Ed.D. Dissertations

Graduate Theses & Dissertations

6-2019

Intercampus Tension at Multi-Campus Institituions: A Phenomenological Study of Higher Education Administrators

Steven Erickson
Concordia University - Portland

Follow this and additional works at: https://commons.cu-portland.edu/edudissertations

 Part of the Education Commons

Concordia University–Portland

College of Education

Doctorate of Education Program

WE, THE UNDERSIGNED MEMBERS OF THE DISSERTATION COMMITTEE

CERTIFY THAT WE HAVE READ AND APPROVE THE DISSERTATION OF

Steven Daniel Erickson

CANDIDATE FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

Chad Becker, Ph.D., Faculty Chair Dissertation Committee

Chris Jenkins, Ph.D., Content Specialist

Melanie Boyle, Ph.D., Content Reader

Intercampus Tension at Multicampus Institutions: A Phenomenological Study of Higher

Education Administrators

Steven Daniel Erickson

Concordia University–Portland

College of Education

Dissertation submitted to the Faculty of the College of Education

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Education in

Higher Education

Chad Becker, Ph.D., Faculty Chair Dissertation Committee

Chris Jenkins, Ph.D., Content Specialist

Melanie Boyle, Ph.D., Content Reader

Concordia University–Portland

2019

Abstract

While institutions spend more resources addressing affordability, access, and accountability measures, they face the added pressures of retirements in upcoming years. Consolidating administrative structures by forming multicampus institutions is one potential solution that purports to save money and preserves access for students. Unfortunately, multicampus institutions face intercampus tension that may reduce the expected gains in efficiency. In this phenomenological study, 11 experienced multicampus administrators were interviewed regarding intercampus tension and leadership at multicampus institutions. Analysis of the interview transcripts utilized Moustakas' modification of van Kaam's method, and resulted in identifying competition for resources, differences in campus culture, local demands on individual campuses, degree of centralization, organizational structure, and employee isolation in decision-making as primary sources of tension. Participants noted several key competencies required to lead in a multicampus institution including collaboration, communication, and listening. All participants engaged in some form of distributed or servant leadership models. Results indicate that organizational structure and an institution's degree of centralization should be balanced to afford key services to students and employees while maintaining consistent processes and definitions to minimize intercampus tension. Campuses also face tension over culture dissonance; interactions between employees on different campuses can help develop an understanding of the unique contributions of each campus towards a singular institutional mission. It is critical for multicampus administrators to spend time focused on communication and spending time on different campuses to increase interactions with employees and to understand the culture of each campus.

Keywords: multicampus institution, higher education, intercampus tension, leadership

iii

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank Dr. Chad Backer and the faculty of Concordia University–Portland for their

guidance while I wrote my dissertation. I would also like to thank my family for their

understanding while I completed this work.

Table of Contents

Chapter 1: Introduction

Unprecedented changes face higher education institutions. State governments have reduced allocations due to "severe economic constraints" (McGuinness, 2012, p. 139) while institutions spend more resources addressing affordability, access, and accountability measures (Webber & Boehmer, 2008). Beyond these institutional pressures, colleges and universities are expected to face an alarming number of retirements in upcoming years (Aspen Institute and Achieving the Dream, 2013; Campbell, Syed, & Morris, 2010; El-Ashmawy & Weasenforth, 2010). With all of these pressures, one option for higher education institutions is to merge into multicampus institutions (Brubaker, 2016; Pinheiro & Berg, 2017).

Introduction to the Problem

Rather than closing individual institutions, forming a multicampus institution through a merger of institutions, or expansion of a single campus into a branch site, can improve access for students (Aglargoz, 2017; Bird, 2011; Hoyt & Howell, 2012) and consolidate services and administrative structures (Aglargoz, 2017; Mills & Plumb, 2012). Although operating a multicampus institution appears to be a cost saving endeavor, fewer than 25% of all mergers and acquisitions meet financial objectives (Maguire & Phillips, 2008). Institutions that merge or institutions that plan to open branch campuses must ensure that leadership is prepared to handle issues within a multicampus environment.

Understanding this gap in the number of leaders due to retirements and leader preparation, some institutions have created internal leadership academies (El-Ashmawy & Weasenforth, 2010). Additionally, the American Association of Community Colleges (AACC) developed a competency framework to guide leadership development (Campbell, Syed, & Morris, 2010). Within leadership competencies and leadership models, many researchers have found that trust is critical (Jameson, 2012; Vidovich & Currie, 2011). However, trust in a multicampus institution is more complicated

due to geographical separation and achieving trust's foundational element, "repeated interactions" (Tierney, 2006, p. 41).

Multicampus institutions are not only facing the same financial, affordability, accountability, and access issues as other organizations, but also must address cultural differences between campuses (Harmon, 2002) and intercampus tension (Padron, Lukenbill, & Levitt, 1999; Pinheiro & Berg, 2017; Zeeman & Benneworth, 2017). The next section expands on background, context, history, and conceptual framework of intercampus tension in multicampus institutions. The statement of the problem follows along with the purpose of the study and the research questions. The subsequent section covers the rationale, relevance, and significance of the study. Before the conclusion, operational definitions, assumptions, delimitations, and limitations are addressed.

Background, Context, History, and Conceptual Framework for the Problem

While many studies have investigated higher education leadership and application of leadership theories, few have addressed leadership in multicampus institutions. Existing multicampus research focuses on sources of tension including institutional organizational structure, branch campus organizational structure, and degree of centralization (Aglargoz, 2017; Gaskell and Hayton, 2015; Mills & Plumb, 2012; Pinheiro & Berg, 2017; Timberlake, 2004; Vartiainen, 2017). One study addressed higher education leadership within multicampus institutions, focusing specifically on decision-making processes (Timberlake, 2004).

Multicampus institutions are a unique context for research studies. Multicampus institutions typically have one chief executive officer and faculty governance body while serving a large geographic area. Due to the large geographic area, individual campuses within the institution have differing regional needs and differing program offerings.

While some multicampus institutions initially formed during the post-World War II expansion of higher education, others emerged from regional or metropolitan systems of institutions (Johnstone, 1999). Over the past several years, institutions have merged due to contractions in enrollment, increased competition, and financial constraints (Brubaker, 2016; Pinheiro & Berg, 2017). Merging institutions, or expansion of a single campus into a branch site, can improve access and affordability for students unable or unwilling to travel (Aglargoz, 2017; Bird, 2011; Hoyt & Howell, 2012).

The conceptual framework of this study includes four primary factors based on existing research. Researchers have discovered intercampus tension may stem from institutional identity and campus culture (Kavanagh & Ashkanasy, 2006; Maguire & Phillips, 2008) as well as differing missions and local needs (Bailey & Morest, 2004; Vartiainen, 2017). Understanding leadership styles, leadership competencies, organizational structure, and trust may help interpret administrator's perceptions and reactions to intercampus tension.

Literature on higher education leadership has tested many leadership theories against leadership practices. Day and Antonakis (2012), divided leadership theories into several schools: trait, behavioral, contingency, contextual, skeptics, relational, new leadership, information processing, and biological/evolutionary. Much of the recent literature has focused on contextual, distributed, and relational leadership theories such as relational and distributed leadership (Dinh et al., 2014). In complexity leadership theory, social and relational interactions are the primary elements that create action within an organization (Arena & Uhl-Bien, 2016; Hazy & Uhl-Bien, 2015; Lichtenstein et al., 2006).

Beyond leadership theories, literature on higher education leadership also includes leadership characteristics and competencies. The AACC listed competencies such as organization strategy, resource management, communication, collaboration, advocacy, and professionalism

3

(Campbell, Syed, & Morris, 2010). These leadership theories and competencies can help administrators understand potential solutions to intercampus tension.

Several researchers have found that organizational structure can have an effect on intercampus tension and feelings of isolation (Aglargoz, 2017; Gaskell & Hayton, 2015). The leadership structure of a single-campus institution differs from that of a multicampus institution where leadership is often distributed with central, as well as branch, leadership (Gaskell & Hayton, 2015). This structure can have several different configurations, each with benefits and limitations (Gaskell & Hayton, 2015).

Building trust and relationships at a multicampus institution with geographical separation can be difficult (Bottoroof, Glaser, Todd, & Alderman, 2008), yet trust is a foundational social and structural element of some leadership models or competencies (Jones, Harvey & Lefoe, 2014; Sewerin & Holmberg, 2017; Wallin, 2010). Without trust, employees may become more entrenched within individual campus cultures thereby exacerbating tension between campuses. Chapter 2 includes two strands of trust in higher education trait based and trust capital.

Statement of the Problem

Tension between campuses in a multicampus institution is a significant problem in higher education literature (Padron, Lukenbill, & Levitt, 1999; Pinheiro & Berg, 2017; Zeeman & Benneworth, 2017). Tension may arise through the relationships between a primary campus and satellite or branch campuses (Gaskell & Hayton, 2015; Vartiainen, 2017). At my own institution, there is a noticeable tension between two of four campuses; each considering themselves the flagship for differing reasons. The other two campuses have different missions resulting in less direct competition and tension.

Researchers have noted that tension may be a result of uncertainty and institutional identity (Kavanagh & Ashkanasy, 2006; Maguire & Phillips, 2008), differing missions and local needs

(Bailey & Morest, 2004; Vartiainen, 2017), or feelings of isolation (Aglargoz, 2017; Gaskell & Hayton, 2015). Although intercampus tension has been well documented, there was little information on how leaders perceive and react to that tension.

Purpose of the Study

This study fills a gap in higher education literature on leadership at multicampus institutions. Through exploring how multicampus administrators understand and react to intercampus tension, other administrators may better understand their own institutions. Additionally, administrators may learn how leadership styles, degree of centralization in decision-making and planning, trust, and college organizational structure all affect intercampus tension. These insights can help administrators develop strategies to mitigate tension through a broad understanding of the problem.

By merging institutions, administrators hope to maintain student access while reducing expenses; however, tension between campuses can derail gained efficiencies (Vartiainen, 2017). How a leader understands and applies meaning to intercampus tension is critical to understanding what actions a leader may take to mitigate tension. Analyzing these perceptions and reactions within the context of the current literature on organization structure, degree of centralization, leadership styles, leadership competencies, and trust, other administrators may better understand their own institution and react more effectively to intercampus tension.

Research Questions

The framing research question for this study was: How do administrators experience intercampus tension in a multicampus higher education environment? A leader's perception of intercampus tension will guide the leader's actions and behaviors. While some tension may be productive (Arena & Uhl-Bien, 2016), tension can also lead to a loss of efficiency or an inability to adapt to new situations. Therefore, the secondary research question was: What leadership

strategies do administrators employ to mitigate tension in a multicampus higher education environment?

Beyond the experiencing of tension, literature indicates that sources of tension include differing regional needs and organizational structure (Bailey & Morest, 2004; Gaskell & Hayton, 2015; Vartiainen, 2017). Factors that may mitigate intercampus tension include leadership style and trust (Bottoroof, Glaser, Todd, & Alderman, 2008; Jones, Harvey & Lefoe, 2014; Sewerin & Holmberg, 2017; Wallin, 2010). These strands in higher education leadership led to two additional research questions: How do administrators experience tension related to differing regional needs and organizational structure, and how do administrators perceive leadership styles and trust as factors in intercampus tension?

Rationale, Relevance, and Significance of the Study

As multicampus institutions continue to develop in the higher education landscape, it is critical to understand how existing leaders perceive and attempt to mitigate tension between different campuses. Tension between campuses can undermine financial efficiencies gained by shared services and limit institutional ability to react and adapt to changing political and academic environments. Furthermore, both current and new administrators can benefit from understanding how other administrators perceive and react to intercampus tension.

Although multicampus institutions have a long history in higher education, relatively few researchers have studied the intricacies of leadership across multiple campuses. In the research of multicampus institutions, most have relied on a case study methodology (Aglargoz, 2017; Gaskell, 2011; Shaw & Bornhoft, 2011; Vartiainen, 2017). These studies have resulted in an improved understanding of the relationship between branch and flagship campuses as well as a glimpse into intercampus tension. Timberlake (2004) used a phenomenological design to study multicampus

decision-making. Even with these studies, more information is needed for multicampus administrators.

Pinheiro and Berg (2017) suggested the need for additional research designed on systems theory. By including contextual leadership theories as described by Dinh et al. (2014) in this study, results may also provide a beginning insight into inter and intracampus tension. This study not only provides valuable information for current multicampus administrators, but also further the general scholarship on multicampus institutions.

Definition of Terms

Throughout discussions of multicampus institutions and multicampus systems, it is critical that terms are clearly understood. Within this study, they are four central terms that have small but unique characteristics. The first is the difference between multicampus systems and multicampus institutions. Additionally, it is important that both flagship and branch campuses have a consistent definition for the remainder of this study.

Multicampus systems are an organizational structure with "separate-but-equal institutional heads and faculty governance bodies" (Johnstone, 1999, p. 6).

Multicampus institutions serve either a large geographic area or differing regional needs through two or more geographically distinct sites but do not have separate-but-equal institutional heads (Pinheiro & Berg, 2017).

Flagship (main) campuses are the primary campus as designated by the institution in the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS). Also where central administration is located (Aglargoz, 2017)

Branch (satellite) campuses are not the primary campus designated in IPEDS but off full programs of study in a permanent location outside of the main location (National Center for Education Statistics, 2018). However, a branch campus may have a larger student population, a

larger administrative structure, or other qualities that may typically be associated with a flagship campus.

Assumptions, Delimitations, and Limitations

This study is phenomenological in nature, using interviews to collect data. Within the design and data collection technique, there are inherent assumptions and limitations related to the participants and the methodology. The delimitations section describes the choices that define the scope and breadth of the study.

Assumptions. Within this study, there were two primary assumptions. The first is that administrators within multicampus institutions have the ability to understand and affect intercampus tension within multicampus institutions. Depending on the role, the administrator may be able to affect the organizational structure of the institution, a key element of intercampus tension and feelings of isolation (Gaskell & Hayton, 2015). While Tierney (2006) described actions to improve trust, there are external factors that also affect trust (Bottoroof et al., 2008). Additionally, it was assumed that administrators have the ability to influence the degree of centralization within the institution.

The second assumption was that throughout the interview process, I would be able to collaboratively describe and construct the reality of intercampus tension with the participants. This began with an effective methodology that built trust between the participant and researcher (Lincoln & Guba, 1989). Additionally, this assumed that participants were well informed of their own institutional processes they would actively share experiences as a participant in this study.

Delimitations. This study was delimited to administrators in multicampus institutions. Administrators held typical titles such as president, vice president, chief academic officer, and dean. Participants had experiences as administrators at multicampus institutions but not necessarily systems of institutions. The scope of this project included 11 multicampus

administrator interviews with no more than two participants from a single institution. To respect the limited time of participants and financial constraints of the study, each participant was interviewed once. Additionally, the participants were able to provide additional information or corrections after their review of interview transcripts and an executive summary of the interview.

Limitations. While a phenomenological research methodology is a strong technique for exploring phenomena such as tension and leadership on multicampus institutions, it has limitations. Qualitative methodologies are limited in the generalizability of results; however, results of a quality study can be transferable to other administrators or institutions. While there are several multicampus institutions within the United States, they are geographically dispersed. Due to limited resources, on-site interviews and immersion in the participants' institutions were not possible. The interviews were conducted using video conferencing technology with both video and audio recordings. When video conferencing was not available, a recording of the phone conversation was used. While Seidman (2013) acknowledged there are critics of recording phenomenological interviews, benefits including the ability to transcribe and analyze the recordings.

