faculty routinely see and converse with each other during the week. The adjunct faculty are allotted just two desks at the end of the faculty office that are not utilized by all adjunct faculty. Most adjunct faculty do not know each other, mostly because they are either at different locations, teach at completely different days and times, or teach at the same time and only pass each other in the hall. The only other time that adjunct faculty do get a chance to come in contact with one another is at training sessions. These physical constraints that impact adjunct faculty are typical across community colleges (Gappa & Leslie, 1993).

As the change initiative moved forward, questions surrounding the composition of the guiding coalition, the members' motivation and participation levels, and the degree to which a change could be successful needed to be explored and analyzed. Initially, I was uncertain as to why only two instructors eagerly understood my plea and decided to act. I blamed my lack of understanding about adjunct faculty and their motivations. I also ignored the relationship between the organizational structure and the adjunct faculty. I needed to further explore my relationship to the adjunct faculty and evaluate how successful I was at empowering them to make changes.

At this point, as chair, I could have exercised more direct authority over the adjunct faculty and directed them to include some form of collaboration. That, however, is not who I am as a leader. I needed to see consensus accomplished through

collaboration. I needed to see people becoming responsible for making the changes and have them feel included in the process.

After examining the participation level and the comments made by the adjunct faculty, it became obvious that adjunct faculty have varying motivations and limitations. I was expecting everyone to respond equally without taking into account the individual's needs. I readily assumed that each person would share my concern for the community.

New Questions

As the semester ended, Robin and Sally started to change roles. Yes, they were instructors, but they were beginning to take on a leadership role as well. They initiated that role by making changes to the course. They furthered their leadership role by becoming advocates for active and collaborative learning and continued it as they spoke to the other adjunct faculty.

A key characteristic of servant leadership is the ability to persuade (Spears, 2010). I needed to persuade the other faculty to adopt pedagogical changes in response to my sense of urgency. I became intrigued as to why these two adjunct professors answered the call, and what specifically motivated them to do so. Did they possess attributes and desires that I could isolate and use as motivational factors to influence the other faculty? Could I look for those attributes when hiring new faculty? I also wanted the other faculty to continue with their changes. I wanted them to continue to feel empowered with the hope that through iterative and positive reinforcement, additional changes would come incrementally.

Part I of Cycle Three examines the faculty's attributes and looks at why they volunteered to become part of the few who made changes. In any action research study there is the potential for events to cause new areas of exploration. The faculty involved became an integral part of this study. I wanted to know how this study affected them.

Chapter 7

Cycle Three - Part I: Assessing Impact Upon Faculty

My intention for this study's first cycle was to convey the need for change and to seek possible solutions. As the research continued I recruited participants who expressed the desire to make changes. The second cycle allowed time for people involved to create and implement changes.

This third and final cycle focuses primarily on data collection. As the second cycle concluded in March, 2010, I utilized the remainder of the spring semester to collect data from both qualitative and quantitative sources. My goal was to have a sufficient quantity of valid data that I could use to analyze the outcomes produced through the study. Data were collected and analyzed during April and May as the spring term concluded. The data analysis spans across the next three chapters. It focuses upon the people who made the changes, the impact that the change had upon the students involved, and finally the impact that the change had upon me as a leader.

As the second cycle concluded, it became obvious that my efforts to persuade individuals to make changes did not equally affect all participants. Data in Cycle One showed that faculty were aware that the instructional methods that they were using were not effective. Additionally, the data showed that the faculty and students viewed the use of technology as a viable method for improving the course. Multiple faculty made pedagogical changes, but only three approached cooperative and active learning through technology. As a department and course whose primary focus is on technology, I felt that

the utilization of technology should be part of the solution. This chapter looks to answer questions as to why I successfully reached only certain people. It specifically examines the characteristics, attributes, and motivations of the adjunct faculty who readily volunteered to make changes and emerge as leaders, and how the project changed and impacted them.

Research Questions

As the beginning of the new fall semester began to draw nearer, I still was not sure who would buy into my vision and accept my proposal for change. I knew that I was relying on adjunct faculty, but was not sure if they would be interested in investing the time and effort required to implement this change. Prior to embarking upon this change project, I consulted the educational research literature surrounding active learning. The research literature provided me with the focus and direction in which I wanted to proceed.

However, as Cycle Two concluded, I found that a secondary search of the literature proved necessary. In order to better understand the dynamics associated with utilizing contingent faculty, I performed an expanded search of the research literature. After all, adjunct faculty do not have the same responsibilities as full-time faculty, nor do they receive compensation for efforts involving curricular change. Although adjunct faculty are individuals, I needed to know if there could be common identifiable factors of the group that motivate their desire to become involved. The following research questions relate to defining and understanding the guiding coalitions' composition.

- 1) What attributes motivated adjunct faculty to invest uncompensated time and effort into pedagogical change?
- 2) How did the project impact the adjunct faculty involved?

Methodology

For Cycle Three I collected both quantitative and qualitative data to analyze the impact that the study had upon faculty, students, and me. For this segment of Cycle Three I am examining the impact upon the faculty who made the changes solely through qualitative data. Qualitative data emerged from several sources that included faculty interviews, classroom observations, meeting notes, emails, a leadership journal, and a Google groups discussion forum. All data were collected within the computer science department on the main campus at Shorelands Community college. The focus was solely on the students and faculty involved with the Information Technology course offered by the Computer Science Department at the institution. All participants were mailed a consent form through interoffice mail asking for their permission to be included in the study. All consent forms were returned signed.

Interviews. Three instructors who ultimately defined the guiding coalition were selected for interviews. I initially thought that there would be more buy-in, but Kotter (1996) finds that successful guiding coalitions consisting of just two or three people can initiate successful change. Adjunct professors Sally and Robin were two of the adjunct instructors who originally met during the summer of 2009 and agreed to work towards an interactive learning environment. The third instructor chosen to be interviewed was Molly, also an adjunct. She was selected because of her desire to adapt and change based

upon the initiative put forward by the other two instructors. In essence, Sally and Robin persuaded Molly to respond and adopt their changes.

Interviews took place during the third week of April, 2010. They were conducted privately in my office in the Computer Science faculty area. The interviews followed a semi-structured format utilizing standard questions posed consistently across all three participants. The semi-structured format allowed me to ask consistent and important questions while giving the faculty the latitude to explore domains perceived as important to them (Hinchey, 2008). The interviews were recorded using a microphone connected to a laptop computer running RecordPad software. I personally transcribed the interviews during the final week of April. The transcripts were forwarded to the participants to confirm their accuracy. All three participants reviewed their respected transcripts, noted several minor grammatical errors, but agreed that the content and context were correct.

Upon receiving the returned transcripts, the qualitative data were parsed and analyzed for major reoccurring themes and subthemes. These themes are discussed as part of the larger analysis section that follows.

Google groups. In November of 2009, I created a Google group entitled InfoTechTeachers. The group's purpose was to provide Information Technology instructors with an online venue to share innovative ideas, concerns, and to collaborate. "Communities provide researchers with opportunities for discussions with like-minded others who share both an interest in inquiry and a passion to make things better" (Hinchey, 2008, p. 119). I felt that this online group would be beneficial to the adjunct instructors since they seldom come in contact with each other. It is normal for instructors

who teach sections at a common time to meet and talk in the adjunct area before and after class, but they are segregated from the majority of other adjunct faculty.

I sent invitations via email to all adjunct faculty and the course administrator asking them to join and participate in the group. As new instructors were hired, I also sent invitations to them as well. In addition to those reasons listed, I also utilized the group as a method of assessing my leadership. I posted several questions asking the adjunct faculty to offer their opinions and views on several leadership topics, which are discussed in chapter nine.

Meeting notes. Several weeks before each semester begins, Professor Bailly conducts a meeting devoted to briefing faculty on course changes as well as instructing them on how to utilize the course assessment software. The meetings are open to both full-time and part-time faculty. The meetings are primarily geared towards the lab portion. Seldom, if ever, are there opportunities to discuss the lecture material. During the summer 2009 meeting, I was afforded time to speak to the faculty about the lecture, how I was interested in invigorating that portion of the course, and that I was looking for volunteers to help out. I spoke about the concept of active learning rather than the traditional method of straight lecture, and challenged the faculty to make meaningful changes to their pedagogy utilizing some form of technology when possible (Reflective Journal, August, 2009).

This first meeting became the launching pad for the change initiative. However, the purpose for the second meeting held in January, 2010 differed. My intent was to utilize the meeting time to communicate the changes that Sally and Robin made in the previous cycle. Additionally, I wanted those two faculty to speak directly to the other

adjunct faculty in attendance. I believed that I had successfully communicated the need for change in Cycles One and Two, but I wanted these two faculty to demonstrate how they were empowered to make those changes.

At the meeting, I spoke briefly about changing the way that we taught, and then conceded the remaining time to the adjunct faculty involved in change. I encouraged them to speak about what they did in their classes, how it worked for them, and changes that they needed to make. During the remaining meetings, I took notes that attempted to describe the interaction between the faculty involved in the changes and the other faculty in attendance.

Classroom observations. The initial reason for the change effort in this study resulted from required classroom observations. Adjunct faculty are required to be evaluated once per year by a full-time faculty member at the college. As I performed my allotment of observations, I was disturbed by the way the students responded during the Information Technology lecture component. As the instructors made changes to their pedagogy, I revisited their classrooms to once again observe the students' behaviors during the lecture class.

The purpose of the observations was to gain a personal, outsider's view of the classroom dynamics. Combined with the interviews and meeting notes, these observations provided a means for triangulating the qualitative data (Glesne, 2006). I evaluate numerous adjunct faculty each semester which has provided me with a solid understanding of classroom dynamics. I utilized my observations to verify the statements made by the adjunct faculty that I interviewed.

Leadership journal. From the commencement of the change initiative, I kept a leadership journal that detailed events that I thought relevant to my personal leadership. I believe that the journal offers a view into not only the change process, but a look at how I have changed. It also illuminates the character of the institution in which I function as a leader.

The leadership journal was used in conjunction with answers to specific questions obtained during the faculty interviews as well as posts on the Google groups discussion segment to analyze my leadership journey and migration. The leadership journal was maintained on my personal computer at the desk in my office. I would take time out each week to write an entry that I thought relevant to leadership or my position at the institution. In addition to weekly postings, I would frequently add an entry when something important happened or when I was outraged. The journal also contains informal conversations that I had with adjunct faculty as I encountered them throughout the year.

Participants. A strong guiding coalition consists of people who can share a vision and work towards a common goal (Kotter, 1996). The qualitative data exposed common traits and values that were common among the teachers involved in leading the change effort, making it obvious as to why they readily volunteered to be part of the coalition. Subthemes that appeared within the teachers' major themes included prior teaching experience, motivation, work experience, learning to become a teacher, and a willingness to help one another.

To qualify as adjunct instructors at Shorelands Community College, applicants must possess a Masters Degree within the field of study that they are going to teach. For

the Computer Science Department, adjuncts must possess a Masters Degree in Computer Science, Information Technology, or Management Information Systems. No prior teaching experience is required. In fact, the majority of adjunct faculty hired within the department have no prior classroom experience. Because of their inexperience, adjunct faculty are usually less confident in their teaching skills and are willing to adopt the patterns established by full-time faculty (Gappa & Leslie, 1993). Adjunct instructors in the Computer Science department are assigned a mentor who is supposed to meet with them on a regular basis, helping them learn how to present the material as well as acclimate them to the college environment.

Analysis

The interviews revealed interesting data that painted a picture of the instructors who were willing to become involved in making a change. Robin, Sally, and Molly, who demonstrated a desire to shift towards active learning, shared common attributes. These three faculty also seemed to change in the same manner. The analysis begins by looking at those common attributes and how they applied those characteristics to lead a change. The analysis also looks at the reciprocal effect that the changes had upon those faculty.

Before the faculty emerged as leaders, they demonstrated leadership traits that I identify with and are found in both servant and democratic educational leadership theories. For example, awareness, persuasion, and community building were all present. Several of these particular attributes are also strong foundations within my own leadership platform, including caring and respect. These faculty moved beyond the notion

held by some researchers that say adjunct faculty are not as adept at creating and implementing powerful and alternate instructional methods (Gappa & Leslie, 1993).

Understanding and caring. Through their writings on adjunct faculty, Gappa and Leslie (1993) found that adjunct faculty differ from full-time faculty on numerous levels. For instance, they found that as a group, adjunct faculty tend to be more student-centered than full-time faculty for various reasons. The three faculty that I interviewed clearly showed that they understood and could positively connect with the individual student. More importantly, they demonstrated that understanding through action. They tended to put in the extra effort needed to reach the atypical student and beamed with excitement when that student reacted positively to their caring.

From their comments that follow, it can be seen how they demonstrated a genuine interest in their students' welfare and success as they worked with students who were challenged by the course. This quality of understanding and caring is described by Robin as she reflects upon an interaction with a student:

I had a young woman. I guess she was in her 30s or 40s. One day they were working on their lab assignments and she goes to leave the classroom and she is crying. And I looked at her and I said what is going on. I try to stay away and let them do it own their own unless they ask for help. I said you are not upset about this work and she said yes. Then I said lets go sit down. So I sat with her and showed her how to it. By the end of the class she was so happy. She wrote me an email at Christmas time to wish me a merry Christmas and told me that the reason that she stayed in the class and the reason she was going to continue with her college was because of me helping her and encouraging her to go on. And she said that she actually missed the class. That's how much she liked me. She liked doing all the assignments and everything. She was really getting to learn how to do them. She was getting frustrated in the beginning, but as soon as she felt like she had a little more confidence, and that is what keeps me coming back. And it seems like every semester I have one or two students like I feel like I am really, really touching. I am really, really helping them.

Molly also has a similar story about reaching out to a student and how she was rewarded through his success. Once again, she demonstrated the ability to understand the diverse needs and skills of her students:

There was actually one student my first semester, an older guy, who kept in touch with me for years. He used me as a reference. He said it was the best course he ever took, but he was not a regular Shorelands student, he was just taking a couple classes. So I felt that I was making an impact and students were learning and were excited about the material. But there was always others that were a little tough to reach because they really didn't want to be there. And I think that is a challenge. I always look forward to coming in to teach. I am excited because, yeah, I would say yeah, it has been high and I want to continue to do it. You know, I am excited when we make changes because it's new things to learn and I think we need to keep up on the latest technology and be teaching it to our students.

Democratic educational leadership principles ensure that all individuals involved in the educational process are afforded an equal opportunity to contribute. Teachers can make sure that certain students are given that opportunity to participate through care and respect. Through her comments, Sally revealed her feelings on how her role in education afforded her the opportunity to connect with students and care for them. She described her motivation for helping others by comparing her role in industry to that of a teacher:

Making a difference; getting through, you know. I have had a very fulfilling career, but whether the company computer systems ran well, it probably did not touch a lot of lives, so this job is about other people, so take a step back in another career and help other people. That is why it is doubly frustrating if you are not helping. You know, when it goes well I like it a lot. There is a lot of psychological benefits to it and in the end when the student says I really learned a lot, or the kid who walked out and said that I never learned so much from one class in my whole life. And you say that is great. That is really motivating.

Experience. All instructors had some level of formal teaching experience. Gappa and Leslie (1993) found that part-time faculty who had some prior level of experience, either in the field or in education, tended to be more effective college instructors. Although each has a strong foundation in education, each worked in industry for

numerous years. While Sally started out in education and turned to industry, both Molly and Robin finished out their careers in industry and became interested in education afterwards.

Robin worked in industry for over 30 years, but decided to enter secondary education when she retired from a major telecommunications company. Robin, who was a significant leader throughout the change process, had the most teaching experience that is directly related to not only education, but to the computer science field as well. She possesses a state K-12 technology certification and has taught at the high school level. To become certified, she needed to teach for at least 200 hours in a high school classroom. She elaborated on her migration from corporate world to education:

I decided to retire and I always wanted to go into teaching so I went back and I started teaching at my high school where I graduated from. And teaching computers I learned that teaching was not as easy as I thought it would be. So I went on and did the alternate route. Got my NJ certification and really learned about education and teaching through the State. So I am certified. And then teaching here has been good too. Just to use the knowledge. I think that when you have the knowledge in the subject you can add more to it but you do need that education piece. Sometimes that helps you.