Due to the complex nature of this phenomenon, there were limitations based on the participants. Some of the participants only had administrative experience at one institution, limiting the ability of the participant to compare how the institution's culture or history affects intercampus tension. Additionally, an institution's president or vice president may set organizational priorities that will affect how all administrators within the institution perceive and react to intercampus tension.

Summary

This chapter included an introduction to the problem of intercampus tension at multicampus institutions. Although multicampus institutions have a relatively long history in

American higher education, little has been researched on how to lead these institutions. Institutional leaders need to cope with financial constraints and issues of affordability, accountability, and access. One popular model is to share administrative services through the merging of institutions or opening branch campuses.

Understanding how to lead in a multicampus environment begins with understanding the experience of administrators. How administrators perceive and react to intercampus tension is critical in developing an understanding of how other leaders may improve multicampus institutions. This phenomenological study employed interviews as the primary data collection method.

Chapter 2 is a review of current literature on multicampus institutions, leadership styles and competencies, as well as trust. To lay the foundation for this study, these content areas are reviewed, analyzed, and synthesized. Chapter 2 also includes a review and critique of these studies not only in content, but also methodological approaches. This foundation is the basis for further study and ultimately a better understanding of intercampus tension.

Chapter 3 includes elaborates on the methodology of the study. The research questions, as well as the purpose and the design of the study, provide the overall framework. The methodology also includes technical details of the participant population and sampling methodology, instrumentation, data collection, and data analyzation procedures. To ensure a quality study, limitations, delimitations, and validity are addressed.

Chapter 4 details the perceptions of the participants while Chapter 5 discusses those results and compares the results to the extent literature. Additionally, Chapter 5 presents recommendations for applying results to practice as well as opportunities for further research. Additionally, limitations of the study are presented based on the actual participants of the study.

<center>**Chapter 2: Literature Review**</center>

Introduction to the Literature Review

   Institutions of higher education are expected to face an alarming number of retirements in upcoming years (Aspen Institute and Achieving the Dream, 2013; Campbell, Syed, & Morris, 2010; El-Ashmawy & Weasenforth, 2010). New leaders will face financial challenges at institutions as state governments reduce allocations due in part to "severe economic constraints" (McGuinness, 2012, p. 139). Because of this strain, many institutions have attempted to share administrative services through merging institutions or campuses (Brubaker, 2016; Zeeman & Benneworth, 2017).

   Study topic. This dissertation focuses on leadership at multicampus institutions. While there is a significant body of research on higher education leadership and application of leadership theories, there is a lack of research on leadership in multicampus institutions. Leadership literature contains several different leadership theories and models (Day and Antonakis, 2012; Dinh, Lord, Gardner, Meuser, Liden & Hu, 2014). While there are many leadership models, research on higher education leadership focuses on traits, qualities, behaviors, and actions of leaders.

   Multicampus studies have not directly approached the topic of leadership. Some researchers have studied the effect of organizational structure on campus roles and intercampus tension (Gaskell & Hayton, 2015; Timberlake, 2004), while other scholarship has focused on branch campuses within multicampus institutions (Aglargoz, 2017; Mills & Plumb, 2012) and degrees of centralization (Gaskell & Hayton, 2015; Pinheiro & Berg, 2017; Vartiainen, 2017). One study addressed higher education leadership within multicampus institutions, focusing specifically on decision-making processes (Timberlake, 2004).

   Context. The context of this study is multicampus institutions. While some multicampus institutions can resemble multicampus systems, they are two distinct organizational structures. For

<center>11</center>

the purpose of this literature review, a multicampus system is an organizational structure with "separate-but-equal institutional heads and faculty governance bodies" (Johnstone, 1999, p. 6). In contrast, a multicampus institution, serves either a large geographic area or differing regional needs through two or more geographically distinct sites. This literature review is focused on multicampus institutions, although important information can be gleaned from literature on multicampus systems.

Multicampus institutions are not a new phenomenon, but there has been a resurgence during the past several years. Institutions and governing boards often use contractions in enrollment, increased competition, and financial constraints as the rationale for forming new multicampus institutions (Brubaker, 2016; Pinheiro & Berg, 2017). Rather than closing individual institutions, a merger between institutions, or expansion of a single campus into a branch site, can improve access for students unable or unwilling to travel (Aglargoz, 2017; Bird, 2011; Hoyt & Howell, 2012).

Mergers were not the original source of multicampus institutions or systems. The original multicampus institutions stemmed from the post-World War II expansion of higher education (Gaither, 1999). Some land grant institutions added branch campuses to serve changing needs or populations while other systems originated from state teachers' colleges expanding to offer comprehensive programming (Johnstone, 1999). Still other institutions naturally emerged from regional or metropolitan systems. Regardless of the source of the merger, current pressures on multicampus institutions can manifest themselves through unproductive intercampus tension.

Problem statement. Tension between employees in a multicampus institution is a well-documented and significant problem (Padron, Lukenbill, & Levitt, 1999; Pinheiro & Berg, 2017; Zeeman & Benneworth, 2017). Tension may arise through the relationships between a de facto flagship campus and satellite or branch campuses (Gaskell & Hayton, 2015; Vartiainen, 2017).

12

Researchers have isolated that some of the tension may be a result of uncertainty and institutional identity (Kavanagh & Ashkanasy, 2006; Maguire & Phillips, 2008), differing missions and local needs (Bailey & Morest, 2004; Vartiainen, 2017), or feelings of isolation (Aglargoz, 2017; Gaskell & Hayton, 2015).

Information on how to address tension is limited. Administrators at both Miami-Dade Community College and the Maricopa Community College District have reduced tension through the broad-based development of a campus culture sensitive shared vision, mission, and values (Padron et al., 1999; Thor, Schober, & Helminski, 1999). Others have cited the importance of leadership (Anderson, 2011; Kavanagh & Ashkanasy, 2006). However, little research has studied how leaders perceive and react to tension between campuses.

Significance. As multicampus institutions continue to develop in the higher education landscape, it is critical to understand how existing leaders perceive and attempt to mitigate tension between different campuses. Tension between campuses can undermine financial efficiencies gained by shared services and limit institutional ability to react and adapt to changing political and academic environments. Furthermore, both current and new administrators may benefit from understanding how other administrators perceive and react to intercampus tension.

Organization. This chapter is a comprehensive review of literature addressing multicampus institutions and higher education leadership. After the conceptual framework of this study is articulated, a detailed review will examine the history, development, and status of multicampus institutions, intercampus tension, and higher education leadership. The subsequent section will analyze the methodology of studies in multicampus and higher education leadership. Prior to a critique of the current literature, the literature is synthesized to provide the current knowledge of higher education leadership in multicampus institutions. This chapter ends with summarizing and concluding remarks.

Conceptual Framework

While the merging of institutions is an often-attempted solution to resolve financial issues and issues of access, tension between campuses can derail gained efficiencies. According to Maguire and Phillips (2008), fewer than 25% of all mergers and acquisitions meet financial objectives. While their study focused on corporate environments, many of the same tensions exist in higher education mergers. Addressing intercampus tension may improve the likelihood that institutions achieve the benefits of merging.

Researchers have discovered intercampus tension may stem from institutional identity and campus culture (Kavanagh & Ashkanasy, 2006; Maguire & Phillips, 2008). Additionally regional or local demands on a campus may precipitate intercampus tension (Bailey & Morest, 2004; Vartiainen, 2017). The primary concepts within this dissertation are leadership styles, leadership competencies, organizational structure, and trust.

Leadership styles. Literature on higher education leadership has tested many leadership theories against leadership practices. Much of the research focuses on traits, qualities, behaviors, and actions of leaders. Day and Antonakis (2012), divided leadership theories into several schools: trait, behavioral, contingency, contextual, skeptics, relational, new leadership, information processing, and biological/evolutionary. While trait and behavioral theories are most closely associated with the leadership competencies in the subsequent section, between 2000 and 2010, there was a growing interest and an increase of literature on contextual, distributed, and relational leadership theories (Bolden, 2011; Day & Antonakis, 2012).

Contextual theories focus on factors outside of simple leadership competencies or behaviors. Dinh et al. (2014) defined contextual leadership theories broadly, incorporating social network theories and complexity theories. These theories, along with relational and distributed leadership, focus on systems within a complex and changing environment (Dinh et al., 2014). In

14

complexity leadership theory, social and relational interactions are the primary elements that create action within an organization (Arena & Uhl-Bien, 2016; Hazy & Uhl-Bien, 2015; Lichtenstein et al., 2006).

Understanding relational, distributed, and complex leadership theories, as well as their focus on systems of interactions, may help with the interpretation of leaders' perceptions, experiences, and actions within a tense multicampus environment. Root causes of tension vary widely and include feelings of isolation (Aglargoz, 2017; Gaskell & Hayton, 2015), differing campus cultures (Kavanagh & Ashkanasy, 2016), and competition or lack of clarity in local versus institutional needs (Pinheiro & Berg, 2017; Vartiainen, 2017; Thor et al., 1999). Focusing on leadership theories that include interactions and organizational systems may provide insight on how some leaders mitigate tension.

Leadership competencies. Literature on higher education leadership includes many different leadership characteristics and competencies. The American Association of Community Colleges (AACC) listed competencies such as organization strategy, resource management, communication, collaboration, advocacy, and professionalism (Campbell, Syed, & Morris, 2010). In a literature review, Wallin (2010) grouped change leader actions into anticipating, analyzing, acting, and affirming (trust). These leadership frameworks can help administrators understand potential solutions to intercampus tension.

Research strongly supports the competencies of the AACC. In a study of branch campus administrators, a mixed method study found strong support from current leaders on the importance of AACC's competencies (Conover, 2009). Organizational strategy includes developing organizational structure and visioning. Organizational structure can enhance or mitigate feelings of isolation in multicampus institutions. These feelings are common among smaller branch campuses (Aglargoz, 2017; Gaskell & Hayton, 2015). In a review of peer-reviewed journals from

1985–2005, Bryman (2007) found vision to be a primary behavior for effective leaders. Wooldridge (2011) cited the importance of envisioning new business models while Gossom and Pelton (2011) described the behavior as entrepreneurial.

Communication and collaboration are also well supported in literature. In a quantitative study of higher education leaders, Smith and Wolverton (2010) developed a five-attribute model that included communication. Beyond communication in general, Padron et al. (1999) found communication to be critical when merging institutions and engaging in organizational change. Multiple studies have highlighted collaboration and participative decision-making as a leadership strength. In Kavanagh and Ashkanasy's (2006) study, they referred to this behavior as consultative while Bryman (2007) described it as inclusive.

Much like relational, distributed, and complexity leadership theories, these competencies indicate a similar focus on communication and collaboration. Additionally, the AACC competencies may help employees with feelings of isolation and may help build a common vision throughout the entire institution. The competencies of resource management and advocacy may influence the leader's tactics for addressing local campus needs.

Organizational structure. Organizational structure interplays with both intercampus tension and leadership competencies. An institution's organizational structure can exacerbate or mitigate feelings of tension and isolation (Aglargoz, 2017; Gaskell & Hayton, 2015). Additionally, the organizational structure is included within the AACC organization strategy competency (Campbell et al., 2010). The physical distribution of campuses within a multicampus institution, require a comparison against distributed and complex leadership theories.

Organizational strategy, a leadership competency of the AACC, includes the design of an institution's organizational structure, affects feelings of isolation on branch campuses (Aglargoz, 2017; Gaskell & Hayton, 2015). The organizational structure of a multicampus institution is often

distributed with central, as well as branch, leadership. Gaskell and Hayton (2015) described several different structures of multicampus systems and the assets and liabilities of each. This balance in organizational structure affects the multicampus institution's constant struggle between centralization and autonomy (Padron et al., 1999; Pinheiro & Berg, 2017; Timberlake, 2004).

Much like the struggle to find a balance between centralization and autonomy at a multicampus institution, an inherent issue that arises with distributed leadership in educational institutional institutions is the balance between top-down and bottom-up leadership (Bolden et al., 2008; Sewerin & Holmberg, 2017). Leaders during the merger and expansion of Miami-Dade Community College attributed part of its success to the balance between centralization and decentralization (Padron et al., 1999). Unfortunately, there is not a known recipe for the right balance.

Trust. Building trust and relationships at a multicampus institution with geographical separation can be difficult (Bottoroof, Glaser, Todd, & Alderman, 2008), yet trust is a foundational social and structural element of some leadership models and leadership competencies (Jones, Harvey & Lefoe, 2014; Sewerin & Holmberg, 2017; Wallin, 2010). Without trust, employees may become more entrenched within individual campus cultures thereby exacerbating tension between campuses. There are two strands of literature on trust in higher education, trait based and trust capital.

Paralleling AACC's leadership competencies, Vidovich and Currie (2011) reported that trust requires traits such as competence, honesty, openness, reliability, and well meaning. However, other researchers are quick to indicate that building trust requires more than a management plan and traits. Instead, trust is "engendered" (Jameson, 2012, p. 402) and comes into existence when conditions permit.

Leaders need to focus on building "trust capital" (Jameson, 2012, p. 402) through working within institutional cultures, structures, and relationships (Tierney, 2006). This strengthens the argument for broad-based participation, inter-personal support, managing relationships, communication, and application of distributed and complex leadership theories. According to Tierney (2006), there are nine components to trust including "a repeated interaction, a dynamic process, an end, an exchange, utilizing faith, taking risks, an ability, a rational choice, a cultural construction" (p. 43).

Tierney's (2006) rational choice and cultural construction intersects complexity leadership theory, AACC leadership competencies, and intercampus tension. The rational choice of trust assumes structural norms, societal obligations, and sanctions while the cultural construction relies on shared identities and social networks (Tierney, 2006). This interplay between formal structures and social networks is comparable to both the formal organizational structure and the informal campus cultures at a multicampus higher education institution.

Review of Research Literature

A study of leaders and tension in multicampus, higher education institutions includes many factors. As institutions have merged or expanded through creation of new campuses, the resulting multicampus institution must overcome key challenges. Leaders of these institutions must not only lead a single campus but rather multiple campuses spread over a potentially large geographical area with different programming. This literature review will examine the history, development, and status of multicampus institutions, intercampus tension, and higher education leadership.

Multicampus institutions. Multicampus institutions are not a new phenomenon but there has been a resurgence over the past several years (Pinheiro & Berg, 2017). These new multicampus institutions can be a reaction to recent contractions in enrollment, increased

competition, and financial constraints (Brubaker, 2016; Pinheiro & Berg, 2017). Rather than closing individual institutions, a merger between institutions, or expansion of a single campus into a branch site, can improve access for students unable or unwilling to travel (Aglargoz, 2017; Bird, 2011; Hoyt & Howell, 2012). While sharing services would appear to be a cost saving endeavor, multicampus institutions plagued by financial concerns (Aglargoz, 2017; Mills & Plumb, 2012) and intercampus tension (Gaskell & Hayton, 2015; Pinheiro & Berg, 2017; Vartiainen, 2017).

Mergers were not the original source of multicampus institutions or systems. The original multicampus stemmed from the post-World War II expansion of higher education. According to Gaither (1999), the number of Americans who attended college after World War II jumped to 51% compared to 10% prior to the war. Multicampus institutions or systems of institutions emerged for varying reasons. Some land grant institutions added branch campuses to serve changing needs or populations while other systems originated from state teachers colleges expanding to offer comprehensive programming (Johnstone, 1999). Still other institutions naturally emerged from regional or metropolitan systems.

Multicampus institutions serve more than one geographic area with differing regional needs through more than one campus location. While the organizational structure of each site may differ, multicampus institutions are led by a single institutional leader (Johnstone, 1999). This literature review is focused primarily on multicampus institutions with limited but important references to literature on multicampus systems.

Tension between multicampus institutions is common. This tension is a result of a variety of issues including feelings of isolation (Aglargoz, 2017; Gaskell & Hayton, 2015), differing campus cultures (Kavanagh & Ashkanasy, 2016), and competition or lack of clarity in local versus institutional needs (Pinheiro & Berg, 2017; Vartiainen, 2017; Thor et al., 1999). Other sources of

tension include staffing and organizational structures within the multi-site institution (Anderson, 2011; Gaskell & Hayton, 2015).

Administrative structures can mitigate feelings of isolation in multicampus institutions. These feelings are common among smaller branch campuses (Aglargoz, 2017; Gaskell & Hayton, 2015). Aglargoz (2017) found that in a two-campus institution, feelings of isolation were common with a student population that only attended classes on campus and did not remain on site for the entire day. In a study of branch campus administrators, Gaskell and Hayton's (2015) work indicated that when branch campus administrative structures include components of departments without strategic clarity, the branch campus lacks visibility and clarity.

From interviews with branch campus administrators, Gaskell and Hayton (2015) identified three organizational structures, referring to them as models 1 through 3, while Timberlake (2004) identified two including campus autonomy and centralized decision-making. These organizational structures are not necessarily distinct; implementation of models can vary by degree and different departments within the same institution may implement different organizational strategies. The effect of organization structure combined with academic programming also has effects on the campuses and intercampus relations (Pinheiro & Berg, 2017).

In the first organizational structure, the branch campus contains its own administrative structure (Gaskell & Hayton, 2015; Timberlake, 2004). While this may seem to be an isolating structure, Gaskell and Hayton (2015) noted opportunities for cross-campus collaborations and committee work. A second model is coordinated approach to services on each branch site, reporting to a central administrator, often at the main campus location (Gaskell & Hayton, 2015). This model hinges on regular communications, such as conference calls or meetings, to ensure a high degree of coordination between the sites. The third model is similar to the second model but with infrequent communications or meetings. Administrators and employees in this model tend

20

are more prone to feelings of isolation (Gaskell & Hayton, 2015) and the institution will have more

organizational silos (Timberlake, 2005).

While the preceding organizational models focus on positions and coordination between

departments and individuals, Pinheiro and Berg (2017) took a slightly different approach to

organizational strategy as it relates to academic programming. Pinheiro and Berg's (2017)

organizational structure is based on four quadrants created by the degree of campus autonomy and

whether or not the programs are unique on each campus. When the programming is similar

between campuses, students have access to programs from a wider geographic region. However, if

the decision-making structure is centralized, campus programming will not be able to respond to

local needs (Pinheiro & Berg, 2017). If the campuses are autonomous, there may be a lack of

strategic vision (Pinheiro & Berg, 2017).

If programming is unique between campuses, there is the ability of campuses to specialize,

although student access to specific programs would decrease. If the institution has a strong

centralized administration, additional efficiencies may be gained through less coordination

between campuses for academic programming (Pinheiro & Berg, 2017). If the administrative

structure is decentralized, there is a real possibility that each campus becomes completely

independent and resists any organizational strategy (Pinheiro & Berg, 2017).

Each of these organizational structures has an impact on the degree of autonomy for each

of the sites. Several researchers agree that it is critical for multicampus institutions to find a

balance between centralization and autonomy (Padron et al., 1999; Pinheiro & Berg, 2017;

Timberlake, 2004). Although centralization may increase efficiency, it often slows decision-

making (Timberlake, 2004). Pinheiro and Berg (2017) noted that there are problems when

individual sites have too much autonomy. If a site sets its own direction, not coordinated with the

entire organization, fragmentation can occur (Pinheiro & Berg, 2017). This fragmentation can lead

to difficulties associated with differential tuition, transferring between campuses, or taking courses at different campuses (Timberlake, 2005). The benefits of extreme autonomy include a more comfortable work environment and faster decision making (Timberlake, 2005). Both Pinheiro and Berg (2017) and Timberlake (2005) agree that institutional visioning and institutional strategic planning should be centralized while local autonomy should allow for localized planning (coordinated with institutional plans) and implementation of those plans. Much like Gaskell and Hayton (2015), Timberlake (2005) suggested that multicampus institutions should provide opportunities for interaction and relationship building between campuses.

While isolation may have its greatest impact in branch campuses, differences in culture affect the entire institution. Differing cultures between campuses can create tension (Harman, 2002; Kavanagh & Ashkanasy, 2016; Wooldridge, 2011). Harman (2002) reported that the effects of institutional mergers can persist for many years and cultural differences are a primary constraint in the integration of institutions. Wooldridge (2011) suggested overcoming this constraint by focusing on developing a bottom-up collegial culture. Although Kligyte and Barrie (2014) argued that collegiality is actually a barrier to organizational change, Wooldridge (2011) limited collegiality to a description of the institutional culture while arguing that other aspects of the institution need top-down decision-making.

Many multicampus institutions purport to address local needs and improve access (Mills & Plumb, 2012). In multiple Finnish universities, Vartiainen (2017) found that tension exists between local interests and that of the system. Additionally, leaders need to be aware of the needs of local communities and balance those needs with system interests and financial investments (Shaw & Bornhoft, 2011; Zeeman & Benneworth, 2017).

This tension is manifest by employees as a lack of trust in leadership. In a large mixed-method study, Kavanagh and Ashkanasy (2006) surveyed 120 academic staff and senior leaders

throughout three institutions in a longitudinal study over six years at 2-year intervals. In the study, Kavanagh and Ashkanasy (2006) found that employees tend to be negative towards central leaders when compared to local leaders. Literature in business mergers does not differ. Maguire and Phillips (2008) studied a merger within Citigroup, found many employees with organizational identity ambiguity, and were more likely to trust leaders who were geographically closer. This is also a common theme in virtual team research (Berry, 2011).

Leadership. While little research has addressed multicampus leadership, there is significant research in leadership as well as the application of leadership theories to higher education institutions. The next section will focus on the leadership theories and their histories followed by specific research into higher education leadership. Due to the distributed nature of multicampus institutions, a further review of distributed leadership theory will conclude this section.

Leadership theories. There is a significant research interest in leadership theories and over time, interest in specific theories waxes and wanes. Day and Antonakis (2012), divided leadership theories into several schools: trait, behavioral, contingency, contextual, skeptics, relational, new leadership, information processing, and biological/evolutionary. The history and current trends are presented for each of these schools of theories.

The trait school of leadership was the first to emerge (Day & Antonakis, 2012). Often referred to as the "great man" theory, trait leadership focuses on dispositions and traits of leaders. Spector (2016) credits Thomas Carlyle as a primary source of the great man theory and describes Carlyle's "view of history as working through the deeds of great men, or conversely through the absence of such a hero" (p. 254). Although researchers dismissed this theory in the 1960's, it reemerged in the 1990's.

Spector (2016), supportive of this reemergence, argued that while the great man theory is not scientifically rigorous, it must be understood in the context of psychology. Through his comparison of Carlyle's development of the theory with Freud's image of the father figure leader, Spector (2016) articulated the "primal need for a father figure to whom they offer dependence" (p. 257) is qualitatively not different from following a heroic strong leader. This approach is common in modern scholarship of trait theory where the majority of investigations includes trait theory with at least one other leadership approach (Dinh, et al., 2014).

In the 1950's, behavioral theory emerged focused on researching supportive behaviors versus directive behaviors. Day and Antonakis (2012) described behavioral theory as "the behaviors that leaders enacted and how they treated followers" (p. 8). Other researchers have taken a global view of behavioral theories, considering behaviors at the individual, dyad, and organizational levels (Dinh et al., 2014). Day and Antonkis (2012) found that interest in their definition of behavioral leadership waned by the 1980's. However, Dinh et al.'s (2014) behavioral leadership category also includes participative and shared leadership; interest in these theories remains strong in the 21st century (Day & Antonakis, 2012).

Contingency and contextual leadership theories followed. Fiedler is largely credited with developing contingency theory, injecting the role of leader-member relations, task structure, and position-based power. Other contingency theories include situational leadership and path-goal theory. Situational leadership requires the leader to adapt to the maturity and motivational level of employees while the path-goal theory focuses on leader support of employees to achieve goals. Although research interest in contingency theories has fallen dramatically (Day & Antonakis, 2012; Dinh et al., 2014), it contributed to the highly researched charismatic leadership theory (Dinh et al., 2014).

Contextual leadership theories focus on factors outside of leader behaviors and include organizational structure and hierarchical levels. Dinh et al. (2014) also included social network theories, complexity theories, and integrative leadership as branches of contextual leadership theory. The fact that research into contextual leadership theories continues (Day & Antonakis, 2012; Dinh et al., 2014) is not surprising given its focus on teams, systems, and how each adjusts over time within a complex and changing environment (Dinh et al., 2014).

Day and Antonakis (2012) identified the next major leadership theory as relational leadership. Other researchers have included relational leadership approaches as a subset of social network and contextual theories (Carter, DeChurch, Braun, & Contractor, 2015; Dinh et al., 2014). Relational leadership predicts that the quality of relationship between the leader and the follower will affect outcomes (Day & Antonakis, 2012). One of the latest shifts is to relational leadership as a process and research and includes shared and distributed leadership theories.

Bolden (2011) surveyed publications and found that shared and distributed leadership increased greatly in popularity since 2000. According to Bolden (2011), distributed leadership theory "can be considered to incorporate shared, democratic, dispersed and other related forms of leadership" (p. 256). Bolden (2011) argued that the practice of distributed leadership surfaced in ancient times but its first direct reference was in the mid 1950's. However, the number of journal articles on distributed leadership did not expand to more than a couple until the early 2000's (Bolden 2011).

Distributed leadership is an extension of relational leadership theory. Developed by Uhl-Bien (2006), relational leadership theory studies leadership "as a social influence process through which coordination and change are constructed and produced" (p. 654). Both theories focus on the process of leadership rather than on the traits and behaviors of leaders (Bolden et al., 2008). The

process includes more than just senior leaders and focuses on shared leadership (Gronn, 2000), and focuses on relationships that include both formal and informal leaders (Jones et al., 2014).

Distributed and relational leadership theories extend the dialogue of leadership to a more systems-based approached. Complexity theory does just that by looking at leadership as "an emergent event, and outcome of relational interactions among agents" (Lichtenstein, Uhl-Bien, Marion, Seers, & Orton, 2006, p. 2). In complexity leadership theory, social and relational interactions are the primary elements that create action within an organization (Arena & Uhl-Bien, 2016; Hazy & Uhl-Bien, 2015; Lichtenstein et al., 2006).

Arena and Uhl-Bien (2016) studied 30 complex organizations over eight years with the premise that each organizational has an operational system, an entrepreneurial system to generate new ideas, and an adaptive space between the two extremities. In this model, the entrepreneurial system and the operational systems have a natural tension while natural leaders or key personnel are often placed in the adaptive region (Arena & Uhl-Bien, 2016). In their findings, Arena and Uhl-Bien (2016) concluded that the tension between the two systems drives innovation and adaptability within the organization. Ultimately, leaders can support the notion of distributed leadership and support the social networks that drive adaptability and innovation.

Additional new leadership theories include neo-charismatic, transformational, visionary, or strategic. Bass (as cited by Day & Antonakis, 2012), argued that previous leadership theories were transactional and did not account for a common sense of purpose that develops within an organization. The basis of transformational or neo-charismatic leadership theory is that leaders inspire followers to act on the good of the organization rather than on their own self-interest. This theory received the most attention in the 1990's but interest has waned since (Day & Antonakis, 2012).

Related to transformational and neo-charismatic leadership, visionary leadership theory studies how "leaders attract followers and inspire them to pursue a shared goal, achieving beyond ordinary expectations" (Kirkpatrick, 2004, p. 1615). Visionary leadership theory focuses on how leaders develop, communicate, and implement the vision (Kirkpatrick, 2004). Although many leadership programs contain aspects of visioning, the actual process of formulating a vision is not well understood (Kirkpatrick, 2004).

Strategic leadership theory focuses on strategic choices made at the highest levels of an organization, including chief executive officers, business unit heads, or a small group of top executives (Finkelstein, Hambrick & Cannella, 2009). According to Finkelstein et al., (2009), "strategic leadership resides at the intersection of cognitive, social, and political concepts" (p. 5). This theory is a direct product of earlier research including Hambrick and Mason's 1984 theory on upper echelons that posited "executives make strategic choices on the basis of their cognitions and values, and that the organization becomes a reflection of its top manager" (Finkelstein et al., 2009, p. 8).

Higher education leadership. There is a wealth of research into higher education leadership and application of leadership theories. Much of the research focuses on traits, qualities, behaviors, and actions of leaders (Conover, 2009). Other researchers have begun applying newer leadership theories including distributed leadership and strategic leadership theories into the higher education setting (Bolden, 2011; Brimhall, 2014).

While there is a significant body of research into both higher education and corporate leadership, it is important to understand the commonalities and differences of leaders in different sectors of the economy. Witt/Kieffer (2013) conducted a comparative study between corporate and higher education leaders, exploring the many commonalities between leaders but also some significant differences. Through their research, Witt/Kiffer (2013) found that leaders of higher

education institutions tend to be more interpersonally sensitivity while corporate leaders are more interested in profits and business opportunities. Based on these differences, it is important to examine the major frameworks within higher education leadership scholarship.

Many of the higher education leadership studies refer to leadership competencies that focus on aptitudes, behaviors, and actions. The AACC developed an often-tested competency framework that includes organizational strategy, resource management, communication, collaboration, advocacy, and professionalism (Campbell, Syed, & Morris, 2010). Similar to the AACC competencies, Wallin (2010) described change leader actions as anticipating, analyzing, acting, and affirming (trust).

Literature strongly supports the competencies of the AACC. In a study of branch campus administrators, a mixed method study found strong support from current leaders on the importance of AACC's competencies (Conover, 2009). Organizational strategy includes organizational structure and visioning. In a review of peer-reviewed journals from 1985–2005, Bryman (2007) found vision to be a primary behavior for effective leaders. Wooldridge (2011) cited the importance of envisioning new business models while Gossom and Pelton (2011) described the behavior as entrepreneurial. This competency, while considered a behavior, also coexists within transformational and the neo-charismatic leadership school.

Communication and collaboration are also well supported in literature. In a quantitative study of higher education leaders, Smith and Wolverton (2010) developed a leadership model with communication as one of five attributes. Beyond communication in general, Padron et al. (1999) found communication to be critical when merging institutions and engaging in organizational change. Multiple studies have highlighted collaboration and participative decision-making as a leadership strength. In Kavanagh and Ashkanasy's (2006) study, they referred to this behavior as consultative while Bryman (2007) described it as inclusive.

While building trust may seem like an intuitive competency for leaders, building trust in a multicampus institution is more difficult than earning respect or being collaborative. Through interviews, surveys, and focus groups, Jameson (2012) discovered a prevailing attitude that trust is not built by a management plan but is rather "engendered" (p. 402) and leaders should work to build "trust capital" (p. 402). The fact that trust is engendered further strengthens the argument for broad-based participation, inter-personal support, managing relationships, and communication.

Thus, if many of these leadership competencies seek to build trust, it is worth exploring the concept of trust in higher education. Vidovich and Currie (2011) reported in their literature review that trust includes competence, honesty, openness, reliability, and well meaning. In the seminal work of trust in higher education, Tierney's (2006) explored trust with a basis in social capital. Tierney's (2006) work sought to explain the conditions by which trust comes into existence.