Sally also possessed a formal educational background. In contrast to Robin, she learned to teach before entering the corporate world. After 29 years as a programmer with a major insurance company, Sally re-entered the education arena possessing important educational theory. She detailed that migration:

I was a special education major in college back in the day and I didn't get a job right out of college. It was the year and they were scaling back on special education so there weren't a lot of jobs out there. I took an interim job in business thinking I would come back to it when they settled that law and they knew what they were doing in special education. At work I would volunteer teaching the women in business seminar. I did a lot of training for the quality stuff that we did. So I did keep hand in because I always had an interest in it.

Adjunct faculty are hired because of their expertise in the content area. Experience in the educational field is not a requirement. The premise is that adjunct faculty are employed to teach; bringing their expertise and industry experience into the classroom. We do not expect them to understand educational theory and make pedagogical changes. But that type of background may give certain adjunct faculty an advantage. Their exposure to educational theory may help become more quickly aware of educational practices that need to change and also supply them with the motivation to make changes. It could be that they demonstrated a level of caring because they possess an innate quality, which made them pursue formal education training to begin with.

Awareness. Awareness is an integral trait found within servant leaders, and Robin, Sally, and Molly exhibited that attribute on two levels (Spears, 2010). They were acutely aware of themselves and their students.

I was responsible for beginning a change initiative focusing on the method in which the lecture is delivered. Because I researched the literature on active versus passive learning, the need for change was obvious to me. My vision was to transform the segment of the course that was stagnant, boring, and passive. Additionally, I am deeply integrated in functions outside of my department and, therefore, was aware of the necessity for change. However, adjunct faculty in my department were not exposed to pedagogical deficiencies and political forces to the extent that I was. But based upon their classroom experiences, they were aware that something needed to change. They were aware of what they were doing, how their students were responding, and what they needed to do to improve. They were also aware of how their students have changed since they first started their adjunct teaching career at Shorelands.

Self awareness. As department chair, it is my duty to be aware of forces that impact the areas I lead. While I sowed the initial seed, persuading them to become involved in making changes, the instructors became leaders. Through their teacher training and current classroom experiences, they were acutely aware of the need for change. They were cognizant of their students, how students have changed, and how students now prefer to learn. They relied on each other for guidance and support, collaborated with each other for marked results, and eventually persuaded others to follow.

Normally, the new adjunct will sit in on another teacher's class in order to gain a better perspective on how the material should be presented. The problem with this method is that the instructor will ultimately learn both good and bad presentation skills. If the veteran instructor utilizes passive learning techniques, that is what the new faculty will be exposed to and most likely will adopt, believing that it is the best method. Lei (2007) found that the lecture was the most common form of instruction in community colleges. This leads to a stagnation that is propagated and passed along from fulltime faculty to adjuncts as illustrated by the comments made by Sally, saying, "That is what I saw my first semester. That is what Professor Baily did. That is what you did. That is what Molly did. Just the PowerPoint. And that is what I did."

Robin was the first faculty member who readily took on the challenge of both change and leadership. To her, the need for change was obvious, "I knew that there was a problem with the lecture. I thought it was more me because maybe I was not interesting enough when I was talking to them." Sally was the next to come on board as she realized:

The lecture is frustrating because I do not feel like they are learning a lot in that class. I even feel that what they learn they spit back on the tests. The class is not

that exciting. And you know what? they don't do well on the tests. They are not learning in there. And I can see that they are much more engaged in the lab class.

The educational literature consistently favors methods of active learning over passive learning, and the instructors involved were acutely aware of how utilizing only lecture was affecting their students. The instructors believed that students started to tune them out after brief periods of time. Molly noticed that her students lost interest in a relatively brief time, stating, “Probably if I am doing a straight lecture, 15 minutes or so.” Robin felt that she could hold the classes’ attention slightly longer, but the outcome would ultimately be the same. The students would eventually drift off. In reference to the ineffective nature of lecturing, she added, “Oh, half an hour. Definitely. I mean I saw half an hour as the max.” Additionally, she realized that the students needed some form of stimulation, adding, “They need to be engaged all of the time. They need to have something going on all of the time. So that is why I find that lecturing does not work that well.”

The students’ reaction to the lecture method was captured by Sally as she compared past pedagogy to current students’ preference for learning. “I think this generation has been raised on novelty and a lot of quick change. I can remember sitting through hours of lecture and taking notes the entire time. These students don’t take notes, they just zone out.”

Robin, Molly, and Sally all saw how their teaching style was negatively impacting the students. They realized that the lecture method was a teaching style that inhibited engagement. Each instructor also felt like they were responsible for what was transpiring in the classroom.

Awareness of students. A major reason for the willingness to adopt new teaching strategies is rooted within the instructors' belief that their students are now markedly different today. The data from Cycle One revealed that faculty perceived a difference in the learning styles and learning preferences between their current students and the ones in their classes when they first began their college teaching careers. The instructors viewed using technology as a necessary method for spurring engagement since technology has become an integrated part of the students' everyday life. They were able to recognize this, and chose to change and adapt in order to reach out to meet the expectations demanded by students who have grown up with computer technology.

The faculty also witnessed the shift from a diverse classroom population to one that is more homogenous as defined by age, use of technology, and study habits. The typical class at Shorelands has changed as more traditional college age students occupy the majority of the seats. Molly said, "I had a lot of older students in the beginning and I don't really have that any more. They tend to be students right out of high school." Robin added, "Right. The typical student is probably right or close out of high school, in their late teens or early twenties and they need a lot of motivation." And although they may be labeled as traditional students, their study habits and relationship with technology is anything but traditional in the eyes of faculty.

Experienced teachers view their current students as dependent upon technology, but unable to use it proficiently, lacking good study habits, and at times unmotivated. There is a stark difference between how the college administrators view a typical student and how the faculty actually experience the students. Administration often tells the campus community that today's student is grounded in technology, is proficient in

technology, and feels the necessity to utilize technology in all aspects of their lives. Students need to be taught how to use technology productively.

The notions held by the faculty were adequately confirmed by another faculty member. Through a Google groups discussion, Jake summed up the feelings of his colleagues as he described his students and the role that technology plays in their academic lives:

It is increasingly interesting how little these students understand about Information Technology. Yes, they are fantastic social networkers, texters, iphone users, and game players; so they are techno savvy, but have no idea how it works and how to effectively utilize the applications that every business expects all hires to be proficient in.

The faculty did seem to agree that the students are generally current with technology used for social and entertainment purposes, but have little comfort with technology utilized for productive means. At times, “they are a little afraid of it,” added Sally. This paradox created through the faculty’s description of a typical student did seem to pose a concern for the faculty who were participating in the study. This may have been an influential factor that prohibited faculty from utilizing certain technologies to spur active learning. While numerous instructors commented about students and their relationship to technology, only two instructors interpreted this as an opportunity to invoke change. They saw the students’ need for using social networking as a sign that this technology could be leveraged to promote interaction among students outside the classroom.

For example, the qualitative data showed that the instructors teaching the Information Technology class tended to find that their students are not adequately preparing for class by reading the required text. Sally said, “Oh, one thing that I really

didn't get, probably the biggest mistake that I made, was I thought they were reading the book." And from the focus group, Hazel added that, "They are not reading it at all. Not even the night before the test or anything." Since the tests given in the lecture are based upon the material in the textbooks, the instructors crafted an alternative method for conveying that material to their students. Their solution was to make the students responsible for the material by having them present the material to their peers. By putting students in groups that collaborated outside class time utilizing some form of Web 2.0 technology, they helped each other learn.

Community building and growth. Robin did not attend nor participate in the focus group so she was unaware of my concerns surrounding the lecture and was initially unaware of the proposal that I put forth challenging faculty to change their pedagogy. She did attend the pre-semester training session Professor Baily held at the middle of August, 2009 to expose faculty to course changes that occurred during the summer. Although the session was to focus solely on changes made to the lab components, I was afforded time at the end to address the instructors concerning the lecture component. After that meeting, an effort surrounding change began to solidify. Robin explained her desire to change as she began a relationship with Sally, unaware of any attributes that the two may share.

It was great when we met that one summer. When we all got together. And then for some reason Sally and I got together afterwards and we started talking and we said, "Why don't we try this?" or "Why don't we try that?" And we both kind of kept together and by the end of the summer we had an idea of what we were going to do. I used some of her stuff and she used some of my stuff and that worked well.

Adjunct faculty relied on each other and not upon fulltime faculty. This seemed to be a recurring theme as Sally added, "I think you can really learn from each other." Both

instructors point to the fact that contact between instructors made helping each other possible. Whether it was the training sessions or time discussing topics online within the Google groups, being able to hear from fellow adjuncts made all the difference. As the teachers started looking for ideas to make their lectures more active, they relied on information supplied by fellow adjuncts.

I felt like faculty were excited about making changes to the way that they taught and that those changes would become contagious. According to Schein (2004), leadership is not just about change, but making a change to the organization's culture. This was a step in the right direction. However, what became more important to me was how those two initial instructors became leaders themselves. Through the use of the Google groups and another training session, these two instructors were able to convey the success that they had in their lectures by sharing their materials and offering help and guidance to anyone who was interested in making changes. They began by practicing leadership in their classroom then effectively extended it to the department level.

All of the instructors started out teaching by utilizing the same methodology. They learned from other teachers who propagated a teaching style dependent upon lecturing enhanced by PowerPoint presentations. However, through their prior educational knowledge, their instincts, and by my challenging them to become better teachers, they saw a need to adopt a student-centered environment based upon active learning and student engagement.

Sally, Robin, and Molly all found that by stepping away from the front of the class and letting their students lead, the class became more engaged. In true democratic educational leadership, they then challenged their students to become responsible for

their education and for the education of their classmates. They challenged their students to become participants rather than bystanders. By implementing group projects they fostered a tighter classroom community (McKinney et al., 2006; Shimazoe & Aldrich, 2010; Slavin, 1983). While the students' perceptions on this portion of the change are evaluated in the next chapter, I was able to personally see it.

During a visit to Sally's class, I was able to confirm what they were claiming (personal communication, March 12, 2010). Sally began her class with a lecture where she utilized the department generated PowerPoint slides. As I observed the class, the students were all sitting facing forward. With the exception of Sally, the class was silent. However, after she concluded her lecture and the student groups took over, the classroom dynamics changed. At one point, a specific topic being presented by a group stirred the students' interest and generated a good deal of side conversation, enough where Sally had to intervene and ask the class to quiet down. The students, who collaborated using Facebook, concluded their presentation and sat together as a group, smiling and congratulating each other on a job well done (personal communication, March 12, 2010).

Additionally, Molly pointed out not only how the class became more engaged, but also demonstrated an important tenant of democratic educational leadership. That premise is that all participants in the educational process can learn and teach. That is also true of the teacher as Molly said, "How do they learn best? I think that when I involve them in the class. What I like is these presentations that I am doing this semester and the students are interested in them. I learned from it."

These instructors showed a desire to increase student engagement and class participation because they have experienced success with these strategies in the past.

Several years ago, I created a test review that utilized a format based upon the popular game show Jeopardy. It was a simple PowerPoint presentation that helped the students prepare for the lecture exams by participating and competing in teams. I shared this idea with Sally who then made it her own, enhancing it by placing the questions in a more formal, working game concept. She then shared that game with other adjunct faculty. That one idea exposed the learning power generated by active learning and class participation. Molly recalls,

I have been thinking about it for a while, that I do want to get more interaction. I have been doing the Jeopardy games for a couple of years now. I was probably one of the first one to do it. Sally and I, actually. And I loved doing that and I saw how the students go very much involved and participated a lot.

Sally added, “The Jeopardy seemed to get their attention.” She agreed that the game did increase engagement. Based upon prior success, the instructors willingly and eagerly searched for additional methods. As the faculty began to construct a plan to change the way that they delivered their lessons, they were acutely aware of their students.

Persuasion. During the January training session, Robin and Sally spoke about their efforts to incorporate active learning into their lessons. During the meeting, each faculty member created a sense of excitement (personal communication, January 28, 2010). Sally and Robin's efforts had an immediate impact upon other teachers. But even before the training session, adjunct faculty were becoming aware of their changes. Since they frequently taught the same day, Molly and Sally routinely encountered each other in the adjunct faculty office area. Molly thought about making changes as she started to incorporate videos into her presentations over the previous summer semester, but she still thought that she could do more to increase engagement. Molly joined the change

movement because Sally and Robin took the initiative to publicize their efforts. It was the spark that she needed.

I knew what Sally was doing that last semester so I kept asking her how it was going. Then I contacted her I guess in December and said I wanted to do this. I wanted to implement this. I'd really liked to start with what you have if that is ok. So we scheduled a meeting and we both came here and she shared everything with me. I reviewed her topics. I think that I gave her a suggestion of one topic that I had used to replace hers. And then I will probably give her my feedback on what I am changing.

Satisfaction. The instructors had an opportunity to reflect upon their changes and evaluate the impact that those changes had directly upon them. I witnessed how the instructors took on a leadership role, but also how they were impacted as educators.

When asked if she felt more satisfied after making the changes, Sally responded, "I think so. You know, just trying different things is more satisfying than feeling frustrated that the class is not going so well. At least taking the steps to make it better."

Besides actually making the changes, Sally derived a sense of satisfaction from simply being empowered to make those changes. She added that, "It didn't occur to me that I could make changes this substantive to the class. Yeah, it's the power to try that makes me more engaged."

Likewise, Molly interpreted the change process as having positive results upon her teaching satisfaction. She also saw the value of incorporating technology into the change as she replied, "You know, I am excited when we make changes because it's new things to learn and I think we need to keep up on the latest technology and be teaching it to our students." Likewise, Robin found that the change experience had positively affected her, saying, "It has been a great experience for me. It really has. I like it. It is the kind of stuff that I like to do."

Research Questions Answered

In democratic educational leadership, nobody stands alone; an intersection between all participants is required. The teacher, the student, and I as initial leader, have roles and responsibilities. From the perspective of servant leadership, the role of the individual instructor evolves from just teacher to teacher and leader. In reference to the first research question, the qualitative data revealed the attributes that the adjunct faculty possessed. Those attributes can be found within prevalent leadership theories. It is uncertain as to whether or not the other adjunct faculty possessed these same qualities. But what distinguished the faculty who volunteered to become part of the guiding coalition was their ability to act upon those attributes.

By observing their actions, the second research question is answered. The faculty did change in a positive sense. They became leaders. Through their actions, they demonstrated their ability to persuade others to act through a collaborative effort. Through their actions, they increased their satisfaction level in teaching.

While this analysis revealed a better understanding of the people who helped create a change, whether or not the change was successful still needs to be evaluated. The next chapter looks at the impact that the faculty had upon their students.

Reflection

I believe that as the second cycle concluded and the third cycle began, I may have misinterpreted elements in Kotter's (1996) change theory. In Cycle Two, I confused establishing buy-in with coalition building. I mistook communicating the vision with the actual implementation of the vision. In Cycle Two, I was overly focused and consumed

with having every person join in and collaborate on making a change. I did not realize that this was wrong until I analyzed the data collected from this third cycle.

Looking back on the beginning of Cycle Two, two faculty had reacted to my plea for change. They were the guiding coalition. Instead of continually trying to persuade all faculty to invent additional changes, I should have concentrated my efforts on communicating their change to the other faculty who were teaching the course. Instead of trying to secure buy-in in order to make changes, I should have focused my efforts on having faculty buy-in to their strategy.

I chose to focus upon the changes made by Robin, Sally, and Molly because they implemented an active learning strategy based upon the use technology that fostered collaboration. However, I cannot help but speculate if I also chose them because their traits that were exposed during this cycle closely align with my leadership and educational values. Or did I choose them because they are the better teachers?

Sally made an interesting comment that caused me to pause and think about how quality faculty can make significant changes because of who they are. She said, “Don’t you think that the teachers who are making changes are likely the teachers who have tried to find more interesting ways may be better overall?”