According to Tierney (2006), there are nine components to "the grammar of trust" (p. 41). This grammar includes "a repeated interaction, a dynamic process, an end, an exchange, utilizing faith, taking risks, an ability, a rational choice, a cultural construction" (p. 43). Tierney (2006) postulated that repeated interactions are required to build trust and that trust is dynamic and changes over time as expectations change. According to Vidovich and Currie (2011), an end refers to the cyclical nature of trust and trust leading to more trust. Trust is a mutual relationship that is exchanged between parties with faith that each person will uphold the agreement requiring incremental change, not demands, requiring a degree of risk taking (Tierney, 2006). Additionally, Tierney (2006) argued that trust is a learned ability and experience, race, gender, and class affect the degree of trust one places in others. The last two components are slightly more complicated and conceptualize the concept of trust.

Tierney (2006) further explained that trust is a rational choice manageable by people. In the rational choice model, there is an "implicit assumption that a structure exists" (Tierney, 2006,

p. 55). This structure includes norms, societal obligations, and sanctions. This model requires trust by built through changing social network and bringing worldviews into alignment.

A cultural construction view of trust relies on structures as well as social contexts and histories (Tierney, 2006). The cultural construction is more fluid than the rational choice model, relying on "social bonds and shared identities that enable trust to occur (Tierney, 2006, p. 56). A key element in the cultural construction view is how multiple people view an individual as well as his actions or reactions.

While trust is an important component of leadership, other scholars have applied leadership theories to the higher education field, including ones that focus on social processes (Bolden, 2011; Dinh et al., 2014). In recent literature, two theories that have received significant attention are distributed and strategic leadership theories. Jones et al. (2014) argued that while the distributed leadership process may be intuitive in a complex educational institution, systematic implementation has been limited due to institutional accountability measures.

Although formal implementation may be lacking, the existence of the distributed leadership process may already be present in higher education institutions. Distributed leadership fits with a leaders' ability to adapt to situations, a commonly cited attribute of strong leaders (Bolden et al., 2008; Cahill, Bowyer, Rendell, Hammond, & Korek, 2015). While some accountability metrics may encourage a top-down, position driven decision making, other initiatives or decisions within the organization may utilize the relational networks described by distributed leadership theory.

These differing approaches to the situation were captured in Bolden et al.'s (2008) leadership construct that included three levels of leadership: personal, group, and organizational. The individual leadership level focuses on the personal context of the leader while the organizational and group levels involve relational qualities between leaders and other employees. Bolden's et al. (2008) leadership construct at the organizational level focuses on the institution's

structure and how it positions relationships. The group level of leadership interprets leadership

with social contexts within the institution. Since Bolden et al.'s (2008) application of distributed

leadership in higher education, others have tested fit with educational institutions. The social and

structural elements of distributed leadership contain elements including trust, respect, and

collaboration (Jones, Harvey & Lefoe, 2014; Sewerin & Holmberg, 2017). An inherent issue that

arises with distributed leadership in educational institutional institutions is the balance between

top-down and bottom-up leadership (Bolden et al., 2008; Sewerin & Holmberg, 2017), once again

supporting the notion that the implemented leadership theories need to be contextualized with the

situation.

Strategic Leadership has had limited attention in higher education literature. Brimhall

(2014) attributed this limited attention to a lack of theory building across disciplines. In her

phenomenological study, Brimhall (2014) found that high performance leaders develop purposeful

strategies to advocate, collaborate, communicate, manage personnel, and manage organizational

structure. While Brimhall's (2014) study focused on the leaders' strategic approach to several

leadership competencies, it further confirms the importance of key traits and interpersonal skills

articulated within other leadership theories as well as the network approach to communication

through informal as well as formal channels.

Review of Methodological Issues

Studies of multicampus institutions, intercampus tension, and educational leadership utilize

many different methodologies. The majority of studies focus on qualitative approaches (Gaskell,

2011; Jones et al., 2014; Timberlake, 2004; Vartiainen, 2017); however, there is a strong body of

quantitative approaches when measuring the applicability of leadership competencies to theoretical

frameworks (Conover, 2009; Smith & Wolverton, 2010). This section reviews the methodology of

studies in each of these areas but begins with a brief overview of the methodologies used within these studies.

Methodology overview. Research in the social sciences have three main branches. Quantitative research is often used to test theories while qualitative research is more varied and may seek to create new theories (Newman & Benz, 1998). Newman and Benz (1998) described this traditionally held dichotomy based on the underlying belief in qualitative studies "that multiple realities exist and multiple interpretations are available from different individuals that are all equally valid" (p. 2), while qualitative studies assume "a common objective reality across individuals" (p. 2). Mixed method studies incorporate both quantitative and qualitative approaches.

Quantitative research seeks to determine relationships between variables. These studies aim to determine the impact of one variable, or set of variables, on the dependent variable. Newman and Benz (1998) noted that dependent variables are typically the outcome the researcher is studying. Researchers typically articulate the expected relationship between variables as either a hypothesis or a proposition. Throughout quantitative research, it is important the research design controls for other factors that may influence the outcome of research. Typical quantitative methods use either a survey methodology or the design of an experiment, testing the effect of a variable or variables on a particular outcome.

Qualitative research may use several different approaches. The more common research designs include narrative research (Pinnegar & Daynes, 2007), phenomenological studies (Moustakas, 1994), grounded theory (Bryant & Charmaz, 2006), ethnography (Wolcott, 2008), and case studies (Yin, 2013). Narrative research can fall within many different frameworks but each framework includes "the study of stories or narratives or descriptions of a series of events" Pinnegar & Daynes, 2007, p. 4). Phenomenological research typically uses interviews as a tool to

describe the shared experience of subjects regarding a particular phenomenon (Moustakas, 1994).

Grounded theory approaches "comprises a systematic, inductive, and comparative approach for

conducting inquiry for the purpose of constructing theory" (Bryant & Charmaz, 2007, p. 1).

Grounded theory is an iterative method that continually collects, analyzes, and focuses an

emerging theory (Bryant & Charmaz, 2007). According to Wolcott (2008), there is controversy as

to what type of research constitutes ethnography. While an ethnography can be an actual product,

many studies borrow ethnographic techniques, studying patterns within a certain cultural group

(Wolcott, 2008). Case studies utilize multiple sources of information to present an in-depth study

about a particular case during a specific contemporary period (Yin, 2013). Yin (2013) noted that

there can be either single or multiple cases and is especially useful when there may not be a

distinction between a phenomenon and the context of the situation.

      Multicampus institutions and intercampus tension. Studies of multicampus institutions

have largely relied on qualitative methods. These studies predominantly use a case study approach

to understanding how multicampus institutions operate and what challenges the institutions face.

Other studies have incorporated a mixed-method approach or have simply relied on the author's

personal experiences.

      Case studies have been the most popular method of examining multicampus institutions

and tension within those institutions. Many of the case studies rely on public documents and

interviews or surveys at a single institution (Aglargoz, 2017; Shaw & Bornhoft, 2011; Vartiainen,

2017). Other case studies have attempted to identify trends among several institutions through

examining multiple institutions (Gaskell, 2011; Gaskell & Hayton, 2015; Mills & Plumb, 2012;

Zeeman & Benneworth, 2017). Anderson (2011) used an ethnographic case study approach to

study cross-campus faculty leadership within a specific subset of college personnel at one

institution.

While case studies can present a thorough review of one institution's experiences, these studies are not without flaws. Case studies have limits including "a relative inability to render judgments on the frequency or representativeness of a particular case and a weak capability for estimating the average 'causal effect' of variables for a sample" (George & Bennett, 2004, p. 22). In short, single institution case studies provide a glimpse into the experience at one institution but are not generalizable to experiences at other institutions. Case studies involving multiple institutions provide a broader view of the phenomena or issue studied. However, as noted by Gaskell (2011), these studies take a significant amount of time and often require significant travel time and expenses.

Other studies have used a mixed-method approach to studying multicampus and systems of institutions. Harmening (2013) examined six systems of higher education through both surveying and interviewing personnel in system offices in higher education. Kavanagh and Ashkanasy (2006) conducted a six-year study involving both large quantitative study of employees in recently merged institutions as well as a follow-up qualitative study with a select group of administrators and sixty other employees. In this study, the qualitative component provided a personal context to the larger quantitative study.

Timberlake (2004) performed a qualitative phenomenological study of higher education personnel in several multicampus institutions. This study focused on decision making at multicampus higher education institutions by interviewing eight individuals. The individuals spanned different types of institutions including both 2-year, technical, and 4-year institutions in the public, private, and for-profit sectors. While this study had great breath of institutions and sectors, it lacked the ability to compare results within one sector. Furthermore, each participant was from a different functional area within each of these different institutions. A further study of

the experiences within one sector and one position could provide greater insight into the experiences of that position within the multicampus institution.

While research on multicampus institutions is relatively immature, this dissertation merges two fields with distinct histories of scholarship and methodologies. Unlike studies on multicampus institutions, the field of leadership has received much more attention. The next section will review the methodologies used in leadership studies including the diversity of qualitative, quantitative, and mixed method studies.

Leadership. Studies in academic leadership vary more than studies on multicampus institutions. With extensive depth and breadth to leadership studies, authors use a variety of approaches including qualitative, quantitative, and mixed method. Significantly different from the reliance on qualitative studies of multicampus institutions, there is a larger set of mixed method and purely quantitative studies involving the application of leadership competencies. The following paragraphs will detail the strengths and limitations of each approach based on the topic of the studies.

Case studies in leadership often use multiple sources of information including document review, interviews, and prior research. Harman (2002) utilized document review in describing challenges for higher education leaders during the merging of institutions while Mercer (2009) studied the role of junior-level academic managers. While these particular studies were limited in scope and diversity of institutions, other case studies involve multiple institutions in multiple states. Bailey and Morest (2004) examined organizational efficiency through 271 interviews across five states. Floyd, Maslin, and Hrabak (2010) examined how community college presidents cope with pressures through using secondary sources of information.

These studies demonstrate that case studies can be useful when examining issues such as position requirements or leader longevity. When a case study includes multiple institutions, the

35

required time and travel can expansive. In Bailey and Morest's (2004) study, a significant amount of time and travel is required to conduct nearly 300 interviews across five states. Without this investment in time, the research would be limited to a detailed study of a single institution.

Beyond case studies, other researchers have employed phenomenological methods to studies in leadership. Many of these studies included interviews to discover qualifications, competencies, or challenges in higher education leadership (Aspen Institute and Achieving the Dream, 2013; Drew, 2010; Gigliotti, 2016). The number of interviews in these studies varied greatly; Drew (2010) interviewed 17 individuals in a single institution while Gigliotti (2016) used seven participants. Other authors used focus groups (Sewerin & Holmberg, 2017), surveys (Gossom & Pelton, 2011), or even analyzed participant reflections in a group project (Jones, Harvey, Lefoe, & Ryland, 2014). These studies are not generalizable to explain the experiences of all higher education leaders but rather provide a starting point for other researchers to develop and test new leadership theories.

Some studies on higher education leadership have employed quantitative methods. These quantitative studies have been used when comparing leadership traits among different groups (Witt/Kieffer, 2013), testing the applicability of a set of competencies to higher education leaders (Smith & Wolverton, 2010), or testing the relationship between behavior and traits (Underwood, Mohr, & Ross, 2016). Each of these studies used a quantitative survey to test a descriptive list of behaviors and traits against the perceptions of leaders.

While the sample of these studies was high (generally over 100 subjects), the sampling methodology was important to the outcome of each study. Witt/Kieffer (2013) used a standard assessment taken by over 1,000 leaders from industry and higher education, resulting in a large body of data. Other studies have opted to use a convenience sample (Smith & Wolverton, 2010;

Underwood et al., 2016). Convenience sampling methodologies are prone to low response rates and self-selection bias.

Although low response rates and self-section bias can affect the results of studies using surveys and convenience sampling methods, there are alternatives. Nordin (2012) used a survey to determine if a positive relationship existed between a leader's secure attachment style and transformational leadership style. In the study, researchers used questionnaires used in previous studies as well as a clustered sampling approach (Nordin, 2012). In this study, the sampling was a simple random sample within two different clusters, main and branch campuses (Nordin, 2012).

Other higher education leadership studies have utilized both qualitative and quantitative measures in a mixed-method approach. Eddy and VanDerLinden (2006) employed a stratified random sample of 1700 administrators to collect quantitative and qualitative data through closed and open-ended questions. Conover (2009) used triangulation to test the applicability of the AACC leadership competencies to branch campus administrators. Triangulation is a method of combining complementary qualitative and quantitative results to better understand the quantitative results and discover any potential shortfalls. Conover's (2009) qualitative questions provided a glimpse into any possible areas not addressed by the AACC competencies.

Methodological critique. While there is a significant literature on institutional leadership and different leadership theories, there is a lack of literature on leadership applied in a tense, multicampus institution. Research has addressed many traits, competencies, potential actions, processes, and considerations of leaders. However, the lack of literature on leaders' perceptions of tension in multicampus institutions is a void in an increasingly larger type of higher education institution. While Padron et al. (1999) and Thor et al. (1999) provided personal experiences of using a common vision and mission to mitigate tension, Pinheiro and Berg (2017) noted that there is a lack of a conceptual framework for understanding multicampus institutions.

Within the studies of multicampus institutions and higher education leadership, researchers have used several different methodologies, each with advantages and disadvantages. Due to limited development of multicampus theory, there is not a body of quantitative research on multicampus institutions. Quantitative research has been more popular with studies on leadership where organizations such as the AACC have developed leadership competencies. Many qualitative studies of multicampus institutions have studied only a single institution (Aglargoz, 2017; Shaw & Bornhoft, 2011; Vartiainen, 2017). These studies have focused on the experience of many employees at one specific institution. Other studies have included multiple institutions but have required a significant amount of time and travel (Gaskell, 2011). Timberlake's (2004) multicampus study was efficient, covering many different institutions and positions. However, based on Timberlake's (2004) sample, it is difficult to understand trends of decision making in multicampus institutions when each participant held very different positions within the participating institutions.

Synthesis of Research Findings

Research has addressed many traits, competencies, potential actions, processes, and considerations of leaders. However, the lack of literature on leaders' perceptions of tension in multicampus institutions is a void in an increasingly larger segment of higher education. This section will synthesize the research findings in multicampus leadership, leadership models, and results from scholarship on higher education leadership. The first section will focus on perceptions and determining underlying reasons for intercampus tension while the second section will focus on mitigating tension within the higher education landscape.

Leaders' perceptions of intercampus tension. Intercampus tension can derail institutional progress to meeting institutional and accountability metrics. Tension may take many

different forms and may have many different causes. For a leader to understand tension, the intercampus tension must be perceived before determining the underlying reason for the tension.

Cultural differences are a primary constraint in the integration of institutions (Harmon, 2002). The definition of culture, regardless of academic source, typically includes customs and traditions within a group of individuals. If campuses within a multicampus institution have significantly different cultures, the academic cultures "can present a considerable force in preventing or severely retarding change" (Harmon, 2002, p. 97). Kavanagh and Ashkanasy (2006), as well Bryman (2007), indicated that one potential solution may be borne from a leader's ability to be collaborative, consultative, or inclusive in decision making.

Beyond managing different cultures, leaders must recognize the impact of geographical separation on trusting leadership. Several studies in private industry have found that both geographical distance (Berry, 2011) as well as with whom the employee identifies with (Maguire & Phillips, 2008) effects employee trust of leadership. Maguire and Phillips (2008) finding that an employee's identification with a particular group effects trust of leadership can also be explained by another manifestation of the role of different institutional cultures. Unfortunately, building trust and relationships at a multicampus institution with geographical separation can be difficult (Bottoroof, Glaser, Todd, & Alderman, 2008).

It is not surprising that culture, trust, and decision-making are interrelated. Depending on organizational culture, a leadership position may come with trust, or lack-of, depending on previous administrations (Wang & Sedivy-Benton, 2016). If this trust is broken or if there is a negative leader, the impacts can last for a long time (Rose & Bergman, 2016; Wang & Sedivy-Benton, 2016). Imagine a multicampus institution where decisions have a disparate effect on each campus. Although the decision may advance institutional mission, it could promote one campus more than another campus. At a shared-governance institution, these disparate effects could

negatively affect faculty-administration relationships and campus cultures could retard institutional change as suggested by Harmon (2002).

Managing cultures and institutional trust requires institutional change and adaptability among institutional leaders. Leaders' ability to adapt to situations is a commonly cited attribute of strong leaders (Bolden et al., 2008; Cahill et al., 2015). The next section will explore different leadership styles and leadership actions that may help mitigate tension between campuses.

Leadership styles and mitigating tension. In the preceding section, mitigating tension may rely on leaders recognizing and addressing cultural differences. Two methods of addressing cultural differences have already been discussed. Leaders may adapt structural elements including an intentional balancing of autonomy and centralization as well as building relationships as suggested by the concept of collegiality.

If the leader does not balance autonomy and centralization, there are potential consequences. Pinheiro and Berg (2017) noted that too much autonomy could lead to fragmentation. This fragmentation could exacerbate any cultural differences, further entrenching a campus in its own culture through maintaining its customs and traditions. Although there is a magnification of campus culture within individual campuses with increased autonomy, it does result in a more comfortable work environment (Timberlake, 2004).

Centralization is not without consequences. While centralization increases efficiency, it often slows decision-making (Timberlake, 2004). Furthermore, centralization results in a less comfortable work environment and can exacerbate feelings of mistrust in leadership (Timberlake, 2004). If one were to accept Timberlake's (2004) conclusions, leaders must seek a balance between centrality and autonomy.

In addition to finding balance, leaders must also demonstrate an ability to be collaborative, consultative, or inclusive in decision-making (Bryman, 2007; Kavanagh & Ashkanasy, 2006).

40

Beyond being a consultative leader, Wooldridge (2001) included collegiately as a necessary requirement of institutional culture. Kligyte and Barrie (2014) argued that collegiality is actually a barrier to organizational change, equating collegiality with an absence of top down decision-making. On the other hand, Wooldridge (2011) limited collegiality to a description of the institutional culture that not includes both a collaborative atmosphere but also requires some decisions be top-down. Once again, the description of collegiality and collaboration within a multicampus institution can only be understood in the context of the degree of campus autonomy.

Because the organizational structure of an institution plays a significant role in the degree of autonomy (Gaskell & Hayton, 2015), it is important for a leader to understand the ramifications of the organizations administrative structure. Organizational structure not only affects the perceptions of branch campus personnel (Gaskell & Hayton, 2015), but also includes an inherent level of distributed duties and decision-making. Thus, understanding relational and distributed leadership theories may help with the interpretation of leaders' experiences.

As previously stated, relational and distributed leadership theories focus on the process of leadership through social relationships. However, communication occurs at multiple levels of the organization and in a variety of contexts. As a result, Bolden, Petrov, and Gosling (2008) developed a distributed leadership construct dividing leadership development into organizational, group, and individual levels, focusing on structural, social, and personal contexts, respectively. The structural components of the model are similar to Brimhall's (2014) intentional formal and informal communications strategically created by a leader, Gaskell and Hayton's (2015) organizational structure, or the balance between centralization and autonomy (Pinheiro & Berg, 2017; Timberlake, 2004).

Beyond the organizational aspects of distributed leadership, social elements such as trust, respect, and collaboration, align with the AACC competencies (Jones, Harvey & Lefoe, 2014;

Sewerin & Holmberg, 2017). Timberlake (2005) echoed these ideals through recommending broad-based participation, inter-personal support, and managing interpersonal relationships. This aligns with Brimhall's (2014) finings that successful leaders strategically plan communication, collaboration, and managing personnel.

Building trust and relationships at a multicampus institution with geographical separation can be difficult (Bottoroof, Glaser, Todd, & Alderman, 2008). Without trust, employees may become more entrenched within individual campus cultures thereby exacerbating tension between campuses. Tierney's (2006) trust framework, synthesized with complex leadership theory and Brimhall's (2014) findings, provides a baseline knowledge that can be applied to a multicampus institution.

Arena and Uhl-Bien (2016) networked framework of an organization includes key personnel as nodes between entrepreneurial and operational systems. According to Brimhall (2014), these nodes can be used as informal communication channels between units. If this model is extended to a multicampus institution, it makes sense that there may be particular individuals who can act as networked connections between different institutional systems or campuses.

If this networked model is viewed through the lens of Tierney's (2006) social capital framework for trust, additional details emerge. As a cultural construction, trust can be built incrementally through behaviors reported by Vidovich and Currie (2011) that include competence, honesty, openness, reliability, and well meaning. Through adapting social networks and structures, individuals can build relationships that bridge differences and enable trust. This clearly overlaps with complex leadership theories and even Brimhall's (2014) findings within a strategic leadership framework of purposeful advocacy, collaboration, communication, and managing personal and structures.

Critique of Previous Research

While there is a significant literature on institutional leadership and different leadership theories, there is a lack of literature on leadership applied in a tense, multicampus institution. Research has addressed many traits, competencies, potential actions, processes, and considerations of leaders. However, the lack of literature on leaders' perceptions of tension in multicampus institutions is a void in an increasingly larger type of higher education institution. While there is evidence that building a common vision and mission was a successful tactic at some institutions (Padron et al., 1999; Thor et al., 1999), there has been little exploratory work into multicampus leaders' perceptions and reactions to intercampus tension.

Literature on leadership in multicampus institutions is generally lacking. Although the multicampus institution is an ongoing and popular model for delivering higher education during tight financial times, researchers have spent relatively little attention on leadership of these institutions. Characteristic of the relatively new nature of multicampus studies, the methodological critique highlighted the over reliance on single-institution case studies.

Additionally, the breadth in both leadership models and leadership studies is staggering; however, what is known does not necessarily help multicampus leaders. Dinh et al. (2014) analyzed the general body of leadership research as studying how leaders are perceived rather than how leaders make institutions effective. Furthermore, Dinh et al. (2014) argued that leadership should be studied as a process, accounting and allowing for both top-down and bottom-up approaches. As an example, leaders can influence institutions through "shaping organizational climates and cultures, leaders can create ethical norms that guide the moral (or immoral) behavior of groups or collectives in a top-down direction" (p. 37) or "simultaneously, leaders may also appeal directly to individuals by aligning followers' values and identities to those of the organization" (p. 37).

Unlike Dinh's (2014) suggestion, much of the leadership literature focuses on analysis or confirmation of leadership competencies. Conover (2009) and Campbell et al. (2010) sought to prove the relevance or suggest implementation of competencies. Others have reframed the competencies with different terms or a slightly different view without moving beyond the competency to the process of leadership (Wallin, 2010). Some leadership literature has not specified sources of information for case studies (Harman, 2002) while others have simply reviewed a single case (El-Ashmawy & Weasenforth, 2010; Mercer, 2009; Shaw & Bornhoft, 2011). Many other researchers have attempted to lay foundational foundation pieces through literature reviews or integration of the literature (Basham & Mathur, 2010; Bolden, 2011; Bryman, 2007; Lamm et al., 2016). In each of these cases, due to limited scope of the study or neglecting the process of leadership, it is difficult to generalize the results or even apply the results to a new situation.

While there are faults with some of the studies, others are quite strong. Kavanagh and Ashkanasy's (2006) study involved the process of leadership and included multiple institutions over an extended period. Bolden et al. (2008) qualitative study utilized interviewing and document research with a very high sample of 152 interviews in 12 institutions is not practical for many researchers. Similarly, Timberlake (2004) researched the process of decision-making; however, Timberlake's sample of incorporated only one representative of several different subgroups of leaders and types of institutions. This high diversity of subjects was also a fault in Smith and Wolverton's (2010) study. In these last two cases, it is difficult to ascertain how people in an equivalent leadership position within organizational structures perceive the process of leadership in a multicampus environment.

Beyond Dinh et al.'s (2014) critique of higher education literature, Pinheiro and Berg (2017) listed several potential future studies focused on multicampus institutions, including

qualitative and quantitative studies based on systems theory. Much like Dinh et al. (2014),

Pinheiro and Berg (2017) requested further research utilizing longitudinal designs, with an ultimate

goal of understanding the "inherent complexity of multicampus universities as systems" (p. 20). It

may be too early for extensive longitudinal research of multicampus institutions. Although a

longitudinal study is a good future goal, most of the research in 2017 has involved literature

reviews (Pinheiro & Berg, 2017; Wirihana, Welch, Williamson, Christensen, Bakon, & Craft,

2017), single-institutions case studies (Aglargoz, 2017) or heavy reliance on personal experience

(Vartiainen, 2017; Zeeman & Benneworth, 2017). Each of these studies provide a framework for

further developing research and knowledge about multicampus institutions but future work needs

to further frame the issues of multicampus institutions.

Generally, literature on multicampus institutions has been lacking. Much of the research

has been limited to the atmosphere on branch campuses and have used a case-study approach

based on only one institution (Aglargoz, 2017; Padron et al., 1999; Thor et al., 1999; Vartiainen,

2017) or even personal experience (Bird, 2011). Hoyt and Howell (2012) used a survey to study

why students choose a branch campus. Although the study provided good information for one

student, the convenience sample in one institution limits the ability for other researchers to

generalize the results.

Other researchers have focused on the regional aspects of campuses within a multicampus

institution (Bebko & Huffman, 2011; Shaw & Bornhoft, 2011; Zeeman & Benneworth, 2017).

Bebko and Huffman's (2011) large survey of administrators was strong but only provided

demographic trends of branch campuses. Shaw and Bornhoft (2011) completed a single institution

case study that focused on the experience of deans within that institution. While the study

provided insights to how deans might balance community and institutional needs, there are

confounding factors that limit a larger use of the results. Zeeman and Benneworth's (2017) study

involved multiple institutions but the source data was unclear and most likely involved personal experience and document reviews. The lack of clarity in data limits the usability of the study.

Methods used by other researchers have provided results that provide clearer source data across a wider range of institutions. Gaskell (2011) used 11 institutions in a detailed case study of how organizational staffing and responsibilities affect other aspects of the institution. With 491 responses, Bottorff et al. (2008) surveyed librarians at multicampus institutions using an instrument based on prior research. Kavanagh and Ashkanasy's (2006) research covered three institutions but followed the participants over a six-year duration.

Chapter 2 Summary

This chapter reviewed literature addressing multicampus institutions and higher education leadership. The detailed review examined the history, development, and status of multicampus institutions, intercampus tension, and higher education leadership, all synthesized to provide a comprehensive state of higher education research on multicampus institutions. Additionally, the chapter examined and analyzed the extant literature on higher education leadership and multicampus institutions.

While there is a wealth of research into higher education leadership and application of leadership theories, there is a lack of research on leadership in multicampus institutions. General leadership literature contains several different leadership theories and models. Although there are many leadership models, research on higher education leadership generally focuses on traits, qualities, behaviors, and actions of leaders. However, there is a growing body of research on distributed, relational, and complex leadership theories.

Multicampus studies have generally not directly approached the topic of leadership but rather focused on intercampus tension and organizational structure. Two primary sources of intercampus tension within literature include differing missions and campus cultures. Researchers

have found that organizational structure and the degree of centralization play a critical role in determining the degree of intercampus tension.

When intercampus tension is viewed through the lens of relational, distributed, and complex leadership theories, the theme of trust emerges. Both complex leadership theory and Tierney's framework for trust account for complex interactions between independent agents within the organization. These interactions and relationships are complex, can tie disparate organizational systems together, and provide a framework for institutions to mitigate unproductive tension.

Based on this review of literature, which developed a framework using leadership theories and competencies, organizational structure, and trust to understand tension within a multicampus institution, there is sufficient evidence to investigate leader perceptions of, and reactions to, intercampus tension. This literature review provided support for a study to answer the following research questions: how do multicampus leaders perceive intercampus tension and how do those leaders attempt to mitigate intercampus tension? Once these perceptions and processes are better understood, further studies can illuminate potential multicampus leadership theories that can be tested through longitudinal quantitative studies.

Chapter 3: Methodology

Introduction

The goal of this study was to understand how leaders experience and react to intercampus tension in the context of a multicampus institution. Multicampus institutions may gain financial efficiencies that resolve financial issues while preserving student access across a larger geographical area than a single campus institution. However, corporate mergers typically struggle to realize the financial objectives (Maguire & Philips, 2008). While these are different sectors of the economy, many of the same tensions exist when institutions merge, regardless of industry.

Although many studies have examined sources of intercampus tension from the perspective of branch campuses, research into multicampus administrators should address administrators' perspectives of the same sources of tension. Researchers have discovered sources of intercampus tension include uncertainty and institutional identity (Kavanagh & Ashkanasy, 2006; Maguire & Phillips, 2008), differing missions and local needs (Bailey & Morest, 2004; Vartiainen, 2017), and feelings of isolation (Aglargoz, 2017; Gaskell & Hayton, 2015).

This study also accounted for two other fundamental issues in multicampus institutions, leadership and trust. Examining leader perceptions and reactions to intercampus tension will likely depend on the administrator's personal style and approach to leadership. Additionally, with geographic separation between campuses, building trust and relationships can be even more difficult (Bottoroof, Glaser, Todd, & Alderman, 2008). The degree to which an administrator attributes intercampus tension to organizational structure or differing regional needs may result in the administrator attempting to affect change through organizational or strategic planning. Regardless of the administrator's ability to affect change in organizational planning, the leader may attempt to mitigate tension through leadership style and building trust.

Moustakas (1994) indicated that qualitative research is important when focusing on the entire experience as well as finding meanings of those experiences. Understanding intercampus tension requires this focus and discovery of meaning. Furthermore, Starks and Trinidad (2007) stated that the goal of phenomenology is to "describe the meaning of the lived experience of a phenomenon" (p. 1373). With a primary purpose of understanding intercampus tension more fully through exploring administrators' experiences, interviewing participants can help understand several leaders' experiences, perceptions, and reactions to tension within a complex higher education environment. Analyzing participant responses through the framework of several different leadership theories and models may help shape and categorize specific leadership processes that ultimately help institutions achieve the desired outcomes of a multicampus institution.

Subsequent sections of this chapter will address research questions as well as the purpose and design of the study. The next sections include specific details including the research population, sampling, survey instrument, and data collection procedures. Next, is the identification of attributes along with the data analysis procedures. The limitations of the design follow along with steps taken to enhance the validity, credibility, and dependability of the study. Before the chapter summary, expected findings and ethical issues are addressed.

Research Questions

With a goal of understanding intercampus tension in multicampus institutions, the primary research question was: How do administrators experience intercampus tension in a multicampus higher education environment? There has been a lack of information in current literature about how administrators perceive intercampus tension in a multicampus institution. As expressed in Chapter 2, this tension can undermine institutional efficiencies and stymie institutional progress.

How a leader perceives and understands intercampus tension may affect leaders' actions and behaviors. Both complex and strategic leadership theories indicate that leaders engage in strategic behaviors and relationships based the situation (Arena & Uhl-Bien, 2016; Finkelstein et al., 2009). It follows that since intercampus tension exists, a leader would need to perceive and interpret the intercampus tension prior to engaging in strategic behaviors or developing strategic relationships.

Additionally, Tierney's (2006) "grammar of trust" (p. 43) indicates that trust is a dynamic exchange between parties. A leader's perception of her own relationship and exchanges with other constituents of the institution will affect the dynamics of trust within the relationship. As indicated in Chapter 2, many researchers have found that trust and relationships are critical for leadership and organizational change.