Chapter 8

Cycle Three - Part II: Assessing Change within the Classroom

“We can do it ourselves – with a little bit of help” (Chickering & Gamson, 1987, p. 2).

In the fall 2009 semester, two instructors changed the way in which they taught their lecture classes. Toward the end of the summer, both Sally and Robin collaborated to create a course syllabus that implemented group presentations and required some form of collaboration tool (Web 2.0). In democratic educational leadership theory, this change integrated all participants more tightly into the learning experience. The process changed the traditional roles held by the both instructor and students. Responsibilities shifted, making the students more responsible for their education. In addition to learning, the faculty emphasized that the students also were responsible for making the class more engaging. This is normally a role reserved for the instructor as they struggle to engage the students by giving presentations, asking questions, and creating dialog.

This final cycle also enabled the adjunct faculty to become leaders themselves. They were able to become role models for other faculty, exposing them to their alternative methods of teaching via various communication modals. In the spring of 2010, the project had come full circle. It started out by me observing a passive learning environment and then opting to take action to change it. The adjunct faculty who had become a driving, guiding coalition, implemented changes through a collaborative manner, sharing my vision of a more engaging classroom environment. At the beginning

of the project, I had stated that change must be implemented for a specific purpose and that the rationale behind the change must be communicated. In this final cycle, the people involved assessed the changes and evaluated their success as a pedagogical method.

Research Questions

- 1) To what degree do the instructors view their changes as being successful?
- 2) How did the change alter the instructor's role as a teacher?
- 3) From the students' perspective, what elements of engagement were positively affected?

Methodology

For the final phase of this study I once again turned to a concurrent mixed methods case study (Creswell, 2009). Using the same rationale as Cycle One, where I explored the opinions of both faculty and students, I utilized both qualitative and quantitative methods to reach out to both constituents. The goal was to evaluate the degree to which the changes implemented by the adjunct faculty were considered successful by those who made the changes, and those who were affected by the changes.

Since my leadership is grounded in both servant and democratic educational leadership, I strived to involve as many relevant stakeholders as possible. Once again I utilized qualitative data obtained from interviews, the Google groups postings, and my reflective journal. Surveys accounted for the quantitative data as voiced by the students. Mellow and Heelan (2008) point out that in order to find out which educational practices work best, educators need to go directly to the students for their opinions.

I approached the data collection in this manner cognizant that student opinion weighed equivalently with that of the faculty. Additionally, I wanted to compare the opinions voiced by the instructors with those of the students when evaluating the legitimacy of the outcomes. I intended the results of this action research study to have a substantial impact beyond its conclusion in written form. I wanted to be an advocate for active learning, utilizing the study's results. However, I also needed to verify that the educational changes were viewed as positive by both faculty and students alike.

Participants.

Faculty. Qualitative data continued to be collected and analyzed from the same sources defined in the previous chapter. Data on how the faculty viewed the success their changes had on engagement were gleaned from interviews conducted with the three main instructors involved with the change. In addition to their views on success, data detailing how their roles changed and how they were affected from a leadership perspective emerged from Google groups postings, classroom visits, and training meetings as well.

Students. Throughout the change process the students' roles also changed. They were no longer passive participants, but had become involved. They had become responsible for their education and their peer's education as well. My goal was to change the relationship that existed among the students and between the students and faculty. The interviews and classroom observations allowed me to obtain qualitative data that affirmed these changes from the teachers' perspectives, but I also wanted to see how the students perceived the changes on their learning. The instructors witnessed a change in their role and that of the student. They felt that students were more engaged during their classes. Additionally, Sally, Molly, and Robin felt that the students were creating bonds

between each other. Finally, they felt that the students were learning from each other rather than just from the instructor.

During the spring 2010 semester, I administered surveys to seven different sections. I utilized a purposeful sample that allowed me to survey sections taught by the three instructors involved in the change process and four sections taught by instructors who did not make any changes. My goal was to compare results between sections that utilized passive versus active learning techniques. For this cycle, I modified the survey that I utilized in the first cycle, adding questions that would probe students for their views on engagement (Kuh, 2009); specifically those relating to interaction, classroom dynamics, and technology (see Appendix B).

I selected instructors in the passive learning category by looking through the Google groups discussion threads. I had posted a topic asking instructors to discuss any active learning strategies that they were currently implementing. These instructors were selected because they either replied that they were not using any or because they did not reply at all. I further narrowed down the field so that the characteristics of the instructors would be close to those of the active instructors. I tried to match the instructors by teaching and work experience. I purposefully stayed away from new instructors. I then confirmed that each instructor was using passive strategies by attending their classes before I distributed the surveys. I personally distributed the surveys in April, 2010 to students in all seven sections. I then utilized SPSS software version 17 running on a personal computer to analyze the results.

Analysis

Leadership transferred from the department chair, to the adjunct faculty, then eventually over to the student. As department chair, I witnessed the ineffective manner in which the lecture was being delivered. The instructors were simply following the behaviors of the full-time faculty who routinely teach the course. As a leader, I planted a seed for change, encouraging the adjunct faculty to be creative. This empowerment allowed the instructors to shift their role away from that of a typical lecturer to that of a leader. This enabled the instructors to effectively become leaders and agents of change. They also became the driving force behind changing the students' educational role. The students eventually became leaders in their own right. Both instructor and student were impacted by this pedagogical change. This segment of Cycle Three looks at how the change effort impacted participants within the classroom.

Teachers' perspectives.

Lecturing less. While the other instructors in the department continued to lecture to their classes, Sally and Robin implemented a strategy that took them away from the front of the classroom and off to the side. They covered the same material but in a different manner as described by Robin,

I do everything that we do that the course syllabus, the original one, calls for except for the ethics term paper. In lieu of the ethics term paper they are put into teams of 5. Five students and they do 2 ethics presentations and one chapter presentation during the semester.

By doing this, she estimates that she has cut down the amount of time by half that she would have normally lectured to the class. Sally and Robin both utilized group projects, but did handle grading the presentations differently and adjusted the assignments to fit the needs of their individual classes.

Throughout the fall semester, the instructors began each weekly lecture component by having a group present their assigned topics. The topics corresponded to the material that the teacher would have normally been giving that week as prescribed by the traditional syllabus. After the presentations, the instructors would then lecture to the class for the remaining time to fill in the pieces that the group may have missed.

Using technology to collaborate. The instructors proposed to change the course by incorporating some formal use of current technology into the lecture. The instructors felt that by utilizing some form of Web 2.0 technology as a tool, the students could collaborate on their projects, in their groups, beyond class time. The technology would allow them to add content to the group project as their schedules allowed. Sally added, "These kids have other schedules and it is hard to get together."

The instructors' goals were to have the students collaborate on assignments, cover the same material as dictated by the original syllabus, make the class more engaging, and all while trying not impose a greater work load upon their students. The instructors felt that learning to collaborate on projects was an important skill the students needed to possess when they entered the workforce. According to Molly, "You have to know how to work with people." Yet the instructors were aware that their typical students already have a significant amount of demands placed upon them. Robin described their typical workload, saying, "I find that they have so much going on. They tell me all the time that I am working and I have all these other classes. I am trying to keep up with all the work." And by encouraging the use of collaborative tools outside of class, the students carried the active learning beyond the physical limits of the college (Chickering & Gamson, 1987).

Although some instructors did feel that the students are not well versed in applying technology correctly, they did feel that the current student was fairly comfortable with Web 2.0 applications such as Wikis, blogs, Facebook, and Google docs. Matt affirmed this, saying, “They are technologically savvy as it pertains to the Internet. They are also, at least many of them, very good at playing games, using cell phones, and social networking through the computer.” The instructors were well aware of this attribute and did attempt to exploit it to the students’ advantage.

All the instructors required the students use some collaboration tool as part of their group presentation development, but also did not make any assumption concerning the students’ familiarity or proficiency with any product. Each instructor taught their students how to utilize several collaboration tools, and then let the group decide on which one they would use.

Robin started her students out by teaching how to use blogs as a collaborative tool. The students were already being introduced to blogs in the lab course’s lab session, as the students were required to create and maintain a personal blog throughout the semester. She turned this into a collaborative concept by having the students create a team blog and making her a member so that she could monitor their progress and contributions to the project. Later on in the semester she also introduced them to Google docs as an alternative. Molly started her students on Google docs then instructed them on how to use wikis. Sally also started her students out with Google docs, but then allowed them to learn and choose from any other tool, including Facebook.

Engagement. After taking two concurrent semesters to implement the change and reflect upon its impact, the faculty found that they had met the goals that we established

at the onset. Their role had dramatically changed and they were able to see benefits in the form of increased student engagement, bonding, and better attendance. In defining her new role, Sally said, “The percentage of time we spent on presentations as a sum of the whole class was up. What I had to cut back on was me talking, which may not have been a bad thing either.” And on the subject of engagement, Robin concurred with Sally on the positive impact that the changes made, saying:

But when we do those presentations, it is amazing how they pay attention to that because it is their peers who are doing it. And not just me up there. Because I am up there seeing them nod off, but I see a whole different dynamic when the students get up there. And they are up there in front of them and actually talking to them and a lot of conversation back and forth, so I like that.

The students are engaged, not because of what the teacher is doing in the class, but rather because they have been charged with producing engagement. They have to interact with their peers while they are creating the presentations, giving the presentations, and as audience members while listening to others present. In referring to principles of quality education, Chickering and Gamson (1987) surmise that students do have the ability to teach segments of courses. Active learning will challenge students to demonstrate higher cognitive skills (Krathwohl, 2002). Robin summarized the impact that occurs throughout the newly instituted collaborative process:

They are doing things, so yes, but I find now that using the group projects, they are engaged. They are engaged, the time that they are doing that. They have to give me a summary report on who did what on the presentation and they have to tell me what collaboration tool they used. They have to come up with some ideas on how to engage the students and I have to see what those ideas are and I also have to see it work.

Through the use of technology, the students were more engaged and developed a stronger working relationship that would not have occurred when the instructors just

lectured. Molly pointed out that, “I think that when they are doing these team presentations they are working together and they are learning from each other.”

More importantly, the faculty witnessed engagement among the students on a more informal level. They created the social factor that has such far-reaching and positive influence upon the student (Astin, 1993; Braxton et al. 2008; Tinto, 1997). When asked if she feels that the students engage more amongst themselves, Sally answered:

Yes I think they do. They know each other now, they are friendly. Yeah. And they have to work together. I definitely see it making bonds between them. You know, the good teams. Even some of your most unlikely combinations of people you know, where you have an older returning student with the kid. Where you might not think that they would. They are tight. They are tight with their group. Their group members.

And Molly observed the same type of results in her class. She agreed that the personal dynamics between students changed for the better, saying:

And I think that some of them have made friends. And I see a lot of the teams sitting together talking. And I think that it is good. And students are talking more in my classes this semester, too, which I think is good because they used to just sit there and not say anything. So they are not afraid to speak up and I think that it is because they have stood up in front of the class and had a chance to talk. So yeah, that kind of breaks the ice.

Robin also found that the bonds created among the students went beyond the lecture. Students tended to stay in their groups when they left the lecture and entered the lab portion of the course. She saw that, “Right from there they bond. And they do help one another. Not only with those team projects, but with the labs. They will help one another with that if someone is having problems. So I think that is invaluable.”

I had taken the opportunity to visit one of Sally’s classes during the spring 2010 semester. What I witnessed during her class confirmed her observations on how her role

had changed and how her new role impacted her students as well as the change in student to student interaction and bonding.

When she began her class, she started out by turning off the lights and making her way through a PowerPoint presentation. I observed how the class was rather subdued with little interaction between the class and the instructor:

She goes on with the slideshow and the class is real quiet unless she asks a question. There are no questions being asked and no dialog between the students themselves. The students are pretty much motionless and all are facing forward. (personal communication, March 12, 2010)

However, after she finished her 10-minute presentation, she turned the class over to the groups that were ready to present that day. Not only did the personality of the class change, but so did the role of the teacher. What I observed was a teacher who changed her role from lecturer to guide. She successfully helped the group accomplish their task and engage their classmates.

The student who starts the presentation is basically reading off the slides. Sally notices this and tries to get them to just tell about the information on the slide. She is mostly guiding them and trying to ask questions that will guide them in the right direction. Sally is sitting up front, but to the left. Sally continues to try to draw the class in to a conversation. Several students start to talk about their thoughts and experiences with social networking problems. The second presenter then offers his experiences and stories. The topic generates a lot of side conversation and Sally asks the class to pay attention. The students are really involved. The presenters now start answering questions from the class. The presentation goes on for 15 minutes which is 5 minutes longer that it was suppose to. At the end, Sally asked the group members how they collaborated and the students responded saying that they used Facebook. (personal communication, March 12, 2010)

Attendance. In addition to engagement, the faculty also witnessed more favorable attendance during the lectures. The use of active learning techniques has a strong and desirable impact upon attendance (Bonwell & Eison, 1993; Braxton et al., 2008; Slavin, 1983). Erratic and weak attendance negatively impacts engagement as students are not

regularly exposed to their instructors or peers. At the onset of the focus group held in Cycle One I had commented that I passed by a lecture and there were only six out of 40 students in attendance. I attempted to convey to the focus group members that the instructor of the class was one who regularly received excellent evaluations, but he solely relied upon the PowerPoint presentations for the lecture component which may be a problem.

Although she did not have the actual attendance numbers that could be used to gauge the change's impact, in her opinion Molly saw the change as positively impacting attendance, saying, "I think that attendance in my lectures is more than it has been in the past. Yeah, I think that definitely there is more." When Robin was asked if she witnessed any positive impact on attendance, she likewise replied, "The attendance? Yes." Robin attributed the increase in attendance to the students' caring for each other as group members. She said that, "They work well together and they care. They show up when their presentations are due."

During the spring, 2010 semester, I visited various classes taught by Molly, Robin, and Sally. During one visit to Molly's class, I noticed that the room was overcrowded. They were in a class that held exactly 40 students and there were very few open seats. In late April I stopped by Robin's class to watch presentations and hand out the student surveys that I utilized in this cycle. I noted that I distributed 14 surveys to a class that started the semester with 20 students. Although six students were unaccounted for, it was undeterminable as to how many students dropped the course during the semester and how many were actually absent. As I attended Sally's Friday class to watch student presentations, I noted that there were only 28 out of 40 initially enrolled students

present. Sally had remarked that since it was a Friday class, attendance tended to be lower on all her classes held on that particular day (personal communication, March 12, 2010). The faculty seemed to have a reliable understanding of attendance patterns and were able to convey that attendance was better, but was still affected by other factors beyond passive learning.

Bonding. While engagement and bonding between students seemed to increase, there was no evidence showing an increased level of engagement between students and faculty during class. However, faculty did seem to feel that students were contacting them more via email after class, which is consistent with findings resulting from studies on virtual office hours (Li & Pitts, 2009). Sally found that the current student would rather communicate electronically than meeting in person. She was readily available at the adjunct desks, but “they don’t ask to see me. I get emails. I get emails up the wazoo.”

Likewise, Molly saw the same trend. When asked if she witnessed an increase in students communicating with her face to face she replied, “No, but I get constant emails. Constant. So I am on my email a lot. I am always checking it. Even into the evenings. This is how students correspond with me.”

It was clear that the faculty thought that the students were being positively impacted by the way that they were delivering their lecture sections. They also felt that, as a part of the educational experience, they were benefiting as well. When asked if their satisfaction in teaching had improved, Sally quickly replied:

I think so. You know just trying different things is more satisfying than feeling frustrated that the class is not going so well. At least taking the steps to make it better, I find that much more satisfying than you know. I didn’t realize that we have as much freedom as you gave us last summer. It didn’t occur to me that I could make changes this substantive to the class. Yeah, the power to try that makes me more engaged. So yeah, so I that overall it has been a good thing.

Molly viewed the changes that she made as being important and necessary, adding to her satisfaction as a teacher.

I am excited because, yeah, I would say yeah, it has been high and I want to continue to do it. You know, I am excited when we make changes because it's new things to learn and I think we need to keep up on the latest technology and be teaching it to our students.