While some tension may be productive (Arena & Uhl-Bien, 2016), it can also lead to a loss of efficiency or an inability to adapt to new situations. Because differing campus cultures can exacerbate intercampus tension, action is required to change the culture (Kavanagh and Ashkanasy, 2006). This led to the secondary research question: What leadership strategies do administrators employ to mitigate tension in a multicampus higher education environment?

Two additional secondary research questions synthesize the extant multicampus literature with this study:

- How do administrators experience tension related to differing regional needs and organizational structure?

- How do administrators perceive leadership styles and trust as factors in intercampus tension?

Purpose and Design of the Study

By viewing intercampus tension through the lens of leaders, other multicampus administrators may better understand situations at their own institutions. Intercampus tension in a multicampus environment often falls into two categories, differing regional needs as well as differing individual campus identities and cultures (Bailey & Morest, 2004; Vartiainen, 2017). Understanding how administrators perceive and react to these sources of tension can inform how others may react to tension at their own institution.

Purpose. The purpose of this study was to discover how administrators have experienced and understand intercampus tension as well as what actions may mitigate tension. Included within that purpose, the study aimed to provide insight into perceptions of intercampus tension and help other administrators develop a framework to mitigate intercampus tension. Additionally, administrators may learn the impact of leadership styles, college organizational structure, and centralization on intercampus tension. Furthermore, insights into building trust across multiple campuses may be gleaned from this study.

This research addressed the gap in the literature reviewed in Chapter 2, specifically the lack of research of similar role administrators' perceptions and reactions to intercampus tension. Although the multicampus institution is a popular model for delivering higher education during tight financial times (Brubaker, 2016; Pinheiro & Berg, 2017), leadership at multicampus institutions has not been addressed. Characteristic of the relatively new nature of multicampus studies, the literature of Chapter 2 highlighted the overreliance on single-institution case studies.

Timberlake's (2004) phenomenological study on decision-making in a multicampus institution improved the understanding of tension as it related to the degree of centralization and autonomy. Although this was not a recent study, little additional research has furthered knowledge of intercampus tension and multicampus leadership. Additionally, Pinheiro and Berg (2017) noted

the lack of current research in multicampus institutions. The body of knowledge produced from this study can help administrators understand and react to intercampus tension.

Through an understanding of how other administrators have perceived and reacted to intercampus tension, administrators may have a better understanding of their own institution. Pinheiro and Berg (2017) suggested the need for additional research designed on systems theory. By including contextual leadership theories as described by Dinh et al. (2014), results may also provide a beginning insight into inter-college tension at a system of institutions or even inter-department tension at a single institution.

Research design. The phenomenological approach of Timberlake (2004) continues to be an applicable means of studying tension at multicampus institutions. Across different institutions, Timberlake's (2004) study provided a broad understanding of how many different individuals perceived decision-making. Additionally, Pinheiro and Berg (2017) suggested additional qualitative and quantitative studies designed on systems theory. This study aimed to employ a qualitative approach to examine leaders' experiences at the president, vice president, or dean level.

A qualitative approach is also important for examining how administrators understand leadership. Dinh et al. (2014) argued that researchers should study leadership as a process, accounting and allowing for both top-down and bottom-up approaches. By viewing leadership as a process, new organizational structures may emerge. For example, organizational leaders may work with individuals outside of the typical hierarchy to create a new organizational climate and organizational norms (Dinh et al., 2014).

There are several different qualitative approaches to research including case study, ethnography, phenomenology, narrative, and grounded theory. Case studies often include multiple techniques and sources of information to examine a particular case or multiple cases (Mukhopadhyay & Gupta, 2014). Ethnographic research includes immersion within a particular

culture for an extended amount of time (Goulding, 2005). Phenomenological research seeks to understand participants experience with a particular phenomenon, typically via interviews (Moustakas, 1994). Narrative research seeks to retell the experiences of an individual or small number of individuals (Harrison, 2008) while a grounded theory approach attempts to develop a new theory (Starks & Trinidad, 2007).

Seeking to understand participant experiences with a particular phenomenon, this study incorporated Moustakas' (1994) transcendental phenomenology methodology. This framework is largely based on Husserl's phenomenological philosophical theory (Barua, 2007). Moustakas (1994) described the primary challenge in human science research, "to describe things in themselves, to permit what is before one to enter consciousness and self-reflection" (p. 27). This methodology will incorporate four primary components: epoché, transcendental-phenomenological reduction, imaginative variation, and textural-structural analysis.

Critical to phenomenology are the concepts of noema and noesis. According to Moustakas (1994), noema is what is experienced while the noesis is the perception of the object. Ashworth and Greasley (2009) indicated that through a rich, thick description, the perception of the object or a "manner of orientation" (p. 565) is evident. The interviews in this research study will include the level of detail necessary to extract and understand the experiences and perceptions of the participants.

In the first stage, epoché, the goal is to view the phenomena "freshly, naively, in a wide open sense" (Moustakas, 1994, p. 33). This investigation has been open, with a naïve approach to the literature review, using the current research to guide the salient points of this dissertation. These key elements include tension rising from regionalization, campus identity, and trust issues. As Moerer-Urdahl and Creswell (2004) suggested for researchers engaged in the epoché process, this chapter includes my previous experiences and the outcomes I expect in the research.

The interviews were appraoched with a similar naivety, open to new perspectives on intercampus tension and administrator actions that may mitigate this tension. Epoché helps researchers develop a contextual description of the phenomena by allowing participant experiences to frame the conversation. However, as noted by Tufford and Newman (2010), suspending aspects of epoché during the interview process may enrich the interview and uncover specific details of the participant's experience. Although information from personal experiences may have been incorporated during the interview process, other strategies enhanced the dependability and credibility of the interviews. These validation strategies are discussed later in this chapter.

The aim of transcendental-phenomenological reduction is to view each situation and experience with a complete description to "derive a textural description of the meaning and essences of the phenomenon, the constituents that comprise the experience in consciousness" (Moustakas, 1994, p. 34). This is similar to Husserl's moving from fact to essence or a "change of focus from the objects perceived to the ways in which the object is consciously known" (Barua, 2007, p. 8). In this study, extended interviews with participants were recorded to capture the full detail of the experience. Additionally, the questions utilized will be open-ended with several follow-up questions to develop the textural description. Recordings, as well as transcriptions of the recordings, will provide the source material for the reduction.

Imaginative variation incorporates the individual experiences to determine the structural essence of the experience (Moustakas, 1994). Once the interviews were complete and transcribed, data analysis sought to identify themes and common experiences among the participants and began the process of determining the structural essence of the phenomena. This will led to Moustakas' (1994) final stage, "a textural-structural synthesis of meanings and essences of the phenomenon or experience being investigated" (p. 36).

Research Population and Sampling Method

Saunders (2012) noted that it is critical for the sample to meet the needs of the research. Researchers employ several different sampling methods to identify a research population. This section begins with an overview of different sampling methodologies before describing the research population for this study and addressing potential barriers to participant recruitment.

The two primary categories of sampling techniques are probabilistic and non-probabilistic. A probabilistic sample requires the researcher know all potential cases in a population and to choose samples at random (Saunders, 2012). A primary benefit of probabilistic sampling is the potential to generalize the results (Saunders, 2012). There is not a comprehensive list of all potential participants in this study; therefore, probabilistic sampling is not possible. Additionally, as noted in Chapter 2, the complex interplay of campus culture, organizational structure, and relationship between campuses has an effect on intercampus tension. This phenomenon needs to be explored through a non-probabilistic method such as convenience or purposive sampling.

Two common non-probabilistic sampling techniques include convenience and purposive sampling. Convenience sampling selects participants based on convenience; participants may be easily accessible, geographically close, or easily available for participation (Etikan, Musa, & Alkassim, 2016). In purposive sampling techniques, the researcher selects participants based on prior knowledge or characteristics of the participant (Etikan et al., 2016). Saunders (2012) stated that purposive sampling is particularly effective in exploratory work. In this study, participants will be selected using purposive sampling with final participants selected based on characteristics outlined in subsequent paragraphs.

The potential research population of this study includes any administrators within multicampus higher education institutions. Initially, multicampus institutions were identified through a review of the Integrated Postsecondary Educational Systems and regional accreditation

agency websites. Following the identification of potential institutions, a review of institutional websites was conducted to ensure the institution has multiple campuses with an administrative structure that includes administrators with responsibilities over multiple campuses.

Purposive sampling was used to create a list of preliminary participants with a goal of applying homogeneous sampling. According to Etikan et al. (2016), homogeneous sampling seeks similar participant traits. In this study, the homogeneity criteria was experience as an administrator in a multicampus institutions, supervisory or leadership experience across multiple campuses, and at least five years in administrative roles. Contacts within the institution were identified through the institutions' websites.

After final approval by Concordia University–Portland's Institutional Review Board (IRB), preliminary participants were contacted via both phone and email to explain the purpose of the dissertation and confirm that the administrator met the participation criteria. Administrators who agreed to participate in the study were emailed a detailed explanation of the study along with an informed consent form. Approval from the participant's institutions was not sought as this study did not use the resources of those institutions.

Timberlake's (2004) study included eight participants with roles as varied as institutional consultant, faculty, and vice president. Slightly narrowing the scope, this study focused on high-level administrators at institutions including typical position titles such as president, vice president, chief academic officer, and deans. These participants have experiences as administrators at multicampus institutions but not necessarily systems of institutions.

There were two primary barriers to recruiting participants. College administrators tend to have busy schedules. Additionally, administrative assistants often control the calendars and scheduling of high-level administrators, creating another layer of communication to contact participants. To incentivize participation, the participants were offered an executive summary of

the completed research, increasing the opportunity to grow in his or her own leadership role. To aid in recruitment, I also used my own professional network to identify potential participants.

Morse (2000) stated that the typical number of interviews for a phenomenological study is 6–10 participants. Guest, Bunce, and Johnson (2006) completed an experiment with data saturation and variability, concluding that codes are well saturated at 12 interviews. Based on this information, the preliminary goal of this study was to interview between 12 and 17 participants, acknowledging that more participants may have been needed during the data analysis phase to saturate the identification and coding of themes. To protect participants from deductive disclosure, a larger cross section of institutions was required. As a result, no more than two participants were currently employed at a single institution. Other participant protections are discussed in the ethical issues section of this chapter. Additionally, publically available information will be collected to identify attributes of participant institutions.

Instrumentation

The interview guide was based on a semistructured interviewing technique, or as Seidman (2013) described, phenomenologically based interviews (see Appendix A). This approach uses mostly open-ended questions with the ability of the interviewer to explore themes to a deeper extent. While Seidman (2013) uses a three-interview process for phenomenologically based interviews, this project involved only one interview with each participant. However, as discussed in the validity section, the participant was involved in a member checking process with an opportunity to elaborate on responses.

Seidman's (2013) three-interview approach serves as a guide in the condensed, one-interview approach of this study. The first two questions allowed the participant to describe her story through describing her journey into higher education administration and discussing the initial first six months at the participant's institution. Subsequent questions focused on Seidman's (2013)

"details of the experience" (p. 21). Two questions focused on the perceived effects of organizational structure and regional demands while two additional questions focus on the participant's leadership style and perceptions of trust. The final four questions were reflective, asking the participant to identify areas of tension, the effects of that tension, and how that tension may be mitigated within their respective institutions.

After approval of Concordia University–Portland's Institutional Review Board and acceptance of the research proposal, the instrument was piloted using experienced administrators in public, multicampus institutions. During this testing, the instrument was modified based on the extent to which details emerged during the interview, as well as to clarify any questions the pilot participants had. As fieldwork evolves, questions may be added, revised, or dropped (Gay, Mills, & Airasian, 2012). While this may be contrary to the bracketing of prior knowledge or presuppositions (Tufford & Newman, 2010), a journal was kept to capture any deviations during the interview protocol as well as my reflections regarding the questions and participant responses.

In addition to the structured interview questions, additional questions were asked based on the content of the interview. Seidman (2013) described this process as asking for concrete examples or for clarification in an effort to move a public voice to an inner, reflective voice. The purpose of those unscripted question was to seek a deeper understanding of the participants' experience and to help the participant reflect on the described experiences.

Data Collection

Data collection consisted of interviewing participants. Preliminary analysis and coding of interviews was projected to be ongoing during data collection. Once additional interviews no longer add new information, data collection was considered completed (Guest et al., 2006; Seidman, 2014). Due to the limited resources and the infeasibility of in-person interactions,

interviews were conducted remotely using video conferencing software, or by digitally recorded phone call if video conferencing was not available.

During the interviews, participants were asked to enable video. Both the video and audio were recorded, allowing for transcription of the audio and later analysis of the video. Although these remote interviews are inferior to in-person interviews due to difficulty in recognizing and reacting to social cues (Opdenakker, 2006), some non-verbal cues from the participant may prompt additional questions and will be noted on the audio transcripts. Additionally, remote interviews require rapport be constructed from initial interactions between the interviewer and the participant.

During the data collection phase, a research journal documented my personal insights of each interview, the reactions of the participants, as well as a self-reflection of the interview process. Once the data was transcribed and initial themes coded and developed, the proposal included a report of each interview to be created. This report, along with the interview transcripts, were to be emailed to the participant to ensure that the participant's experiences were captured accurately, as well as provide an opportunity for the participants to add to or refine the description their experiences.

Identification of Attributes

Data collection and analysis consisted of four primary attributes. While the demographic information was collected and included the participants current and previous leadership experiences, other factors have direct applicability for this study. These factors include signs of intercampus tension and the tension's perceived source, organizational structure within the institution, leadership styles and competencies, as well as elements of trust using Tierney's (2006) nine frames in his *grammar of trust*.

Intercampus tension can take many forms. The tension often stems from institutional identity and campus culture (Kavanagh & Ashkanasy, 2006; Maguire & Phillips, 2008) as well as

59

differing missions and local needs (Bailey & Morest, 2004; Vartiainen, 2017). Responses from the participants were categorized through the lens of these primary sources of tension. Each of these sources was considered a fundamental issue, rooted in institutional culture, which require institutional change rather than simple changes within staff members. The subsequent paragraphs address additional attributes including organizational structure, leadership styles and competencies, and trust.

Leadership styles and competencies play a fundamental role in leading any institution. While leadership styles and competencies are well studied, there is a lack of research on the process of leadership (Dinh et al., 2014). In this study, the attribute of leadership styles and competencies will take a broad view of leadership that not only includes competencies or a single leadership style, but rather general ideas and practices of the leader. This may include strategic actions, where the leader uses specific top-down leadership approaches, and how the leader may support bottom-up leadership. As Arena and Uhl-Bien (2016) described, leadership actions may involve facilitating processes across the organization using key personnel that active as facilitators in an adaptive region of the organization, outside of the typical compliance oriented positions or the entrepreneurial aspects of the institution. While the leader may identify particular informal channels of communication, the actual organizational structure plays a significant role in the how personnel on branch campuses interact across campuses within a multicampus institution.

Gaskell and Hayton's (2015) work on organizational structure demonstrated the effect of organizational structure on branch campus personnel. This structure can be highly centralized or distributed. With each organizational choice, there are significant implications for the level for the degree of interaction among campuses and how personnel are attached to the individual campus and the institution as a whole. The organizational structure of the institution may manifest itself on feelings of isolation and may affect how leaders perceive and respond to intercampus tension.

Additionally, the entire organization may not necessarily have a systematic approach to organizational structure but rather utilize different structures in different divisions or even departments.

Trust is a final attribute of this study. Both the interview and the subsequent analysis of the data focused on Tierney's (2006) *grammar of trust*. Specifically, the leader's perceptions and actions will be analyzed with regard to repeated interactions and examples of how trust or how expectations changed over time. Other elements of trust, including how personnel and the leader have exchanged trust as well as how the leader or organization encourages risk taking and faith in colleagues' actions, was explored. Any discussion on faith of colleagues will need to account for Tierney's (2006) description of trust as a learned ability; some employees may not have the ability to trust while others are much more likely to trust. Additionally, actions of both current and past leaders can affect trust. With so many possible confounding factors with the trust of leaders, the interview needed to address the leader's perceptions of the institutional culture as well as how previous leaders may have affected the current level of trust within the institution.

Data Analysis Procedures

Data analysis for this research began with the interview recordings and transcriptions of those recordings. The procedural approach to analysis followed Moustakas' (1994) modification of van Kaam's method. The steps were conducted on each interview transcript and included listing and preliminary grouping of statements, reduction and elimination, clustering and theming invariant constituents, validating invariant constituents and themes, and construction of individual textural, structural, and textural-structural descriptions of the experiences and the essences of the experiences for each interviewee (Moustakas, 1994).

After analyzing the individual transcripts, member checking was employed to increase credibility. The initial proposal included both a report of the interview and interview transcripts to

be shared with each participant while the final practice included only the interview transcripts. The participant then had the opportunity to add additional details and clarify any statements. According to Lincoln and Guba (1989), this can also build credibility and allow participants to share more information.

After reviewing the transcript of each interview, the data was analyzed for both similar and divergent experiences. After gaining a full grasp of the overall context and substance of the interview, statements were reviewed for "relevance to the experience" (Moustakas, 1994, p. 120), also known as horizontalization. These statements were preliminarily coded and categorized.

Coding and categorization of the study was to include multiple stages. In the first stage, In Vivo coding was employed. In Vivo coding uses the participants own language and nearly all statements can be coded (Saldaña, 2016). Higher education often includes its own vocabulary that can differ between institutions; In Vivo codes can initially help keep the data in a format representative of individual institutions.

These statements were then evaluated to discover the "invariant constituents" (Moustakas, 1994, p. 120) by seeking the major source of conflict or problem within the described circumstances. According to Moustakas (1994), an invariant constituent contains a particular moment that fully explains the situation and its context. This moment must be able to be abstracted and labeled. Next, the core themes of the experience were identified through clustering and labeling the statements. According to Moustakas (1994), these core themes and the invariant constituents need validation through determining if the expression is explicit or compatible with the entire interview. Any statement that does not meet those standards was eliminated.

The final stage of analysis for each individual interview involved constructing individual descriptions for the interviewees. The textural description of the experience included a summary of themes and specific examples from the interview transcripts while the structural description will

describe how the context influenced the experience through the textural description and the imaginative variation component of the phenomenological process (Moustakas, 1994). Finally, a textural-structural description of the meanings and essences of the experiences was developed.

Once all interviews were analyzed, coded, and grouped into themes, the set of all interviews were analyzed for patterns. This led to the second phase of coding: the codes were reviewed in a second cycle, aimed at creating themes among the preliminary codes (Saldaña, 2016). Viewing the collection of the interviews demanded creating new themes and re-coding previously developed themes. In addition to patterns of similarity, areas where experiences differed were noted. These patterns were documented in what Moustakas (1994) described as composite contextual and structural descriptions as well as a textural-structural synthesis.

Once the coding of responses was saturated, data collection was concluded. Saturation was achieved when analyzing new information did not result in new codes or unique information (Guest et al., 2006; Saldaña, 2016) and interviews no longer provided new information (Seidman, 2013). Additionally, use of analytic memos both aided in the coding process as well as provided another epoché technique during the coding process (Saldaña, 2016).

Throughout the data analysis procedures, epoché was employed to keep my views and experiences separate from the phenomenon. During data collection, this included a self-reflection process to compare my own experiences with that of the participants and augment questions as necessary. Realizing that alternative experiences occur, differing opinions provided counter examples. During the data analysis phase, bracketing was employed and included a critical examination, "including the researcher and the participant's social location and the social structures within which the participant's experiences are situated" (Tufford & Newman, 2010, p. 91).

Limitations and Delimitations of the Research Design

A phenomenological research methodology is a strong technique for exploring phenomena such as tension and leadership on multicampus institutions. However, the methodology does have limitations. It is important that these limitations are acknowledged and that the delimitations of this study are articulated. Delimitations describes the participant criteria and research design choices while the limitations describe inherent issues within the phenomenological design and implementation. Understanding these limitations can provide insight for future research studies examining tension and multicampus leadership.

Limitations. Within phenomenological research, there is a complex basis for the phenomena. The phenomena of intercampus tension and how leaders perceive, interpret, and attempt to mitigate tension is no different. Bolden (2008) described the importance of both internal and external contexts of how leaders perceive and react to phenomena such as tension. External factors can include differing local or regional needs (Bailey & Morest, 2004). Internal factors can include organizational history and priorities (Bolden, 2008) or institutional culture (Bolden, 2008; Kavanagh & Ashkanasy, 2006).

Participants were also a source of limitation for this study. The experience of the participants in higher education were largely limited to only one institution, limiting any comparisons by the participants between institutions based on institutional history or culture. However, the participants were able to compare how leadership changes at their institutions set organizational priorities that affected how administrators not only experienced tension, but also influenced how the participants took action.

As a technique, phenomenological interviewing has its own limitations. Seidman (2013) described both the time and cost of transcribing interviews; transcription can often take three hours for every hour of interview. Additionally, the transcripts of the interviews contain a large amount

of data that often deter researchers from using interviewing as a research technique (Seidman, 2013).

Implementing this methodology is dependent on interactions with multicampus leaders. While there are several multicampus institutions within the United States, they are geographically dispersed. Due to limited resources, on-site interviews and immersion in the participants' institutions was not possible. The interviews were conducted mostly using video conferencing technology with both video and audio recordings. If video was not available, digitally recorded phone calls were used. Opdenakker, (2006) referred to this technique as synchronous communication of time but asynchronous communication of place. The primary limitation of this method is the difficulty in recognizing and reacting to social cues (Opdenakker, 2006). While the video software helps identify some social cues, not all were visible.

Limitations can be associated with the software as well as the technological infrastructure on either end of the call. As with any software, video conferencing software did not always function as planned. As a communication software, video conferencing can have delayed audio or video of there is insufficient network infrastructure at either location. When this eventuality or any software issues existed, the alternative structure of the interview was via telephone and recording using a digital recorder.

Delimitations. This study is delimited to administrators in multicampus institutions. These positions include typical titles such as president, vice president, chief academic officer, and deans. Participants had experiences as administrators at multicampus institutions but not necessarily systems of institutions.

To respect the limited time of participants and financial constraints of the study, other delimitations exist. Seidman (2013) indicated that the phenomenological interview process should include three interviews. This study only included one interview; however, member checking was

employed to both ensure the accuracy of the transcriptions as well as provide an opportunity for the participant to add additional information. Additionally, interviews were conducted virtually and recorded via software. While Seidman (2013) acknowledged there are critics of recording phenomenological interviews, benefits including the ability to transcribe and analyze the recordings.

Validation

This qualitative inquiry employed several techniques that address the credibility and dependability of the research. Increasing the credibility and dependability ultimately improve the trustworthiness of the study (Shenton, 2004). Using both purposive sampling along with employing validation strategies increased the transferability of this study's results (Saunders, 2012). Shenton (2004) stated that a credible study starts with "the adoption of research methods well established" (p. 64). This study employed a standard phenomenological qualitative approach and the subsequent sections address other strategies used to improve both the credibility and dependability of the study.

Credibility. To strengthen the credibility of this study, several strategies were employed. Moerer-Urdahl and Creswell (2004) defined epoché as "setting aside prejudgments" (p. 21). In this phenomenological study, epoché began with careful acknowledgment of my own experiences. As suggested by Tufford and Newman (2010), I maintained a journal throughout the interview process and analysis phases of the study.

With purposive sampling, I identified and prioritized potential research participants based on longevity within leadership positions at multicampus institutions. Additionally, any institutions that merged within the past five years were excluded; newly merged institutions face pressures that may be different from institutions that have adjusted from initial tension (Vartiainen, 2017). This basic familiarity with the participants and the institutions adds credibility (Shenton, 2004).

Employing peer debriefing can also add credibility to the study (Shenton, 2004). In this study, peer debriefing involved ongoing debriefing with colleagues. As an administrator in a multicampus institution, I have direct access to two vice presidents with multiple years of experience in higher education and multicampus institutions. Discussions with these colleagues excluded any participant names or institutions; alternative perspectives of my colleagues provided new and different insights.

Dependability. Shenton (2004) described a dependable study as one that would achieve the same results if repeated. Clearly, the details of the study as presented in this chapter are critical as well as the implementation of a standard research framework. Two methods were used to increase dependability, member checking and what Shenton (2004) described as researcher reflection. Additionally, I attempted to build trust with the participants in a limited amount of time to increase the dependability of the participants' responses (Lincoln & Gruba, 1989).

This study included interviews with participants in multicampus institutions throughout the country. I did not have a prior relationship with any of the participants, each of whom are in high profile, high-stakes positions. Lincoln and Guba (1989) described a simple issue with dependability in a situation like this: trust. Like Tierney (2006), Lincoln and Guba (1989) argued that trust is a negotiation that is earned over an extended period. Seidman (2013) described this process as developing an appropriate level of rapport with the participant. Although processes to protect confidentiality were explained, participants must have trust in the process maintaining confidentiality, especially as administrators in high-stakes positions.

The participants' trust in the researcher is also key during the interview process. Lincoln and Guba (1989) described interviews as a negotiation for data and information; the interviewer must build trust and allow the participant to describe her reality. This is even more difficult using electronic interviews where the interaction is more utilitarian (Seidman, 2013). If the interviewer

attempts to take too much control, the participant may lose trust and may not describe her truth in its entirety (Lincoln & Gruba, 1989). Seidman (2013) indicated that when interviews are conducted electronically, rapport must consciously be built from initial contact to interview and subsequent member checking. Iacono, Symonds, and Brown (2016) agree that building rapport electronically can be difficult but some participants have responded positively and even feel more comfortable than in face-to-face interviews.

Member checking improved the dependability of the captured data. The first stage of member checking occured during the interview process when I ensured understanding through clarifying and restating responses (Shenton, 2004). During the analysis phase, emerging themes were to be shared with the participant through an executive summary to ensure its accuracy (Carlson, 2010; Shenton, 2004). Carlson (2010) indicated that the details of member checking, including the type of participant review and the type of source material, can help avoid pitfalls during this step of the research. The participant was notified that member checking would include an executive summary and interview transcripts. Through those documents, the participant would be invited to add, clarify, or delete information. This process has the potential to increase trust through sharing an accurate portrayal of the interview and inviting additions or corrections (Lincoln & Guba, 1989).

Expected Findings

I expected to discover several key elements to intercampus tension and leadership in multicampus institutions. Based on prior experiences, I believed that there would be tension of varying degrees at each institution. I also expected each leader to attribute this tension to key sources indicated in literature such as differing campus cultures, regional needs of individual campuses, competition between campuses, and organizational structure.

While the sources of tension differ, I expected participants of this study to employ similar tactics to mitigate tension. I believed that these responses may have included a focus on communication with employees, both formally and informally, along with seeking feedback from individuals throughout the institution's hierarchy. I anticipated that each leader would also struggle with maintaining a centralized focus on the institutional mission while allowing individual campuses to satisfy regional needs as an autonomous campus.

The results of this study were anticipated to inform the literature on leadership and intercampus tension in a multicampus institution. While the results of the study may not be generalizable to all institutions, the information will be transferable for other administrators, especially multicampus administrators. The framework may help inform both current and future leaders of what are key salient elements of multicampus institutions that affect intercampus tension, intercampus competition, trust in leadership, as well as organizational structure. This information will fill an existing gap of knowledge in multicampus literature.

Ethical Issues

As with any research, this study adhered to ethical guidelines. The subsequent sections address any potential sources of conflict of interest as well as any ethical issues in the study. Additionally, though practicing epoché (Moerer-Urdahl & Creswell, 2004), I will examine my own position regarding intercampus tension at multicampus institutions.

Conflict of interest assessment. The sample of this study included participants chosen from multicampus institutions. The participants of the study did not include administrators within my institution nor within the same state. While I am currently an administrator at a multicampus institution, no current employees at my institution participated in the study; however, I used two vice presidents at my institution to pilot the preliminary interview questions and participate in peer debriefing. I am not vested financially, nor am I bound to this study and its outcome.

Researcher's position. Prior to this study, I have been both a faculty member and an administrator at two multicampus institutions over the past 15 years. For 11 years, I have been a multicampus administrator in two separate institutions. Both institutions share similarities but also have several differences. Institution A is private and has campuses in more than one state. The governance structure includes a central administrative office with a full administrative structure on each campus. As a private institution, employees in institution A were not organized as a union. Institution B is a public institution with four campuses; the furthest distance between any two campuses is 90 miles. The statewide faculty union exerts significant power; other non-administrative employees are organized with representation from several different unions.

It was my perspective that tension exists within multicampus institutions and that leaders must address specific issues inherent in multicampus institutions. From Chapter 2, researchers have cited geographic distance, regional needs, and campus culture as sources of tension; I believe that leaders must address sources of tension both directly and strategically. While these were preconceived notions of my own experiences, I bracketed my own experiences and remained open to alternative viewpoints and alternative successes experienced by participants. This openness led to a better understanding of the phenomena in different contexts while searching for both similarities and negative case studies.

Ethical issues in the study. This study required the typical safeguards of any study involving human participants. These safeguards included providing participants with an informed consent form via electronic mail prior to the interview (Seidman, 2013). While the study posed limited risk to participants, participants were assigned a pseudonym and limited contextual information of the institution was provided. Additionally, participants were provided with potential risks and benefits of the study (Seidman, 2013). Although each institution's contextual information poses a risk of identifying the interviewee, the contextual information of the institution

is a paramount in understanding tension within the institution. Additionally, participants were

informed that peer-debriefing would be used. In order to prevent deductive disclosure, only

themes and anonymous information from a projected minimum of 12 participants and six

institutions would be used. Deception was not be used within this study.

In the informed consent, it was also pivotal that data handling practices were addressed

(Seidman, 2013). In this case, all personably identifiable information was removed from the

transcriptions. Immediately following transcription and review of the transcripts for accuracy,

recordings were deleted immediately. Transcriptions were held securely in a locked cabinet at my

residence until publication of my dissertation.

Chapter 3 Summary

Many administrators can benefit from understanding intercampus tension through the lens

of multicampus administrators. Administrators who transition from a single to a multicampus

institution could benefit from an understanding of how administrators perceive and react to

intercampus tension. Additionally, this information may be pertinent to leaders at any institution

with complex cultural dynamics.

Utilizing a phenomenological design, participants were interviewed via electronic video-

conferencing software. If the software had any issues, a recorded phone call would substitute for

the software. The interviews were recorded and transcribed for analysis through three cycles of

coding. The preliminary cycle included In Vivo coding while the second cycle focused on

thematic coding.

Several measures were taken to enhance the credibility and dependability of the study. To

validate and pilot the survey instrument, I interviewed two vice presidents at my own institution.

Once participant data had been collected, member checking was employed in the study by

providing participants with an executive summary and transcript for review. This was be

supplemented with information gleaned from peer debriefing sessions at my own institution.

Additionally, I journaled my experiences including the interviewing and coding processes.