The change initiative began with the goal of creating a course that could be more engaging for the students. I was looking for a change that impacted classroom dynamics in a face-to-face structured course by having students collaborate and contribute to the educational process through the use of technology beyond class time. In order for this to occur, the role of the instructor needed to change. The instructors were not only satisfied with the changes that they instituted, but were also well aware of how they changed as instructors.

A changing role. As the teachers began to change, they recognized the necessity to help their students in ways that were beyond that of the typical lecturer. Their new duties included helping students with their oral presentation skills, helping them develop multimedia presentations, how to use online collaboration tools, and providing them with methods to engage their classmates in discussion. While the instructor spent less time lecturing, the significance of their role was never diminished. As stated by Shimazoe and Aldrich (2010), the instructors maintained critical roles by helping and guiding the students as individuals and groups.

Utilizing groups proved beneficial, but also put forth some challenges that the instructors observed and needed to act upon. Students needed to learn how to become effective presenters and also needed to learn how to collaborate. The instructors have

commented on the difficulties that they had as they learned to become effective instructors and how they developed the required skills over time. Yet we are asking the students to instantaneously assume a portion of the instructor's role. These problems effectively changed the instructors' roles in the classroom. They migrated from functioning solely as a lecturer to a facilitator, helping and guiding the students through their presentations. Through this role, they do see their students positively progress as the semester continues.

Robin commented on how the students are often nervous and initially lack good presentation skills saying, "Because some of them are uncomfortable and you can see that they just want to read the slide and sit down." Sally also added, "I am not real dynamic, but some of these students are. You can't expect that they are going to have outstanding presentation skills, so that's a conundrum."

Although the students have the option to utilize available technology, their unfamiliarity with the technology often caused more problems with their presentations.

Robin detailed the common flaw saying,

They will put a word document on the slide and they'll read it, and I am like, should I say something. And you don't want to make a spectacle of them when they are in front of the class, but you try to nicely say that if you are going to read off of that it is going to take us an hour before you get finished.

Since the students were being charged with educating their peers, the instructors also required that they attempt to engage the class in conversation as best that they could. Again, since the students had relatively little experience in this realm, the task did pose problems. In addition to being nervous, students were inexperienced in asking questions, not only when to ask questions, but also the correct type of questions to ask. Molly elaborated on this problem saying, "When the students ask yes or no questions, all they

are going to get is a yes or no answer.” But Robin did challenge her students to work at it:

They have to give me a summary report on who did what on the presentation and they have to tell me what collaboration tool they used. They have to come up with some ideas on how to engage the students and I have to see what those ideas and I also have to see it work.

Once in their groups, the instructors needed to invest time in teaching the students the proper way to construct an engaging presentation. They each recognized that the students arrived in the class with varying degrees of skills and it became their job to bring everyone in the groups up to the same level. Robin noted that, “They will put a word document on the slide and they’ll read it, and I am like, should I just say something.” Sally adds that when they start their presentations, they still may have difficulties and commented, “I make them stand up and when they start reading off the slide, I tell them to tell us in their own words.”

All of the instructors agree that the students were not familiar with techniques that create dialog and engagement. Robin said, “I give them some techniques that they can use like YouTube clips.”

All instructors felt that their new role of guide included the task to direct and keep their students on track, helping them stimulate dialog, but in an unassuming manner and from the side. Molly demonstrated this, saying, “I keep them on time because they are allowed so much time. So I keep track of the time. And I just make sure that it is covering the material that it is supposed to because they have guidelines.” Robin added, “I mean, if I see them just ending and the presentation is over and no one’s said anything, then I will try to bring something up so that the class will start to talk about it.”

I was able to confirm what the instructors were saying as I visited Sally's class. She clearly demonstrated her new role as guide, helping the students with their presentation without being overly intrusive. She also overcame one of the most difficult barriers to active learning on the teacher's end, which is the ability to relinquish control of the class (Bonwell & Eison, 1991). During my visit, I noted:

The student who starts the presentation is basically reading off the slides. Sally notices this and tries to get them to just tell about the information on the slide. She is mostly guiding them and trying to ask questions that will guide them in the right direction. Sally is sitting up front, but to the left. When a slide pops up that is interesting, Sally poses a question to the class rather than having the presenters pose the question to the class. The students seem a little nervous and not sure that they should be trying to engage the class in conversation. (personal communication, March 12, 2010)

As Sally and I left the classroom and made our way back to the faculty office, we talked about what had transpired. In her opinion, she was satisfied with the participation and interaction, but slightly concerned about the presentation skills. I offered my advice, which included having the students start out the semester by critiquing her presentations. That would require the students to pay close attention to the construction of the materials in addition to the way she was speaking. I also advised her that the students should email their presentations to her beforehand so that she may review them for style and substance (personal communication, March 12, 2010).

Robin went beyond agreeing with Sally and Molly in how her role changes. She was able to see not only how teaching differently impacted her satisfaction, but also how the change process played a critical role in doing so. The interaction between faculty and the collaboration amongst her colleagues was important to her. Within the theory of democratic educational leadership, she was able to appreciate her new role as a partner in

the course rather than just an instructor. Her response commenting on her satisfaction was enlightening:

Yes. With every class that I teach because I learn something. I learn from them. I learn from them and then I make improvements. In teaching you have to understand that so many times you try something and it doesn't work. You spend a lot of time preparing for it but it may or may not work and that is what I find. And it is frustrating so you just kind of ok, that didn't work, let me try something else. That is why the collaboration with all of the other teachers really helps too.

Throughout the study, I made an effort to converse with Sally, Molly, and Robin in person every week. There are two exits in the faculty office. One exit is directly across from my office door. The other is around the back next to the adjunct faculty office. I made a point of trying to only using the back door so that I would be required to pass by any adjunct faculty who were stationed at those desks. Although not every conversation was recorded, numerous reflective journal entries were in response to dialog that I had with adjunct faculty in that area. For instance, during one encounter Sally had mentioned a concern that she had regarding presentations and the class size. She had suggested that we do away with the combined lecture format and run the sections as individual sections. This eventually became a topic that I posted on the online discussion area (Reflective Journal, March, 2010).

I was fortunate to have direct access to the faculty and easily extracted their opinions from online discussions, in person discussions, and interviews. But I also needed to hear from the students.

Students' perspectives. Surveys were distributed to students in seven different sections of the Information Technology course in the spring 2010 semester. Of the seven sections, three were taught by faculty who participated in the change and implemented active learning strategies. The other four sections were taught by four different faculty

who did not deviate from passive learning. One of the active learning instructors was assigned a course where two lecture sections were combined. In order to have a balanced quantity of students within each group, I included one more section taught by a passive learning instructor.

Students were instructed to complete the surveys to the best of their ability, informed that their answers would be kept anonymous and confidential and that their personal answers would not be shared with their instructor or impact their grade. Each survey included an alternative consent form on the front. As I collected each survey, they were numbered for entry into an SPSS database. I also marked off a check box indicating whether the section was active or passive. Additionally, I included the instructor's name at the bottom of each survey. The means for all students who responded to the survey questions are included in Table 2.

In all, 145 students completed the survey. Seventy students were in sections taught by the active instructors and 75 were in sections taught by the passive instructors. The responses between the two groups were separated out through the use of *t*- tests, keying in on the active versus passive checkbox.

Table 2

Mean scores for survey questions 1- 30

| Question | Mean | Standard Deviation |
|----------------------------------|------|--------------------|
| Participate in class discussions | 2.64 | 1.059 |
| Regularly answer questions | 2.72 | 1.025 |
| Regularly ask questions | 2.83 | .993 |
| Offer opinions on ethical topics | 2.84 | 1.018 |
| Offer opinions on current topics | 2.67 | .967 |
| Prepare by reading text | 3.08 | 1.112 |

Table 2 (Continued)

| Question | Mean | Standard Deviation |
|---|--------|--------------------|
| Participate when prepared | 2.32 | 1.025 |
| Discuss personal experiences with Tech. | 2.45 | 1.067 |
| Participate when material is personally relevant | 2.06 | .843 |
| Participate when material is work related | 2.23 | .888 |
| Required assignments would make me participate | 2.97 | 1.054 |
| Graded participation influences my participation | 2.41 | 1.244 |
| Participate when teacher uses the whiteboard | 3.00 | .957 |
| Participate when teacher uses PowerPoint | 2.97 | 1.030 |
| I learn from my fellow students | 2.81 | 1.054 |
| Working in groups would make me participate | 2.57 | 1.098 |
| I have contact with fellow students outside class | 3.06 | 1.279 |
| I have contact with my teacher outside class | 3.48 | 1.119 |
| I feel comfortable with technology | 1.83 | .853 |
| Hours per week using social networking | 2.35 | 1.456 |
| Social networking can be beneficial in class | 2.48 | 1.055 |
| Web 2.0 items should be embedded in class | 2.39 | 1.035 |
| Hours per week on the computer | 3.12 | 1.322 |
| Hours spent studying | 1.99 | 1.090 |
| Age | 1.43 | 1.049 |
| Credits earned | 3.17 | 2.931 |
| GPA | 3.1457 | .58467 |
| Gender | 1.49 | .502 |
| Enrollment status | 1.14 | .347 |
| Instructor status (full or part time) | 2.20 | .897 |
| Pedagogy (active or passive) | 1.52 | .501 |

The surveys were analyzed in attempt to find elements of engagement that were positively impacted by teachers utilizing active learning strategies. The surveys depict the students' opinions; specifically comparing those of students who had experienced active verses passive learning environments in the same course. I utilized *t*- tests on key questions surrounding engagement issues in order to compare the opinions between these two groups of students. Since I was looking for a positive change detailing how much more the active students were satisfied over the passive students, I implemented a one-tailed significance result with a significance level of .05 (Cronk, 2006).

Students are considered engaged in class when they become actively involved, that is, asking and answering questions. However, *t*- tests performed on the survey questions regarding those items showed no significant difference between the groups. Likewise, there was no significant statistical difference between students in the active and passive classes on the questions regarding whether they freely give their opinions on ethical topics or current events.

However, key differences were found that related to other important aspects of engagement relating to socialization, classroom dynamics, and modals for learning. Active students differed from their passive counterparts in how they viewed their relationships between themselves and their classmates. They also showed that they positively value how they learned.

When asked if the students felt that they learned from their fellow students, an independent samples *t*- test confirmed a statistically significant difference of opinion between the two groups ($t(133.06) = 1.729, p < .05$). The students in the active group had a lower mean ($M = 2.66, SD = 1.153$) than that of the passive students ($M = 2.96, SD = .936$). This confirms that the active group felt stronger than the passive group, believing that they did learn from their peers.

Additional *t*- tests showed that students differed in their relationships between fellow students and their teachers. An independent sample *t*- test performed on the survey question asking how the students interacted with their peers outside of class time confirmed that a statistical significance existed between the two groups ($t(143) = -5.9, p < .05$). Students in the active group had a lower mean score ($M = 2.47, SD = 1.073$) and felt that they had more contact with their peers outside of class ($M = 3.60, SD = 1.219$).

Additionally, the active students also felt that they had more contact with their teachers outside of class time. In comparing the two groups across these questions, an independent samples *t*-test ($t(143), -1.918, p < .05$) confirmed that the active students had a statistically significant lower mean score ($M = 3.30, SD = 1.073$) than the passive students ($M = 3.65, SD = 1.097$).

Interestingly, the students who answered in the affirmative that teachers should include usage of Web 2.0 technologies in lectures were the group that actually did use them. An independent samples *t*-test ($t(143), -2.117, p < .05$) confirmed that the students in the active group more heavily favored the use of Web 2.0 technologies in class. The active group had a lower mean ($M = 2.20, SD = .957$) than that of the passive group ($M = 2.56, SD = 1.081$).

Important attributes between the groups proved not to be significantly different. Independent samples *t*-tests did not show any significant differences between the groups in the categories of being comfortable using current technologies, enrollment status, gender, grade point average, or age.

Finally, other independent sample *t*-tests revealed a marked difference in how the two groups prepare and learn. The first *t*-test ($t(143), 1.759, p < .05$) compared how the two groups viewed reading the textbooks as an important method of preparing for class. The active group had a higher mean ($M = 3.24, SD = 1.083$) than that of the passive group ($M = 2.92, SD = 1.124$). The second independent samples *t*-test ($t(143), 2.024, p < .05$) showed that students in the active group had a higher mean ($M = 3.14, SD = .937$) than that of the passive group ($M = 2.80, SD = 1.090$), indicating that passive students felt that they learned more when the teacher used PowerPoint presentations.

Since student to faculty interaction is an integral part of engagement, a chi-square test of independence was calculated to see if students' knowledge of whether their teacher was full-time or part-time was dependent upon the pedagogy applied. In other words, did a relationship form between the faculty and student that would help the student understand the teacher's employment status. A significant interaction was found ($X^2(2) = 15.077, p < .05$), indicating that active versus passive pedagogies affected students' knowledge of their teacher's employment status. All students in the survey had adjunct faculty, but 26.7% of passive students, compared to 4.3% of active students accurately indicated their teacher's status. Conversely, 64.3% of passive students did not know their teacher's status, while 41.3 % of the passive students admitted to not knowing their teacher's status. Students who had teachers with a passive teaching style were more aware of their teacher's role.

Research Questions Answered

The survey analysis, what the teachers said, and what I observed during classroom visits seem to concurrently validate the successful impact caused by the change process. The data align and validate the fact that an active learning environment stimulated by collaboration technology is preferred over a passive environment utilizing straight lecture.

A thorough analysis of the qualitative data positively qualified the first two research questions. These questions looked at the results through the eyes of the faculty who made the changes. The interviews that I conducted with the three main adjunct faculty, along with my notes generated from classroom visits, conclude that the

instructors did witness overwhelming benefits derived from the change. The primary purpose in changing the way that the instructors delivered their lecture was to generate more student engagement, creating a learning environment that was based upon active rather than passive learning.

All three faculty attest that their students had exhibited better attendance habits and were forming bonds among each other during their group work. My observations verified that there was a marked difference among the students in the active versus the passive environments. The students in the active sections created a more friendly, collegial, and cohesive environment. This environment also extended beyond the classroom.

From the faculty's perspective, the students were able to successfully utilize some form of technology, Web 2.0 in this case, to collaborate. From the very beginning, starting with the focus group, the faculty concurred that collaboration skills are an important life skill that students should start implementing during their educational years. The groups utilized a collaboration tool to extend their working partnerships outside of class time. Although the students were not physically together, they were still working together rather than isolated or alone. Prior research has also shown that including some form of technology into active learning helps reach a student body with a wider spectrum of learning abilities and motivation (Komarraju & Karau, 2008). This may have accounted for a more positive response.

Modern educational theory calls for a change in the instructor's role. A call for active learning environments requires that the instructor move from the sage on the stage to the guide on the side. One of my goals during this change process was to do exactly

that. I wanted the students to become more involved in the class and have the instructors do less lecturing. I wanted the instructors to look for solutions that would have them use fewer PowerPoint presentations. Through classroom observations and interviews it was clear that the faculty did see their roles change. They did witness the change from sage to guide. As the faculty put the students in charge, their task shifted from lecturer to aid. Each instructor pointed out that their job was to monitor the presentations, keep the students on schedule, offer suggestions on how to improve engagement, and, at times, help the presenters by provoking classroom discussions.

In the end, not only did the instructors see their role change, but they also witnessed an increased level in satisfaction. Although they admit that the way that they now teach requires more work, they found that the efforts put into changing has paid off. As instructors, they have come to enjoy making the changes and appreciate the work that is required to perfect those changes.

The survey data allowed me to answer the third research question, which assessed the change effort's success from the students' vantage point. The data showed that the students were positively affected by the change effort in regards to specific elements of engagement. The results verified what the faculty and I had witnessed. The students' role in the educational process had changed in a positive manner. When the results for the active students were compared to their passive counterparts, there was a clear difference in perceived engagement. The active students believed that during the lecture they learned from their peers, were more likely to engage with their teachers and peers outside of class, and they were more appreciative of collaboration and Web 2.0 collaboration tools for educational purposes.

The change also exposed what students viewed as sound learning techniques. For the students who were actively involved in the learning process, conventional methods were less appreciated. Lecturing, reading the text, and watching PowerPoint presentations as methods of preparing for class and learning were more favored by the students who did not get a chance to participate in active learning scenarios. These pedagogical changes caused a change in how the students viewed their teachers.

All the sections that were surveyed were taught by adjunct faculty. The final question on the survey asked students to mark off their teacher's status. The students had a choice of answering that their teacher was a full-time faculty, part-time faculty, or that they did not know. My goal was to see if the use of active learning strategies impacted the way that students viewed their teachers.

Far more students in the passive group answered correctly while an overwhelming amount of active students openly admitted that they could not tell. This may say something for the way that the instructors carried themselves and also for the learning environment that they successfully created.

This could also have been attributed to the formal education training that the active learning instructors possessed, as revealed in the previous chapter. Perhaps the students more closely related the methods that the adjunct faculty utilized with those that they were exposed to in high school. Bonwell and Eison (1991) found that using active learning strategies requires more time and dedication on the instructor's part. Perhaps the students recognized the extra time invested and assumed that the faculty had to be full-time instructors to do so. Additional studies should be conducted to look at the relationship between active learning and perceived instructor status.

In the eyes of the faculty and students, the data from all sides conclusively show that the change was successful. From a democratic educational leadership and a servant leadership perspective, the change was indeed successful. The students played a more integral part in the educational process. The adjunct faculty changed, not only within their instructional role, but as educational leaders as well. This is an action research study. An integral part of action research examines how the researcher was affected. The final chapter examines my leadership, specifically how I demonstrated my leadership and how I may have changed over the course of this study.

Chapter 9

Cycle Three - Part III: Leadership Revisited

“Leadership defines what the future should look like, aligns people with that vision, and inspires them to make it happen despite the obstacles” (Kotter, 1996, p. 25).

As I reflect back upon my leadership journey, I can explicitly and vividly recall my first semester of doctoral work. I can picture the person whom I sat next to and the teachers who stood in front of us. I can recall my anxiety level as I questioned my knowledge and experience in the leadership realm. Most importantly, I can recall the first and last assignment that the class was charged with completing. As class was concluding on that first evening, we were instructed to create a picture detailing our leadership style. This was to be the beginning, the laying of the groundwork for our leadership platform.

My picture yielded several crudely drawn frames that attempted to encompass what I believed to be my current leadership style contrasted with the leadership style that would evolve from the doctoral program. Pictured in the first frame were several people running about haphazardly, while problems dropped from the sky. As a leader, I felt that I had little control over my environment. My leadership was situational, responding to problems as they arose.

The second frame showed the same group of people sitting in a circle, acting as a team, quickly dispatching the problems before they hit. In essence, I felt that I lacked strong leadership and organizational skills. In all sincerity, I simple did not know where I

stood as a leader. I was truly unaware of the differences between leadership and management as well as the various types of leadership.

During the very last class that first semester we concluded the course as each student delivered a presentation on his newly found leadership ideals. Our leadership platforms had solidified and I had a better understanding of myself and how I interacted with various contingencies in my life. Additionally, that last assignment also required that each student bring in an artifact that they felt best represented their leadership. For me, it was a bicycle wheel. I had pictured my ideal leadership as a circle with me acting as the center, or the hub. I found out that I truly did not enjoy being out in front, but rather choose to be in the center, holding things together. For me, the wheel best demonstrated my platform foundation that was rooted in both servant and democratic educational leadership.

But as I progressed through my leadership project and dissertation, I found that the picture of an arrow works better for me. I found that you can truly lead from behind. You do not always have to be in the middle of the circle. You can empower people to act responsibly and trust that they will produce significant outcomes. Subscribing to servant leadership tenets, I empowered the people who were actively involved with my project to step in the front and become leaders. They were the point, the portion that makes the impact. I became the back end, as I pushed and guided from behind.

Methodology

I have seen elements within my leadership platform be reaffirmed as I implemented an action research study that created an environment for interactive learning

utilizing technology. Throughout the study I gathered data on my leadership from several sources. My primary source of data was a leadership journal. I recorded key events and feelings about my leadership in the journal throughout my dissertation process. Since the study was equally about process as it was about outcomes, I also embedded questions about my leadership within the interviews that I conducted with the adjunct faculty who were intimately involved in the change process. Additionally, I posted questions about my leadership on the Google groups site that I had initially created as a mechanism for sharing and collaborating amongst Information Technology faculty. Finally, I kept field notes on classroom visits and training sessions that involved the people within this study.

Analysis

The data not only demonstrated my servant and democratic educational leadership, but also measured the degree that my personal code of ethics, grounded in communitarianism, carried through.

While this action research study confirmed my leadership views, it also exposed several deficiencies. Although my initial leadership platform was primarily grounded in servant and democratic leadership, I also had seen elements of transactional leadership. What I discovered during the project was how transactional leadership emerged, and how well it effectively integrates with both servant leadership and democratic educational leadership. I also found out that I was totally missing a key element.

Politics and the ability to lead through a political landscape never entered into my initial leadership platform. I was naïve. But as I sifted through the data, elements of me as a political leader not only surfaced, but emerged with a strong presence.

Servant leadership. It is difficult, and sometimes even contradictory, to write about one's self in the light of a servant leader. The focus should be on the people who one is attempting to inspire, grow, and empower. I can only gauge my success as a servant leader based upon how the people who were intimately involved in this study changed.

From a servant leadership perspective, my change initiative was successful. Students participated in a course characterized by an active as opposed to passive learning environment. The data showed that the change was successful in both the students' and faculty's eyes. However, I did not make that change. I only provided an environment that fostered change. I challenged faculty to improve upon what they were doing and then supported their efforts. The key to gauging my success as a leader is not solely derived from the successful outcomes produced by the change, but how the adjunct faculty eventually changed. They not only changed in their role as instructors, but they morphed into leaders in their own right.

Of the 10 characteristics that Spears (2010) associates with a servant leader, I was able to prove that I successfully identified with at least eight of those traits through data collected from my leadership journal, the focus group, online postings, and interviews. Although I was unable to point to specific instances where healing and empathy occurred, there were numerous examples that demonstrated listening, awareness, persuasion, conceptualization, foresight, stewardship, commitment to growth of people, and community building.

These specific characteristics found within a servant leader are benign unless they are applied. These attributes, when leveraged correctly, also correlate tightly with actions

specified by Kotter (1996) in his strategic change process. What I also discovered is how these characteristics defined by Spears (2010) complement each other. It is impossible to assess each trait without seeing how they are impacted by one another.

Awareness. This study represents my reaction to specific events that were occurring within my institution. Because of my leadership position, I was well aware of how our students were reacting to passive learning and I was also well aware of the political environment and how it impacted my department. As a leader, you need to be immersed within your institution in order to become exposed to important issues and forces. Just like learning, leadership cannot be passive; you must take an active role in order to be aware. For example, it was my involvement in the general education committee that enabled me to observe how other people in the institution viewed the Information Technology course. I was able to bring this information back to the department and utilize it as a means for creating a true sense of urgency (Reflective Journal, March, 2009). It is the ability to become acutely aware of your surroundings and the impact that external forces have upon your organization that enables leaders to successfully create a sense of urgency (Kotter, 1996).

Awareness also developed as I progressed through my doctoral program and as I spent more time in the department chair position. I learned more about educational theory and more about myself. As chair, when I performed classroom evaluations of adjunct faculty, I was more aware about learning modals and how we were performing a disservice to our students. Through my research on active learning, I was more fully aware of good educational practices. These observations led me to create a focus group that commenced this study. The ninth tenet in my personal code of ethics states that I

firmly believe that I will not always have the answers and will need to seek collaborative input. Through others, I have the ability to become more aware of problems and solutions by listening to their voices.

In addition to department chair, I consider my role as an instructor a leadership position. No matter the pedagogical style adopted by the instructor, he or she is a role model and leader at that specific time and place. Within my role as instructor, I was not totally blind to what was transpiring in my own Information Technology classes. Because of my teaching experience, I did not need someone else to attend my class and inform me of what I was doing right or wrong. I was aware of the students and their opinions. I was also aware of my own feelings.

I felt uncomfortable lecturing when the students reacted negatively to that learning format. I decided to make my own change within the course that would be the start of an active learning strategy aimed at creating a better classroom community. The PowerPoint presentations that the students developed as part of their grade were rather benign and unrelated to their personal experiences. I changed those assignments to ones that the students could personally relate to. I required students to create and present a PowerPoint presentation about themselves. The class reacted positively and two benefits unfolded. First, I was able to quickly learn each student's name. The literature finds that the best way to improve the classroom environment is to learn each student's name quickly (Bonwell & Eison, 1991). Secondly, the class more quickly became a community. Not only did I know the students, but they knew each other. I discussed this strategy at a department meeting and the full-time faculty responded favorably. It quickly became part of the course syllabus and a required assignment.

One of my last journal entries reaffirmed my commitment to participatory learning as my spring semester classroom evaluation occurred (Reflective Journal, March, 2011). As the dean sits in my class each year, I normally go through extra efforts to ensure that I am organized and utilize time most efficiently. My perception has always been that educational administrators want to see efficiency. They want to be assured that the college is getting the best economical use out of faculty. However, this semester I deviated from how I would normally present my class material. Instead of beginning the course with a lecture, I had the class participate in two group problem-solving activities. That is how I normally start each class and I really did not want to deviate from that structure. However, to the outsider, the use of active learning techniques may seem somewhat inefficient. The instructor is speaking less and the students are talking more and there seems to be less learning (Lammers & Murphy, 2002). My fear was that administration would ask why we are paying faculty to “not teach.” My only hope was that the dean could see the invaluable classroom dynamics that occurred.

This research project has also heightened my awareness of adjunct faculty overall. The comments made by faculty throughout the interviews and the Google groups postings have changed the way I see the members of that group. Their needs and motivation are not only different from the full-time faculty’s, but often differ from each other as well. I need to spend more time considering the adjunct faculty as individuals rather than stereotyping them into a single group. Matt summed this up, as he wrote, “There is also, it seems to me, a pretty big gap in how much time each adjunct has and/or is willing to devote to preparing for the class” (personal communication, March 1, 2010).

Listening. This action research study was aimed at making a significant change. A leadership limitation that I initially observed in my leadership platform involved communication, and my hope is that this study helped me improve that deficiency. While listening may be a characteristic of a servant leader, the leader must also present a forum and opportunity for people to be heard (Mellow & Heelan, 2008). The leader needs to reach out to all constituents and make them feel welcome, and that dialogue among peers is desirable, meaningful, and valuable. In essence, this is the heart and sole of democratic educational leadership.

Tinto (1997) writes, "Having a voice without being heard is often worse than having no voice at all" (p. 616). The focus group that I conducted in April, 2009 was executed with the sole purpose of me listening to faculty. The faculty dominated the conversation during the focus group as I listened and acted as a guide. I asked questions such as, "Does anyone have problems with the lecture?" and, "Do you get good attendance?" in order to solicit their concerns and position on the lecture's current state.

After I created the Google group to share ideas and resources, I showed the adjunct faculty that I was concerned about their input as I posted a discussion titled "Being heard." The results on this discussion topic were mixed and one response in particular disturbed me. In response to the question that referenced my valuing adjunct input, Wayne wrote:

On the first question, I have a mixed response. There have been some efforts directed toward soliciting adjuncts' input into the information technology course over the last few years, through our annual meetings and by occasional invitations to join in discussions such as these. However, it is not a formal process and is difficult to participate in due to our variety of our commitments and limited time availability. (personal communication, March 2, 2010)

During interviews I questioned Robin, Molly, and Sally about who they felt inspired them to make substantial pedagogical changes, and to what degree they felt empowered to make those changes. Robin replied,

You did. You did, because you, I mean I was just going along with the syllabus and I thought it was fine. I knew that there was a problem with the lecture and I thought it was more me because maybe I was not interesting enough when I was talking to them. But then you had suggested that we put together, start to come together, and come up with some ideas. That's when I thought about this.

More disturbing was Ann's comment,

Feel that you have the freedom and opportunity to contribute to making changes? Desire to contribute more? No, and I tried. In recent years we have been asked what we think, but I don't get the feeling we have been heard. (personal communication, March 6, 2010)

I initially found this response disturbing and it made me question my success in reaching out to the faculty. Ann had been teaching for the Computer Science department for seven years as an adjunct, and abruptly resigned at the end of the spring 2009 term. Both Wayne and Ann taught at off-site locations and felt removed from the main campus. My goal in setting up the discussion group was to reach out to all faculty, no matter where they taught. Both were invited to participate in the focus group and to become involved in making substantial changes to the course, but neither chose to.

However, the faculty that did become involved and did actively participate in making changes had a different view on being heard. During her interview, Robin commented,

I felt a little funny when I was reading that some of the people thought they didn't know that they could make changes to their class. And I thought why would they think that they could make changes to their class? Why did they think they couldn't make changes? You sent this to everybody to think about making changes and I just didn't understand that. Why they thought they couldn't do that. Why they couldn't teach the course the way they thought it would work?

Listening must go beyond merely hearing their words. People must see some sort of action attached to the gesture of listening as proof of commitment on the leader's part. During the interviews, I asked the adjunct faculty if they believed that I valued their input. In other words, did I really listen to what they were telling me? Robin said, "Oh, absolutely. Absolutely. I wouldn't be sitting here. You wouldn't be asking me if you didn't value it." And Molly added, "Yeah, I do. I think that you are very easy to talk to and I have certainly not been shy letting you know. So, yes, yes I do."

Molly also confirmed that I was serious about what I said. She confirmed that not only did she speak and I listened, but that I took action, as she commented, "The department helps by saying try things and then by bringing us together to share what we tried."

This specific research project gave me pause to think about how effectively I implemented my desire to listen to and include a wider range of educational community members. But it also allowed me to reflect back on how I acted upon those same actions before the project began. While I strongly believe in listening to people, I need to question what I was doing before the first research cycle. In other words, why did I not have this type of communication mechanism in place when I first began my term as department chair? My belief is that I simply inherited the policies and attitudes linked to the department chair position from my predecessors, much like adjunct faculty inherit bad teaching habits from full-time faculty.

I also discovered that I was limited in the scope and immediacy of opening up a clear communication channel. I needed a much broader voice to reach faculty who I did not see in person, and also needed to get to the faculty sooner.

In my research, I point to the necessity of having active learning strategies in place throughout the college so that students will be accustomed to expecting that type of pedagogy from the start. Similarly, I need to work with faculty from the very beginning as they are hired. Meg was a new hire when I made the post on the Google group asking faculty if they felt that they could make changes. She responded. “I did not know that we could deviate from the syllabus or create our own tests” (personal communication, March 1, 2010). As a new hire, my concern was getting her into the class with the required materials and not so much focused upon empowering her to make changes. I erroneously assumed that only the faculty who have been teaching before would have valuable input.

I am fortunate to have such a project paired so closely to my personal beliefs, as it not only made a significant pedagogical change, but changed the way that I see and interact with my own part-time faculty. Why was I so surprised and disappointed when the full-time faculty rejected my pleas to become part of the focus group? Apparently, my lack of understanding and conditioning prevented me from seeing the adjunct faculty’s dedication, and how they value and possess a genuine concern for students.

The research literature on adjunct faculty and their cooperation in my change project gave me a new perspective. But now that the communication channels have been opened between the adjuncts and me, I need to extend this openness so that it permeates the entire department. If I want to become a truly effective community college leader, creating, maintaining, and extending open communication channels between all full-time and part-time faculty needs to become a priority (Roueche & Roueche, 1996).

Persuasion. Mellow and Heelan (2008) claim that an important leadership characteristic is the ability to motivate. They closely relate this ability to Greenleaf’s

(1998) servant leadership attribute of persuasion. Throughout this study I remained persistent in persuading people that a change was needed. I began creating a sense of urgency with the full-time faculty, and then concentrated on the part-time faculty as I secured their attention through the focus group, training sessions, and Google group discussions. I relied on the research literature in the education field to show people the benefits of active over passive learning. During the focus group I pleaded for them to make a change, as I said:

So when I look at the student surveys, a lot of the comments that come back, the negative comments that come back, usually have to do with the lecture. It doesn't seem like students mind the lab too much. All of the research out there, anyone who is familiar with educational research, really says that you shouldn't be lecturing. And you shouldn't be standing in front of the class. So we say ok, let's use PowerPoint. Well if you just put slides up on the board, it's really lecturing. You tend to lose students. And that's pretty much the way people are tending to go; away from the lecture method and bringing some new stuff.

In an attempt to reach and persuade faculty who were not at the focus group, I posted a discussion on the Google groups site. This post not only referred to the sound educational reasoning behind the change, but also incorporated the political reasoning.

A long term goal here at the college is to change the way we teach. The evolution from passive learning to active learning is being stressed throughout higher education across the country. The idea is to spend less time lecturing (passive learning) and more time acting as a facilitator (active learning). The Information Technology course is scrutinized by a multitude of constituencies across the campus and we would like to show that not only what we teach, but HOW we teach is relevant. (personal communication, February 24, 2010)

And although my persuasive attitude persisted throughout the study, I also gave way to the adjunct faculty, letting them speak at the training session. They became passionate about the changes they made and the other adjunct faculty listened and inquired about their techniques and successes. Servant leadership is about creating future leaders (Reflective Journal, January, 2010).

Conceptualization and foresight. I visualized a course that could change. I envisioned a course that would evolve utilizing technology as a method for promoting student engagement. According to Kotter (1996), a successful leader has the ability to paint a picture of what the future will look like and also convey the logistics on how it will be achieved. However, I only set the visionary seed. Through my persuasive mechanisms, the adjunct faculty rapidly developed their own conceptual models of how the course should evolve. During the focus group, I attempted to illustrate the current status of the course and provide rationale and guidance for what I believed the course could potentially evolve into. In addressing the faculty I said, “We are looking at moving away from just the slide behind you to involving the students more.” In an effort to encourage the faculty, I also added, “So I am giving you latitude to pick something that is interesting as far as technology goes and try it.”

I learned that the ability to envision the future does not happen by chance. As a leader, you need to be removed from your departmental silo and involved throughout your organization and your field of study. Foresight cannot happen in a vacuum.

My ability to successfully conceptualize and communicate a significant change created an impact that reached beyond just the initiative at hand. Faculty were stimulated and began to conceptualize on their own. They produced their own visions and shared them with their peers. This led to a stronger bond between faculty, a stronger sense of community and belonging, and a stronger sense of responsibility on their part. Again, all traits that can be found within a servant leader were appearing within people who helped forge a change.

Stewardship. From my own personal perspective, the ability to hold the trust of all constituencies belonging to the educational community is the most profound characteristic of leadership. Myran et al. (1995) view a successful community college leader as one who has a strong sense of stewardship and personally values community college ideals. Stewardship means caring for the health of the institution and the people who are involved. It is the ability to personally accept ownership and responsibility. As I reflect upon my leadership within the chair's position, I see that my sense of stewardship has increased, and it has become more apparent how it tightly integrates within my personal code of ethics.

To maintain a healthy organization, leadership needs to create change in response to pressure from external forces (Kotter, 1996). Leadership must be able to see the need for change, envision the change, and implement the change as to benefit the community. I believe that this leadership project demonstrated my ability to see a need for change and carry it through for the benefit of my department, teachers, and students. Empowering others also effectively extends the concept of stewardship to others, therefore spanning and bridging conceptual elements between servant and democratic educational leadership theories.

However, it is difficult making decisions that balance the needs of the constituencies involved as well as persuading others that this shift in responsibilities and ownership needs to occur. Full-time faculty were reluctant to share ownership. At a department meeting, one full-time commented on part-time faculty making substantial changes, saying, "Adjuncts should be sticking to the syllabus" (Reflective Journal, December, 2009).

Some part-time faculty were not convinced that students had the ability to assume ownership of their education. At the onset, students told faculty that the concept would not work. One student approached Sally and remarked, "Group projects don't work. Kids at Shorelands are all lazy and I wind up doing all the work." But the faculty possessed the foresight to see that students should and could seek ownership of the educational process. By persuading faculty to utilize Web 2.0 collaborative software, both students and faculty became empowered to contribute to a better way of learning.

If not handled correctly, a strong sense of stewardship can cause problems, especially when viewing an organization through a political frame (Bolman & Deal, 2003). As my term in the chair's position progressed, and as I became more deeply involved in this project, I became more protective of my department. I became more argumentative and cynical in response to actions generated by forces outside my department. Therefore a problem arises as one takes ownership and responsibility from a reactive and protective stance rather than from a proactive stance, assuming the former can lead to stagnation, while the latter can help foster change and growth. While a defensive attitude is certainly warranted at times, it does not foster growth within the individual.

Commitment to growth of people and community building. From the onset of this study, my main concern was to change the method that a course was delivered in order to make it more engaging for both the students and faculty involved. What transpired was not only a more active environment, but a change in the faculty. They became more involved and a more closely integrated part of the equation. Within my

personal code of ethics I state that I believe that it is the responsibility of the community to help all individuals grow intellectually, socially, and psychologically.

The community, not the leader, is charged with growth. It is the leader's task to provide an avenue free of obstacles that will allow participants to help each other grow. Through their efforts, the faculty demonstrated that as a cooperative unit, they were able to help each other. Like the faculty in their classroom, my role also changed. I became the facilitator, not the leader, as I provided the impetus for change, the inspiration, the rationale, and the tools. Through the focus group, Google groups, and training sessions, comments from faculty trace an outline of events that led to a commitment to helping each other grow while fostering a stronger sense of community.

In reference to the focus group meeting, Sally commented about her interaction with another adjunct faculty member, Matt, who contributed several ideas. "Matt. I got a lot out of what he said. He seems like a great guy. I think that you can learn from each other." She quickly realized that she could extract sound educational practices from her peers. In reference to my plea during the training session in the summer of 2009, Robin reflected upon how she connected with Sally:

When we all got together, then for some reason, Sally and I got together afterwards and we started talking and we said why don't we try this or why don't we try that. And we both kind of kept together and by the end of the summer we had an idea of what were going to do. I used her stuff and she used some of my stuff and that worked well.

The faculty found that collaboration was a necessity for professional growth and that they could rely upon their community members to seek that growth. For Robin, she found the Google group as an extension to the physical community:

In teaching you have to understand that so many times you try things and it doesn't work. You spend a lot of time preparing for it but it may or may not work

and that is what I find. And it is frustrating so you just kind of ok, that didn't work, let me try something else. That is why the collaboration with all of the other teachers really helps too. So then you can say this didn't work so don't try it. I have learned a lot from what people have written in the Google groups.

From utilizing that online community, Molly was drawn in and the process had come full circle. Through meeting with Sally in person, Molly was able to implement changes in her pedagogical methods. Her comments detailed this process:

I knew what Sally was doing that last semester so I kept asking her how it was going. Then I contacted her, I guess in December and said I wanted to do this. I wanted to implement this. I really liked to start with you have if that is ok so we schedule a meeting and we both came here and she shared everything with me. I reviewed her topics. I think that I gave her a suggestion of one topic that I had that she replaced hers. And then I will probably give her my feedback on what I am changing.

I had previously described how I felt during a classroom evaluation conducted by my academic dean and my commitment to active learning. A most disturbing revelation occurred after reflecting upon this scenario. I recalled an incident that occurred five years prior, when I had just inherited the department chair position. As part of my duties, I was evaluating an adjunct faculty member who was teaching the Information Technology course. The faculty member was not specifically teaching a lesson, but was walking around the room talking to the students about slideshows that they were creating. The students were allowed to create a presentation about any subject that they wanted. The classroom seemed lively, but what the teacher was covering was not dictated by the syllabus.

After the semester ended, I decided to dismiss the person, not hiring him back the next semester. The reasoning went beyond his classroom presentations and involved his arbitrary use of department-mandated tests. But what I failed to see was the interaction that was occurring between the students and between the students and faculty. I

incorrectly assumed that the faculty was not doing his job at that point in time. Had I been familiar with the active learning research, I would have approached the situation differently. I would have utilized his classroom strategy as a positive area from which to draw constructive criticism. Instead of dismissing this person, I should have looked at what he was doing correctly and helped him grow professionally into a better instructor.

Empowering others. According to Batten (1998), servant leaders not only serve others, but they empower as well. I believe that I was able to change the environment where adjunct faculty felt empowered to make substantive changes. It started when I assembled a focus group, encouraging them to offer their insight into the current state of the lecture, and to soliciting their thoughts of incorporating active learning techniques into the lecture utilizing technology. It then progressed as I stepped in front of the adjunct faculty at the summer training session and challenged them to be creative and collaborate on making changes. Comments from Sally demonstrated her feelings about the latitude she possessed before and after I started this research. When asked if she recalled when a change occurred she stated,

This year. Starting with the end of last spring right. You had your first meeting about that. From there forward. Before that, maybe it was my inexperience. I did not feel like I should change anything. I thought that it was important that it was the same for every class.

This was unusual for me. I consider myself extremely reserved and normally tend to shy away from speaking out. When I first began my service as department chair, I rarely spoke in forums attended by my peers or supervisors. I do not consider myself as motivational or inspiring. However, I did feel passionate about making this important change and it seemed as if it became easier to address, motivate, and challenge faculty. Sally and Robin were the two adjunct faculty who spearheaded the change. Like Sally,

Robin also shared her feelings on being empowered to collaborate and become creative within bounds, saying,

Yes. Just the fact that you inspired this to all happen I think. Yes I feel like I can. I feel like as long as I am covering the material in the syllabus, if I am covering it all, the way that I cover it is really up to me. As long as I am covering it then I can do it the way that I feel that I need to.

Molly came on board after discussing the changes with the other two faculty.

Even though she became involved a semester later, her comment showed that she also felt empowered to become involved:

Oh, absolutely. I feel that I have been able to. You know, there haven't been any problems with it. I start with the syllabus and I try to incorporate, you know, what I want to incorporate into it. I use everything that is provided to me. It is not like I eliminate certain things, I just try to work my things into it. And if I have any issues, I will either talk to you or Professor Baily.

Inspiring future leadership. While various elements surrounding my servant leadership gradually surfaced, the most important element proved to be how the faculty involved changed. Acting as a servant leader means much more than simply helping people succeed in what they are attempting. The test of a successful servant leader is how the people putting forth the effort have changed. In this case, the three adjunct faculty changed within their instructional role, but they also developed as leaders themselves. They led the change effort but they also took on the role and responsibilities of becoming role models for the other faculty. They spread the message about active learning through their online posting as well as their actions at the January training session (personal communication, January 28, 2010).

During that session, all three were eager to talk and the other adjunct faculty readily listened and asked about them to share resources. Not only were they eager, but they seemed confident to talk about what they did. In essence, they had taken over the

cause from me. From the onset of the study I had been the one standing in front of the faculty making my plea for faculty to change (Reflective Journal, January, 2010).

At one point I felt guilty having these instructors assume a portion of my leadership role. During the interviews I had asked the faculty if they minded standing and speaking in front of the other faculty. Robin quickly replied, “No. I like that stuff. I like working with people. I tend to learn a lot from people. I like coordinating things.” Her previous occupation was that of a manager, which may have contributed to her feeling comfortable speaking in front of her peers. This exposure to people and her drive to make meaningful change may have been a contributing factor in her willingness to become part of the change coalition.

Sally felt the same. She saw a need for adjunct faculty to be better exposed to sound educational practices. She commented that, “I was just amazed that this is an educational environment and there is so little education for the teachers.” When asked if she felt burdened being called upon to be one that provides that educational leadership, she responded, “No. I don’t mind it in the least. I just felt like it was the very partially sighted leading the blind.” She was also acutely aware that she had grown as a leader. “I feel more comfortable now. I am really amazed that you would pick me.”

In addition to speaking at meetings, the adjunct faculty continued to post and contribute to online discussions. Most noted was their willingness to post and share their complete and revised syllabus with the other adjunct faculty in the department. I was excited as I watched the faculty interact and collaborate.

I witnessed the culmination of their leadership on display during the beginning of the spring 2011 term as Sally and Molly met in the faculty office to plan changes for the

upcoming semester. They would normally meet at the adjunct stations that are at the back, secluded corner of the Computer Science office. For the first time, they moved to the conference table where the full-time faculty conduct department meetings.

Although a small gesture, it made me feel like I had accomplished my leadership role by making them feel like significant contributors and members of our department. They sat down, spread their papers across the table, and began working (Reflective Journal, December, 2010).

As a leader and the chair of the department, I continually walked a fine line. I never coerced a person into work that they did not want to do. I only asked for volunteers and then nurtured the needs of those people so that they may succeed. The three faculty who were a guiding coalition possessed the desire and drive to change what they were doing, become advocates for that change, and were willing to grow into a leadership role. From a servant leadership perspective, it is the leader's task to recognize those traits and desires, and then foster them.

Through their words, the faculty proved that servant leadership does work. They commented numerous times about not only how they had evolved, but how their students changed as well. They also found that as a person with power in the classroom, the same skills in enticing rather than forcing their students to lead must be exhibited. They witnessed how students evolved into leaders and how they stepped forward to take charge.

Democratic educational leadership. My belief in democratic leadership never wavered, but only grew stronger with the success of the project. Bell (2009) recognizes the need to balance the community's needs with those of the individual, and it is here that

the ideals of democratic educational leadership intersect with those of servant leadership. Dewey (1944) and Foster (1986) see the need for leaders to act as change agents so that education can progress. Dewey (1944) insists that the individual become responsible for his own education. Education becomes a collaborative process that involves all participants, not just the faculty as the disseminator, and the student as the receptor of knowledge.

The project drew all the individuals into the process. Students were no longer bystanders. They were charged with collaborating with their peers and teaching one another. I fostered an environment that allowed faculty to develop their own goals while charging their students to become engaged and responsible for their education (Reitzug & O'Hair, 2002). There was a careful balance that required the cooperation of all participants. In the end, the faculty learned as much as the students. Education did evolve.

I strongly believe that all people who are affected by change should be included in the process. I extended the invitation to participate in the change to all faculty, both full-time and part-time. As I witnessed only the part-time faculty willingly participate, I felt a loss of community, but also felt the need to press on (Reflective Journal, April, 2009). My goal was to create a community of people who shared a common passion for improving education. However, reaching faculty who teach at various off campus centers, teach only one night per week, or do not teach every semester could limit participation. My response was to create an online community so all people could participate, contribute, collaborate, and learn from one another.

Robin witnessed how the process unfolded and how it required the participation from both faculty and students. She commented on how the part-time faculty acted as a

cohesive group, collaborating through using Google groups, and how that collaborative process was passed down to our students. She said, “And this way, everybody has an opportunity to participate. It is the same way with the classes. We want the kids to collaborate so we should be collaborating too.”

Robin became part of a powerful reciprocal effect defined by democratic education. A relationship evolved around and between the faculty and students. She had become a leader, but she became a more integral part of the educational equation. Robin became a student as she learned from her class, saying, “I mean, I am learning stuff.”

The data proved that the educational process did evolve and became stronger and student centered. The student was no longer on the outside looking in, but rather an integral part of the educational process. I believe that this project demonstrated my commitment to the third and fourth elements in my personal code of ethics, which are also reciprocal, stating that the community must take care of the individual and that the individual is responsible for the health and welfare of his or her community.

Transactional leadership. Prior to this study, I spent a significant amount of time reflecting on and analyzing my leadership. I found that I was a strong believer in communitarianism. I found that my leadership core revolved around the symbiotic relationship between the growth of the individual, and the health and growth of the community. My beliefs were heavily vested in the actions taken to stimulate the necessary change and growth process. I paid little attention to the necessary transactional piece, believing that leadership must concentrate on the loftier transformational aspect of change. However, my leadership journal and interviews with faculty reveal the actual

depth of labor that I invested in the transactional side (Burns, 1995; Conger, 1995; Judge & Piccolo, 2004).

Both Kotter (1996) and Schein (2004) elaborate on the differences between management and leadership. For both, leadership is about creation. From Kotter's (1996) perspective, leadership produces change. A leader inspires, builds coalitions, creates a vision, and guides others to achieve that vision. Schein (2004) believes that a leader creates a new culture. Kotter (1996) believes that a manager's role is subservient to a leadership role. A manager secures and allocates the necessary resources to accomplish tasks. Schein (2004) sees a manager not as creating culture, but as one who has the ability to function within an established culture.

However, from a servant leadership perspective, these elements are truly necessary elements of leadership. Change cannot happen without securing necessary resources. If the idea of servant leadership is to serve others and inspire them to become leaders in their own right, the leader must be willing and able to provide for them.

My leadership journal revealed the amount of time that I spend on performing transactional duties on behalf of my department. These tasks included scheduling of classes, preparing budgets and reports, meeting with supervisors, evaluating part-time faculty, and representing the department at various college-wide committees and meetings (Reflective Journal, 2009; Reflective Journal, 2010). Without me performing these tasks, faculty would not be able carry out theirs. I take on these tasks in order for faculty to concentrate on what they need to do in order to deliver a quality course and fulfill their needs.

However, I discovered that I had to be careful within my transactional role. The true role of transactional leadership should be to complement my other leadership roles. The emphasis needs to be on securing resources in order to produce change and growth within the individual and community, but if not careful, transactional leadership can enable stagnation rather than change. I often found myself contemplating this paradox, and my journal writing revealed a subtle discovery detailing what can happen when transactional leadership acts without taking into account the other theories:

This week's past events have made me realize the greatest difference between transactional and servant leadership. As a transactional leader, people come to you with problems, looking for solutions. As a servant leader, people come to you with ideas. They want to make changes and try new things. They are looking to share ideas and spread them to others. As a transactional leader, people are looking for comfort. They look to you to ease change and help them protect what they see as right. (Reflective Journal, September, 2010)

As a servant leader, I realize that I need to act as a transactional leader for the right cause. If I expend my energies on efforts that secure resources to protect my department, but also enable the individuals in the department to maintain the status quo, then I have done a disservice to both the individual and the community. While the individual may feel secure for the immediate future, they are put at risk for the long term. Additionally, resources gathered, but unwisely invested produce no significant benefit to the student or educational process as a whole.

From a transactional viewpoint, I queried the faculty, asking them what they viewed being my role as department chair. I was interested in seeing how they perceived my leadership from this angle. When asked what she thought my role should be, Robin responded,

Just what you are doing. I mean having the meetings, coordinating, providing to us what we are suppose to teach, the syllabus, what the course content should be, and helping us with any problems that we might have with teaching.

Although her thoughts would align with what Kotter (1996) views as a managerial role, it is difficult to envision a change that could occur without these actions.

From a transactional perspective, I found that the most important task proved to be establishing sound communication avenues. The adjunct faculty found that having an online discussion tool, in addition to in person meetings and training events, enhanced collaboration. Reporting back to full-time faculty events that transpired at various meetings enabled me to legitimize the need to change. For people who dwell within individual silos, communicating the political forces on the outside sheds light on the need to break from the status quo.

Political leadership. As I constructed my leadership platform throughout my doctoral education, I paid little attention to how I reacted to political forces within my department and my institution. I firmly believed that my leadership actions were grounded in servant and democratic educational leadership theories. However, upon analyzing my leadership journal, it is strikingly obvious how I changed as a leader, and how political forces have caused this change.

Early events within my life have caused me to become quiet and reserved. I do not speak out often unless I feel extremely comfortable within the environment. Because I spoke less, I tended to listen more. Since my term as department chair began, this has changed. I have become more in tuned to agendas, both stated and hidden, as well as statements and actions that are exercised by individuals throughout the institution. As a

result, I have become more argumentative and combative. As a transactional leader, this change was necessary.

This initial view of my leadership emerged from incorrectly framing my own institution. At the time that I constructed my first leadership platform draft, I only viewed my institution through structural and symbolic frames (Bolman & Deal, 2003). Until I became more entrenched in a leadership role, I ignored the political frame. My leadership role as chair caused me to become more acutely aware of my institution's political nature, and that awareness had a profound impact on my leadership. I was required to interact with more people on a broader basis. This, in turn, impacted my servant and transactional leadership in addition to my change theory.

It is simple to see the structural and symbolic elements of any college (Bolman & Deal, 2003). For example, most every college has a seal, an inspiring mission statement, a motto, and graduation ceremonies with appropriate attire and symbolisms. The college is also structural in nature as the faculty are divided into ranks and separated from administration and staff. However, as funding declines, the institution's political nature surfaces.

Bolman and Deal (2003) characterize a political organization as one consisting of diverse coalitions that possess individual agendas and compete for scarce resources. The task of the leader is to create an agenda for change that will position the organization to favorably respond to external forces. In line with Kotter (1996), Bolman and Deal (2003) state that it is the leader's responsibility to create a vision for change and to build a coalition that will work to meet that vision. Bolman and Deal (2003) add that a successful

leader must have the ability to view his organization through a political frame in order to become aware of agendas, relationships, power, and communication channels.

I began this study as response to an educational process that disturbed me. Upon evaluating adjunct faculty, I believed that the educational environment was unhealthy for the student. I truly felt uncomfortable during those evaluations. The lectures lacked interest, engagement, and participation. I felt that the learning experience should be more collaborative and interactive. Democratic educational leadership was initially guiding my response (Reflective Journal, March, 2009). As I began to challenge faculty to explore methods for delivering the course utilizing alternative and engaging methods, the political organization began to make an impact and my response to those forces mutated my rationale for change.

Being involved in college-wide committees enabled me to closely view agendas as they unfolded, and these agendas had the potential to negatively impact my department (Reflective Journal, December, 2009). The pressures for creating this change stemmed from varied constituents, each having something to gain. In my view, the agendas were pushed relentlessly by individuals with little knowledge of the course content. Combating the repetitive pressures imparted by leaders who were unwilling to listen became frustrating and exhausting. As they mounted, I reacted by becoming more outspoken and argumentative. At one point I wrote, "I am not sure if I am becoming stubborn or confident." (Reflective Journal, February, 2010). But as I became more exposed to others, and more comfortable with my leadership role, I quickly realized that I had changed in favor of confidence. A journal entry reveals how the need to react to political forces had made me more assertive:

Just thinking about how I have progressed as a leader since I have gone through the Rowan program. I am much more forward and outspoken. I have more confidence. I think that it is because over the past 3 years I have been totally immersed in the community college literature. I have talked to my colleagues each week about the community college. In a way, each of us has become an expert in the community college system. I feel comfortable volunteering for committees and contributing when I serve. In the past, I would largely remain silent. (Reflective Journal, February 2010)

I also found the need to seek a sense of solidarity within my department. As I routinely communicated the climate within the institution, I repetitively asked for their advice and told them that we need to find a solution together. However, solutions need to be creative when limited by power. Bolman and Deal (2003) point out that change can occur even without power, from the bottom up, when approached with passion and solidarity.

I found that I was disturbed by the length of time that it took me to become accustomed to my leadership role. As I read through my leadership journal, comments seemed to echo and mirror the evolution that I pass through in any leadership role that I take on. I am often reserved and cautious, taking time to become comfortable with my situation and the people around me. I have a need to understand the power structure surrounding me, and how it could affect me. My assumption is that I rely on expert and referent power in response to a structural organization where figures have clear legitimate authority. It takes time to build the relationships required of referent power as well as time to demonstrate to others that you do possess the required expertise. I only desire to expedite the process in which I become comfortable and exercise that power.

Limitations and Further Actions

Limitations. Because action research is meant to solve a specific problem that is germane to specific and limited parties, numerous limitations exist within this study. I have found that the strategies utilized by the instructors have produced outcomes that are consistent with the research literature. However, because this study intimately involved my leadership and my institution, it would be difficult to generalize all the findings beyond my environment. This is not to say that the study did not reveal important information or usable results.

This study was narrow in scope. It focused upon a single department within a single institution. Because it was a bound case study (Creswell, 2009), it further focused upon faculty and students who enrolled at only one site of a multisite campus. I am aware, through journal entries and group postings, that the students who enroll in the Information Technology course sections off the main campus have different needs, attributes, and expectations.

Next steps. The data that were collected and analyzed throughout this study did prove invaluable, at least from my point of view. Future action would require sharing the results of this study with all faculty in some manner. I have started exposing full-time faculty to the pedagogical changes implemented by the part-time faculty by leveraging the adjunct evaluation process. I have already assigned full-time faculty to evaluate each part-time faculty, and have had the evaluations returned to me for review. Each full-time faculty had made numerous positive comments on the part-time faculty's evaluations, and each adjunct faculty had received consistently excellent marks in each evaluation category.

The challenge will be to expose the larger adjunct contingency to these pedagogical strategies. Working on getting more involvement in the Google groups discussion will most likely be a perfect place to start. Each semester, I request adjunct faculty to email their next semester course requests to me. I think that if I do this through Google groups, I may have a better chance of getting each instructor to login to their account, perhaps exposing them to the conversations surrounding pedagogy.

Continuing with my belief in democratic educational leadership, I went directly to the faculty and asked them for their thoughts on how we should extend these changes into the future. The adjunct faculty were quick to respond with various suggestions, but the underlying theme was that we need to get people together, collaborate, and talk.

Finally, I know that the change has had a positive effect upon community building and engagement. However, I am uncertain to how the change has quantitatively affected grades and attendance. The next important step would be to analyze and compare test scores and grades between sections taught by the faculty in the guiding coalition to those who are continuing to lecture. This would extend the study and perhaps satisfy questions concerning the legitimacy of active learning by people who insist on using quantitative assessment values as a means for judging academic success.

References

- Ajjan, H., & Hartshorne, R. (2008). Investigating faculty decisions to adopt Web 2.0 technologies: Theory and empirical tests. *The Internet and Higher Education*, 11(2), 71-80.
- Argyris, C. (1990). *Overcoming organizational defenses: Facilitating organizational learning*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Astin, A. W. (1993). What matters in college? *Liberal Education*, 79(4), 4-26.
- Bank, B. J., Slavings, R. L., & Biddle, B. J. (1990). Effects of peer, Faculty, and parental influences on students' persistence. *Sociology of Education*, 63, 208-225.
- Barr, R. B., & Tagg, J. (1995, November/December). A new paradigm for undergraduate education. *Change*, 27(6), 12-25.
- Batten, J. (1998). Servant-Leadership: A passion to serve. In L. Spears (Ed.), *Insights on leadership* (pp. 38-53). New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons.
- Bean, J. C., & Peterson, D. (1998). Grading classroom participation. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, 74, 33-40.
- Bell, D. (2009). *Communitarianism*. Retrieved March 13, 2009 from Stanford University, The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy Web site:
<http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/spr2009/entries/communitarianism/>.
- Benner, R. B. (2007). Virtue theory and leadership theory: Cross-cultural models for administrators and faculty. In D. M. Hellmich (Ed.), *Ethical leadership in the community college: Bridging theory and daily practice* (pp. 2 - 15). Boston, MA: Anker Publishing Company.
- Bergquist, W. H., & Pawlak, K. (2008). *Engaging the six cultures of the academy*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Berry, W. (2008). Surviving lecture: A pedagogical alternative. *College Teaching*, 56(3), 149-153.
- Black, L. W. (2005). Dialogue in the lecture hall: Teacher-student communication and students' perceptions of their learning. *Qualitative Research Reports in Communication*, 6(1), 31-40.
- Bloom, B. (1956). *Taxonomy of educational objectives: Cognitive domain*. New York, NY: Longman.
- Bolman, L. G., & Deal, T. E. (2003). *Reframing organizations: Artistry, choice, and leadership* (3rd ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

- Boniecki, K. A., & Moore, S. (2003). Breaking the silence: Using a token economy to reinforce classroom participation. *Teaching of Psychology, 30*(3), 224-227.
- Bonwell, C. C., & Eison, J. A. (1991). *Active learning: Creating excitement in the classroom*. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report No. 1, Washington, DC.
- Braxton, J. M., Jones, W. A., Hirschy, A. S., & Hartley, H. V. (2008). The role of active learning in college student persistence. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning, 115*, 71-83.
- Braxton, J. M., Milem, J. F., & Sullivan, S. S. (2000). The influence of active learning on the college student departure process: Toward a revision of Tinto's Theory. *The Journal of Higher Education, 71*(5), 569-590.
- Burns, J. M. (1995). Transactional and transforming leadership. In J. T. Wren (Ed.), *The Leader's companion: Insights on leadership through the ages* (pp. 100-101). New York, NY: The Free Press.
- Chickering, A. W., & Gamson, Z. F. (1987). Seven principles of good practice in undergraduate education. *AAHE Bulletin, 39*(7), 2-6.
- Ciulla, J. B. (2003). *The ethics of leadership*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth, Cengage Learning.
- Cohen, A. M., & Brawer, F. B. (2008). *The American community college* (10th ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Collis, B., & Moonen, J. (2008). Web 2.0 tools and processes in higher education: Quality perspectives. *Educational Media International, 45*(2), 93-106.
- Community College Survey of Student Engagement. (2010). Retrieved from http://www.ccsse.org/publications/national_report_2010/36379tw/CCCSE_2010_national_report.pdf
- Conger, J. A. (1999). Charismatic and transformational leadership in organizations: An insider's perspective on these developing streams of research. *Leadership Quarterly, 10*(2), 145-170.
- Couto, R. A. (1995). Defining a citizen leader. In J. T. Wren (Ed.), *The Leader's companion: Insights on leadership through the ages* (pp. 11-17). New York, NY: The Free Press.
- Creswell, J. W. (2007). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Creswell, J. W. (2009). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

- Cronin, T. E. (1995). Leadership and democracy. In J. T. Wren (Ed.), *The Leader's companion: Insights on leadership through the ages* (pp. 303-309). New York, NY: The Free Press.
- Cronk, B. C. (2006). How to use SPSS®: A step-by-step guide to analysis and interpretation (4th ed.). Glendale, CA: Pycszak Publishing.
- Dallimore, E. J., Hertenstein, J. H., & Platt, M. B. (2004). Classroom participation and discussion effectiveness: Student-generated strategies. *Communication Education*, 53(1), 103-115.
- Dewey, J. (1944, 1916). *Democracy and education*. New York, NY: The Free Press.
- Fassinger, P. A. (1995). Professors' and students' perceptions of why students participate in class. *Teaching Sociology*, 24, 25-33.
- Foster, W. (1986). Paradigms and promises: *New approaches to educational administration*. Amherst, NY: Prometheus Books.
- Frey, B., & Birnbaum, P. (2002). Learners' perceptions on the use of PowerPoint in lectures. *Computers and Education*, 41, 72-86.
- Fritschner, L. M. (2000). Inside the undergraduate college classroom: Faculty and students differ on the meaning of student participation. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 71(3), 342-362.
- Gappa, J. M., & Leslie, D. W. (1993). *The invisible faculty: Improving the status of part-timers in higher education*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- George, B. (2007). *True north: Discover your authentic leadership*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Gier, V. S., & Kreiner, D.S. (2009). Incorporating active learning with PowerPoint lectures using content-based questions. *Teaching of Psychology*, 36, 134-139.
- Glesne, C. (2006). *Becoming qualitative researchers: An introduction* (3rd Ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson Education.
- Google. (2011). Welcome to Google Groups. Retrieved from <http://www.google.com/intl/en/googlegroups/overview.html>
- Greenleaf, R. (1998). Servant-leadership. In L. Spears (Ed.), *Insights on leadership* (pp. 15-20). New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons.
- Hashemzadeh, N., & Wilson, L. (2007). Teaching with the lights out: What do we really know about the impact of technology intensive instruction? *College Student Journal*, 41(3), 601-612.

- Hellmich, D. M. (Ed.). (2007). *Ethical leadership in the community college: Bridging theory with daily practice*. Boston, MA: Anker Publishing Company.
- Herr, K., & Anderson, G. L. (2005). *The action research dissertation: A guide for students and faculty*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Hinchey, P. H. (2008). *Action research*. New York, NY: Peter Lang Publishing.
- Howard, J. R., & Henney, A. L. (1998). Student participation and instructor gender in the mixed-age college classroom. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 69(4), 384-405.
- Howard, J. R., Short, L. B., & Clark, S. M. (1996). Students' participation in the mixed-age college classroom. *Teaching Sociology*, 24, 8-24.
- Hughes, R. L., Ginnett, R. C., & Curphy, J. G. (1995). In J. T. Wren (Ed.), *The Leader's companion: Insights on leadership through the ages* (pp. 339-351). New York, NY: The Free Press.
- Judge, T. A., & Piccolo, R. F. (2004). Transformational and Transactional leadership: A meta-analytic test of their relative validity. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89(5), 755-768.
- Kanter, R. M. (2001). *Evolve!* Boston, MA: Harvard Business Press.
- Kennedy, G., Dalgarno, B., Gray, K., Judd, T., Waycott, J., Bennett, ... Churchward A. (2007). The net generation are not big users of Web 2.0 technologies: Preliminary findings. In ICT: Providing choices for learners and learning. Proceedings of the Australian Society for Computing in Learning in Tertiary Education, Singapore. Retrieved from <http://www.ascilite.org.au/conferences/singapore07/procs/kennedy.pdf>
- Kight, J. K., & Wood, W. B. (2005). Teaching more by lecturing less. *Cell Biology Education*, 4, 298-310.
- Kirkpatrick, S. A., & Locke, E. A. (1995). Leadership: Do traits matter? In J. T. Wren (Ed.), *The Leader's companion: Insights on leadership through the ages* (pp. 133-143). New York, NY: The Free Press.
- Klemm, W. R. (2007). Computer slide shows: A trap for bad teaching. *College Teaching*, 55(3), 121-124.
- Komaraju, M., & Karau, S. J. (2008). Relationships between the perceived value of instructional techniques and academic motivation. *Journal of Instructional Psychology*, 43(4), 70-82.
- Kotter, J. P. (1996). *Leading change*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.

- Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (1993). *Credibility: How leaders gain and lose it, why people demand it*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Kraft, R. G. (1985). Group inquiry turns passive students active. *College Teaching*, 33, 149-154.
- Krathwohl, D. R. (2002). A revision of Bloom's taxonomy: An overview. *Theory into Practice*, 41(4), 212-218.
- Kuh, G. D. (2009). The national survey of student engagement: Conceptual and empirical foundations. *New Directions for Institutional Research*, 141, 5-20.
- Lammers, W. J., & Murphy, J. J. (2002). A profile of teaching techniques in a university classroom: A descriptive profile of a US public university. *Active Learning in Higher Education*, 3(1), 54-67.
- Lei, S. A. (2007). Teaching practices of instructors in two community colleges in a western state. *Education*, 128(1), 148-160.
- Lencioni, P. (2002). *The five dysfunctions of a team: A leadership fable*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Li, L., & Pitts, J. P. (2009). Does it really matter: Using virtual office hours to enhance student-faculty interaction. *Journal of Information Systems Education*, 20(2), 175-185.
- Lucas, L. (2007). The interface of ethics and courage in the life of a chief academic officer. In D. M. Hellmich (Ed.), *Ethical leadership in the community college: Bridging theory and daily practice* (pp. 88 - 102). Boston, MA: Anker Publishing Company.
- Mabey, C. (1995). The making of a citizen leader. In J. T. Wren (Ed.), *The leader's companion: Insights on leadership through the ages* (pp. 310-317). New York, NY: The Free Press.
- Magolda, P. M., & Platt, G. J. (2009). Untangling Web 2.0's influences on student learning. *About Campus*, (July-August), 10-16.
- Maslow, A. H. (1954). *Motivation and personality*. New York, NY: Harper & Row.
- McDougall, D., & Granby, C. (1996). How expectation of questioning method affects undergraduates' preparation for class. *Journal of Experimental Education*, 65(1), 43.

- McLoughlin, C., & Lee, M. J. W. (2007). Social software and participatory learning: Pedagogical choices with technology affordances in the Web 2.0 era. In *ICT: Providing choices for learners and learning*. Proceedings of the Australian Society for Computing in Learning in Tertiary Education, Singapore. Retrieved from <http://www.ascilite.org.au/conferences/singapore07/procs/mcloughlin.pdf>
- McKeachie, W. J. (1999). *Teaching tips: Strategies, research, and theory for college and university teachers* (10th ed.). Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.
- McKinney, J. P., McKinney, K. G., Franiuk, R., & Schweitzer, J. (2006). The college classroom as a community: Impact on student attitudes and learning. *College Teaching*, 54(3), 281-284.
- McKinney, K. (2008). Active learning. Center for Teaching, Learning, & Technology. Retrieved from <http://www.cat.ilstu.edu/additional/tips/newactive.php>
- Meera, K., & Karau, S. J. (2008). Relationships between the perceived value of instructional techniques and academic motivation. *Journal of Instructional Psychology*, 34(4), 70-82.
- Mellow, G. O., & Heelan, C. (2008). *Minding the dream: The process and practice of the American community college*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Messineo, M., Gaither, G., Bott, J., & Ritchey, K. (2007). Inexperienced versus experienced students' expectations for active learning in large classes. *College Teaching*, 55(3), 125-133.
- Michel, N., Carter, J., & Varela, O. (2009). Active versus passive teaching styles: An empirical study of student learning outcomes. *Small Business Institute National Proceedings*, 33(1), 55-67.
- Michael, J. (2007). Faculty perceptions about barriers to active learning. *College Teaching*, 55(2), 42-47.
- Miller, J. B. (1995). Domination/subordination. In J. T. Wren (Ed.), *The Leader's companion: Insights on leadership through the ages* (pp. 222-230). New York, NY: The Free Press.
- Myran, G., Zeiss, T., & Howdysshell, L. (1995). *Community college leadership in the new century: Learning to improve learning*. Washington, DC: American Association of Community Colleges.
- Napell, S. M. (1978). Using questions to enhance classroom learning. *Education*, 99(2), 188-197.
- O'Reilly, T. (2005, September). What Is Web 2.0? Design patterns and business models for the next generation of software. Retrieved from <http://oreilly.com/web2/archive/what-is-web-20.html>.

- Owen, P. S., & Demb, A. (2004). Change dynamics and leadership in technology implementation. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 75(6), 636-666.
- Pascarella, E. T. (1980). Student-faculty informal contact and college outcomes. *Review of Educational Research*, 50(4), 545-595.
- Pascarella, E. T., Duby P. B., & Iverson, B. K. (1983). A test and reconceptualization of a theoretical model of college withdrawal in a commuter institution setting. *Sociology of Education*, 56, 88-100.
- Pascarella, E. T., & Terenzini, P. T. (1977). Patterns of student-faculty informal interaction beyond the classroom and voluntary freshman attrition. *Journal of Higher Education*, 48(5), 540-552.
- Pascarella, E. T., & Terenzini, P. T. (1980). Predicting freshman persistence and voluntary dropout decisions from a theoretical model. *Journal of Higher Education*, 51(1), 60-75.
- Patten, M. L. (2001). *Questionnaire research: A practical guide* (2nd ed.). Los Angeles, CA: Pyrczak Publishing.
- Paulson, D. R., & Faust, J. L. (2008). Active learning for the college classroom. Retrieved from <http://www.calstatela.edu/dept/chem/chem2/Active/main.htm>
- Prince, M. (2004). Does active learning work: A review of the research. *Journal of Engineering Education*, 93(3), 223-231.
- Pocock, J. G. A. (1976). The classical theory of deference. *The American Historical Review*, 81 (3), 516-523.
- Powner, L., & Allendoerfer, M. (2008). Evaluating hypotheses about active learning. *International Studies Perspectives*, 9(1), 75-89.
- Reinsch, R., & Wambsganss, J. (1994). Class participation: How it affects results on examinations. *Journal of Education for Business*, 70(1), 33.
- Reitzug, U. C., & O'Hair, M. J. (2002). Tensions and struggles in moving toward a democratic school community. In G. Furman (Ed.), *School as community: From promise to practice* (pp. 119-141). Albany, NY: SUNY Press.
- Roueche, J. E., & Roueche, S. D. (1996). Identifying the strangers: Exploring part-time faculty integration in American community colleges. *Community College Review*, 23 (4), 33-49.
- Sanders, M. E. (2000). Career decision-making self efficacy, perceived stress, and an integrated model of student persistence: A structural model of finances, attitudes, behavior, and career development. *Research in Higher Education*, 41(5), 537-580.

- Schein, E. H. (2004). *Organizational culture and leadership* (3rd ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Senge, P. (1999). *The dance of change*. New York, NY: Doubleday.
- Shapiro, J. P., & Stefkovich, J. A. (2005). *Ethical leadership and decision making in education* (2nd ed.). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Shimazoe, J., & Aldrich, H. (2010). Group work can be gratifying: Understanding and overcoming resistance to cooperative learning. *College Teaching*, 58, 52-57.
- Slavin, R. E. (1983). When does cooperative learning increase student achievement? *Psychological Bulletin*, 94, 429-445.
- Spears, L. (2010). Character and servant leadership: Ten characteristics of effective, caring leaders. *The Journal of Virtues and Leadership*, 1(1), 25-30.
- Strage, A. (2008). Traditional and non-traditional college student's descriptions of the "ideal" professor and the "ideal" course perceived strengths and limitations. *College Student Journal*, 42(1), 225-232.
- Straus, L. C., & Volkwein, F. J. (2004). Predictors of student commitment at two-year and four-year institutions. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 75(2), 203-227.
- Tinto, V. (1975). Dropout from higher education: A theoretical synthesis of recent research. *Review of Educational Research*, 45(1), 89-125.
- Tinto, V. (1997). Classrooms as communities: Exploring the educational character of student persistence. *Journal of Higher Education*, 68(6), 599-623.
- Ullah, H., & Wilson, M. A. (2007). Students' academic success and its association to student involvement with learning and relationships with faculty and peers. *College Student Journal*, 41(4), 1192-1202.
- Umbach, P. D., & Wawrzynski, M. R. (2004, June). *Faculty do matter: The role of college faculty in student learning and engagement*. Paper presented at the Forum of the Association for Institutional Research, Boston, MA.
- Walling, D. L. (2007). Ethical leadership: The role of the president. In D. H. Hellmich (Ed.), *Ethical leadership in the community college: Bridging theory and daily practice* (pp. 33-45). Boston, MA: Anker Publishing Company.
- Weaver, R. R., & Qi, J. (2005). Classroom organization and participation: College student's perceptions. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 76(5), 570-601.
- Whitney, D. & Trosten-Bloom, A. (2003). *The power of appreciative inquiry: A practical guide to positive change*. San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler Publishers.

Yair, G.(2000). Educational battlefields in America: The tug-of-war over students' engagement with instruction. *Sociology of Instruction*, 73, 247-269.

Yazedjian, A., & Kolkhorst, B. B. (2007). Implementing small-group activities in large lecture classes. *College Teaching*, 55(4), 164-169.

Appendix A

Preliminary Student Survey

Directions: Please answer each question as it relates to your experience in the lecture component of this class only. Please note that there are 2 pages with 29 questions.

1. I frequently participate in class discussions.

Strongly agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly disagree

2. I regularly answer questions in class.

Strongly agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly disagree

3. I regularly ask questions in class.

Strongly agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly disagree

4. I frequently offer my opinions on ethical topics.

Strongly agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly disagree

5. I frequently offer my opinions on current topics.

Strongly agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly disagree

6. I prepare for class by reading the text.

Strongly agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly disagree

7. I am more likely to participate when I have adequately prepared for class.

Strongly agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly disagree

8. I feel free to discuss my personal experiences with technology in the class.

Strongly agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly disagree

9. I am more apt to participate when the material is relevant to me personally.

Strongly agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly disagree

10. I am more apt to participate when the material is relevant to what I do at work.

Strongly agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly disagree

11. The room configuration influences the degree to which I participate in class.

Strongly agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly disagree

12. The way the teacher phrases a question prompts my participation.
 Strongly agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly disagree
13. Required assignments would make me participate more often.
 Strongly agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly disagree
14. Working in groups would make me participate more often.
 Strongly agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly disagree
15. I would participate more often if participation was a part of my final grade.
 Strongly agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly disagree
16. I am more likely to participate in class when the teacher uses the whiteboard.
 Strongly agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly disagree
17. I am more likely to participate in class when the teacher uses PowerPoint presentations.
 Strongly agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly disagree
18. I feel comfortable using technology.
 Strongly agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly disagree
19. Hours per week spent on social networking sites (MySpace, Facebook):
 0-5 6-10 11-15 16-20 over 20
20. Using my social networking site to collaborate with my classmates and teacher would be beneficial to my in class experiences.
 Strongly agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly disagree
21. I would learn more in this class if usage of current technologies (blogs, wikis, Youtube, Facebook, podcasting, etc.) were built into the course.
 Strongly agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly disagree
22. Hours per week spent on a computer:
 0-5 6-10 11-15 16-20 over 20
23. Hours per week spent studying:
 0-5 6-10 11-15 16-20 over 20
24. My age is:
 18-25 26-30 31-40 41-50 51 – 60 61 or over

25. Before this semester, the total number of college level credits which I have earned is:
 0 1 – 15 16 – 30 31 – 45 over 45

26. Before this semester, my GPA is approximately: _____

27. I am Male Female

28. My enrollment status is: Full Time Part Time

29. My major is : _____

Appendix B

Spring Student Survey

Directions: Please answer each question as it relates to your experience in the lecture component of this class only. Please note that there are 2 pages with 30 questions.

1. I frequently participate in class discussions.

Strongly agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly disagree

2. I regularly answer questions in class.

Strongly agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly disagree

3. I regularly ask questions in class.

Strongly agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly disagree

4. I frequently offer my opinions on ethical topics.

Strongly agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly disagree

5. I frequently offer my opinions on current topics.

Strongly agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly disagree

6. I prepare for class by reading the text.

Strongly agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly disagree

7. I am more likely to participate when I have adequately prepared for this class.

Strongly agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly disagree

8. I feel free to discuss my personal experiences with technology in the class.

Strongly agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly disagree

9. I am more apt to participate when the material is relevant to me personally.

Strongly agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly disagree

10. I am more apt to participate when the material is relevant to what I do at work.

Strongly agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly disagree

11. Required assignments would make me participate more often.

Strongly agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly disagree

12. I would participate more often if participation was a part of my final grade.
 Strongly agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly disagree
13. I am more likely to participate in class when the teacher uses the whiteboard.
 Strongly agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly disagree
14. I am more likely to participate in class when the teacher uses PowerPoint presentations.
 Strongly agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly disagree
15. In this class, I have learned from my fellow students
 Strongly agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly disagree
16. Working in groups would make me participate more often.
 Strongly agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly disagree
17. I have interacted with my classmates in this course outside of class time.
 Strongly agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly disagree
18. I have interacted with my teacher for this course outside of class time.
 Strongly agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly disagree
19. I feel comfortable using technology.
 Strongly agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly disagree
20. Hours per week spent on social networking sites (MySpace, Facebook):
 0-5 6-10 11-15 16-20 over 20
21. Using my social networking site to collaborate with my classmates and teacher would be beneficial to my in class experiences.
 Strongly agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly disagree
22. I would learn more in this class if usage of current technologies (blogs, wikis, Youtube, Facebook, podcasting, Google Groups, etc.) were built into the course.
 Strongly agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly disagree
23. Hours per week spent on a computer:
 0-5 6-10 11-15 16-20 over 20
24. Hours per week spent studying:
 0-5 6-10 11-15 16-20 over 20

25. My age is:

18-25 26-30 31-40 41-50 51 – 60 61 or over

26. Before this semester, the total number of college level credits which I have earned is:

0 1 – 15 16 – 30 31 – 45 over 45

27. Before this semester, my GPA is approximately: _____

28. I am Male Female

29. My enrollment status is: Full Time Part Time

30. My instructor is : Fulltime Faculty Part-time faculty Don't Know