Employing safeguards is important in any study involving human subjects. While this study included minimal risk to participants, efforts to maintain confidentiality was used. Prior to this study, I expected many of the sources of intercampus tension would be derived from aspects already explored in the literature. I believed, the responses of participant administrators would likely include tactics that involve college systems including informal communication channels, formal personnel networks, and organizational structures.

Chapter 4: Data Analysis and Results

Introduction

Understanding tension and leadership in multicampus institutions is important to developing administrators who will replace current leaders. The importance of developing both current and future administrators for success in multicampus institutions is magnified by the well-documented expectation that colleges and universities are expected to face an alarming number of retirements in upcoming years (Aspen Institute and Achieving the Dream, 2013; Campbell, Syed, & Morris, 2010; El-Ashmawy & Weasenforth, 2010). These administrators must understand the role of multicampus institutions in expanding access for students (Aglargoz, 2017; Bird, 2011; Hoyt & Howell, 2012), improving efficiency in delivering services (Aglargoz, 2017; Mills & Plumb, 2012), as well as understanding cultural differences between campuses (Harmon, 2002) and intercampus tension (Padron, Lukenbill, & Levitt, 1999; Pinheiro & Berg, 2017; Zeeman & Benneworth, 2017).

I have been a faculty member and administrator in one multicampus institution as well as a faculty member in a second multicampus institutions. Within both institutions, intercampus tension is evident. Many administrators within the institutions struggled to build trust with employees and to manage effectively over a large geographic region. Additionally, I have witnessed administrators with a successful history in post-secondary education never build the required rapport with faculty and staff to effectively lead across campuses.

A phenomenological approach was employed to answer the primary research question: How do administrators experience intercampus tension in a multicampus higher education environment? Secondary research questions included:

- What leadership strategies do administrators employ to mitigate tension in a multicampus higher education environment?

73

- How do administrators experience tension related to differing regional needs and organizational structure?

- How do administrators perceive leadership styles and trust as factors in intercampus tension?

To answer these questions, a qualitative phenomenological design was employed, using interviews as the primary data collection method.

Interviews were transcribed and data analysis followed Moustakas' (1994) modification of van Kaam's method. *In vivo* coding yielded the first set of codes. Three sets of coding followed the initial *in vivo* codes. The first round of coding reduced the number of codes but required additional refinement as analysis continued. The second set of codes included a further reduction in the overall number of codes. The third round of coding included identifying sub-themes in the existing code set.

Analysis of the data resulted in six primary themes. These themes included intercampus competition for resources, differences between campus cultures, local demands on each of the campuses, degree of centralization, employee isolation, and organizational structure. While there is overlap between these themes, each theme includes unique characteristics that differentiates the source of tension from other sources of tension. For example, organizational structure and degree of centralization are related but each contributes uniquely to intercampus tension.

Included in this chapter is a description of the sample, which encompasses the number of participants and the participant's titles. Subsequent sections include a review of the research methodology and data analysis, as well as a summary of the results. After the summary of the results, the majority of this chapter is the presentation of the data and results before the chapter summary.

Description of the Sample

Saunders (2012) noted that it is critical for the sample to meet the needs of the research. In this study, a purposive sampling technique was employed. In purposive sampling, the researcher selects participants based on prior knowledge or characteristics of the participant (Etikan et al., 2016). Saunders (2012) stated that purposive sampling is particularly effective in exploratory work.

The population of this study included any administrators within multicampus higher education institutions. Unfortunately, there is not a complete list of all multicampus institutions. Without a comprehensive list, multicampus institutions were identified through a review of the Integrated Postsecondary Educational Systems and regional accreditation agency websites. Following the identification of multicampus institutions, a review of institutional websites was conducted to ensure the institution includes administrators with responsibilities over multiple campuses. Throughout this process, institutions in the state of Minnesota were excluded per the conflict of interest statement in Chapter 3.

Purposive sampling was used to create a list of potential participants while applying homogeneous sampling. According to Etikan et al. (2016), homogeneous sampling seeks similar participant traits. In this study, the homogeneity criteria was experience as an administrator in a multicampus institution, supervisory or leadership experience across multiple campuses, and at least five years in administrative roles. Institutional websites yielded administrative contacts within the institutions to identify potential participants.

Searches identified 24 multicampus institutions with an organizational structure that fit the criteria of this study. This included identification of 65 administrators as potential members of the sample. Emails were sent to 47 of these individuals, limited to only two people per institution. Two individuals did not meet qualifications to participate in the study and another declined due to

organizational changes at her institution. Any individual who did not respond was sent a follow-up email. If a response was not received after the second attempt at contact, additional administrators at the same institution were selected at random and contacted via email.

The emails yielded responses from an additional 14 administrators. These individuals were informed of selection criteria, asked if they met the selection criteria, and emailed the informed consent form. Three individuals initially agreed to be sent more information but did not respond to future emails or phone calls.

Eleven higher education administrators at multicampus institutions remained and all were interviewed as participants in this study. The 11 participants spanned eight institutions in six different states. As an element of selection criteria, the length of experience as an administrator in multicampus institutions was collected during initial contact with the potential participants, during each interview, and from public websites. On average, the 11 study participants had 25 years of experience in higher education with a range of 12 years to over 40 years. Participants averaged 21 years of employment at multicampus institutions.

All 11 participants currently hold, or have held, a dean-level position. Four of the participants are currently vice presidents for their institutions while one is an associate vice president. The participants have an average of eight years of experience as an administrator with supervisory responsibilities at multiple campuses. Throughout this section and for the remainder of the chapter, all participants was assigned a pseudonym ranging from Participant A through Participant K, and will be referred to with feminine pronouns to protect confidentiality.

Research Methodology and Analysis

When focusing on experiences, Moustakas (1994) indicated that qualitative research can help find meanings in those experiences. Furthermore, Starks and Trinidad (2007) stated that the goal of phenomenology is to "describe the meaning of the lived experience of a phenomenon" (p.

1373). With the primary purpose of understanding intercampus tension more fully through exploring administrators' experiences, interviewing participants helped me to understand several leaders' experiences, perceptions, and reactions to tension within a complex higher education environment.

Phenomenology. Seeking to understand administrator's experiences in multicampus environments, a phenomenological methodology was employed. Data was collected using an interview protocol as the data collection instrument (see Appendix A). Through phenomenology, Moustakas (1994) explored the concepts of noema and noesis. Noema is what is experienced while noesis as the perception of the object. How an individual perceives an object depends on the individual's context and experience. Ashworth and Greasley (2009) indicated that through the noema and rich, thick description, the noesis, or "manner of orientation" (p. 565) is evident. The interviews in this research study included the level of detail necessary to understand the experiences and perceptions of the participants.

In the first stage, epoché, the phenomena was viewed "freshly, naively, in a wide open sense" (Moustakas, 1994, p. 33). As Moerer-Urdahl and Creswell (2004) suggested for researchers engaged in the epoché process, Chapter 3 included my previous experiences and the outcomes that I expected from this research. Bracketing was employed throughout the process using a research journal and peer debriefing. As suggested by Tufford and Newman (2010), I maintained a journal throughout the entire process that consisted of reflection on pilot interviews, reflections on each participant interview, reflections on the initial *in vivo* codes and the coding process, as well as notes on my thoughts during subsequent iterations of coding. Shenton (2004) encouraged peer debriefing to add credibility to a study. In this study, peer debriefing involved ongoing discussions with my colleagues, to help me bracket my own experiences and better understand emerging themes during the data collection phase.

In this study, extended interviews with participants were conducted virtually using both video conferencing software and digitally recorded phone calls. Seven of the interviews were conducted with full video and audio and the remaining four were conducted with only audio. Of the four phone interviews, two were at the request of the participant and two were due to difficulties participants had connecting to the video conference. The interview questions were open-ended with several follow-up questions to develop a contextual understanding of the participant's experience. After each interview, the recordings were transcribed. These transcriptions provided the source material for the transcendental-phenomenological reduction. The goal of transcendental-phenomenological reduction is to view each situation and experience with a complete description to understand the essence of the phenomenon (Moustakas, 1994).

After transcription, member checking was employed to address credibility. This included providing the interview transcript to each participant allowing an opportunity for the participant to add details and clarify any statements. No additional details emerged from the participants' review of the transcripts.

Only the first participant received an executive summary in addition to the transcript of the interview. As a deviation from the research protocol, the remaining 10 participants did not receive an executive summary. The process of initial transcription and coding was exceeding two weeks. In an effort to reduce the time to return a transcript for the participant to review, I excluded the executive summary from later participants. This decision removed the redundancy in member checking techniques. By reviewing the transcripts, the participants completed a full review of what was said during the interview; however, the amount of material may have been daunting for the participant and reduced the amount of feedback during member checking.

Data analysis. Data analysis followed Moustakas' (1994) modification of van Kaam's method. The steps included In Vivo coding, listing and preliminary grouping of statements,

reduction and elimination, clustering and theming invariant constituents, validating invariant constituents and themes, and construction of individual textural, structural, and textural-structural descriptions of the experiences and the essences of the experiences for each interviewee (Moustakas, 1994). As previously mentioned, coding notes were recorded in a research journal.

Coding and categorization included multiple stages. In the first stage, In Vivo coding was employed. In Vivo coding uses the participants' own language and nearly all statements are coded (Saldaña, 2016), preserving the language of the participant and the participant's institution. These statements were evaluated to discover the "invariant constituents" (Moustakas, 1994, p. 120) by seeking the major source of conflict or problem within the described circumstances. Next, the core themes of the experience were identified through clustering and labeling the statements. According to Moustakas (1994), these core themes and the invariant constituents need to be validated. The validation process included determining if the expression is explicit or compatible with the entire interview.

Analyzing the set of interviews led to a second cycle of coding, aimed at creating themes among the preliminary codes. This cycle of coding was necessary to further reduce the number of In Vivo codes into a more manageable set of codes that could be used across all of the transcripts. Upon initial coding, this resulted in 38 primary codes. After further analysis this set of codes were too specific and did not incorporate imaginative variation.

In the second phase of coding, the codes were reviewed in another cycle aimed at creating themes among the preliminary codes (Saldaña, 2016). This stage began with the 38 codes from the previous stage. Imaginative variation was used to view each participant's experiences from multiple perspectives to determine the structural essence of the experience (Moustakas, 1994). Additionally, the original 38 codes were abstracted to 10 primary codes where themes began to emerge. The 10 primary codes were then analyzed and subdivided into a second level of coding.

In addition to patterns of similarity, areas where experiences differed were noted. These patterns were documented in a synthesis of the participants' experiences.

Summary of the Findings

The interview questions were intentionally designed to foster an understanding of each participant's experience at a multicampus higher education institution including the participant's perception of intercampus tension, the perceived effects of that tension, and potential strategies to mitigate intercampus tension. Additionally, questions precipitated an explanation of each participant's leadership style as well as how the participant has attempted to build trust among faculty and staff. The final interview question asked each participant to give advice to a new administrator at the participant's institution. The answers to this question provided a glimpse into what each participant felt were key issues at the institution that typically involved an underlying tension.

The six primary themes that emerged from analysis of the interview transcripts highlight the challenges associated with multicampus institutions. The participants not only acknowledge these aspects of a multicampus institution, but also actively consider each factor in decision-making and in the administration of programs at their institutions. Each of these themes play an important role in how participating administrators perceive intercampus tension at multicampus institutions.

Competition for resources. Regardless of the administrative structure, participants noted that campuses compete for resources. While competition for resources includes financial resources, it also includes competition for expanding or renovating facilities, competition for program enrollment, and competition for the ability to offer online courses. This competition for enrollment included controversy over where new academic programs would be located or even where new initiatives would be implemented. Much of this competition for resources was evident

in how the participants described employees' sense of belonging to a particular campus with statements such as "I wasn't one of them," or referring to a campus as "my campus." Based on the processes of the institution, tensions resulting from competition for resources are often most evident through the actions of faculty and staff at the campus and program level.

Differences in campus culture. Most campuses were described as exhibiting a unique culture based primarily on academic program offerings, the local community and neighborhood of the campus, and student demographics such as age and ethnicity. There is often a relationship between campus cultures and local influences; the campus is typically representative of the local community in terms of socioeconomic status and student demographics. Additionally, faculty impart influence based on the instructor's primary discipline. This differs between faculty of career programs and general education disciplines. When campus personnel do not have frequent interaction with other campuses, division between campuses can be magnified. As a result, Participant H focuses on "Getting people to know each other, bringing them together."

Local demands. By definition, multicampus institutions are located in different communities. The communities can be within a single metropolitan area or even distributed across large rural areas. Participant G stated, "We had a strong desire to fill the need for those communities all around us." At a minimum, administrators need to travel to participate in local chambers of congress, local industry, and local K–12 institutions. Often, communities may have specific needs for the campus resulting in differences among campuses within the same institution. How an institution makes decisions related to these differing cultures and needs may lead to employees feeling that their campus is not valued.

Degree of centralization. These feeling of isolation may be mitigated or exacerbated based on the institution's degree of centralization. Participant C described the degree of centralization as a "pendulum" that oscillates between more campus flexibility and high degree of

centralization of processes and decision-making. Each participant experienced tensions related to extreme centralization or decentralization. In highly centralized organizations, there is a lack of flexibility to meet local needs and it is more difficult to hear employee input. In strongly decentralized organizations with autonomous campus units, employees are able to give more input, but campus priorities may not align with institutional priorities. Half of the institutions in this study have undergone at least one significant reorganization of administrative structure while other institutions have varied position responsibilities to address issues related to employees' isolation and intercampus tension.

Organizational structure. Related to the degree of centralization, the organizational structure of an institution has a significant impact on the experiences of an employee within the institution. While the centralization of processes may indicate a desire for a consistent student experience, the organizational structure may prohibit the ability of a campus to provide that consistent experience. Organizational structure also affects the ability of a campus to respond to local needs and is a factor in employees feeling isolated from the larger institution.

Each participant experienced tensions related to a lack of flexibility and inability to incorporate faculty and staff input based on the degree of centralization and feelings of isolation. These feelings are manifested through the organizational structure of the institution. Participants noted that changes in organizational structure could demonstrate a commitment of the institution to inclusive input focused on a singular mission without neglecting the needs of the local communities. Similarly, organizational structure affects the ability of campuses to collaborate. Participant D stated that she has to remind faculty "that if it is being taught across multiple campuses, they need to run that by all the divisions."

While several institutions represented in this study refer to campuses as distinct entities but of equal stature within the organizational structure, others clearly refer to a certain location as the

"mothership." Multicampus institutions declare a main campus for both accreditation agencies and the federal government, identified by the Office of Postsecondary Education Identification (OPE ID) number. While the main campus may have roots in the historical development of the institution, it can cause tension between campuses. The tension is often a question of campus value or the perception of a favored campus.

Employee isolation and decision-making. Participant B stated, "You will inevitably have folks that feel left out and disconnected." With responsibilities across multiple campuses, participants are often not physically on the same campus as their employees. This lack of physical access compounds feelings that administrators are not available. This lack of perceived physical availability can lead staff and faculty to feel isolated from administration and not valued. This also included a perceived isolation from decision-making processes where employees feel that they have limited input in overall institutional decisions. This is often manifested in a feeling that the administrator is favoring other individuals or another campus.

The need to demonstrate value in every employee was evident in how participating administrators approach their day-to-day work. Instead of only navigating the culture and processes of a single campus, multicampus administrators must take additional time to understand the cultures and processes of each individual campus in addition to the entire institution. When considering feelings of isolation and lack of voice in decision-making, travel and physical presence can help an administrator learn campus cultures, develop relationships with employees, engender trust, improve communications, listen to voices of employees, and reduce isolation of employees.

To ensure that employees feel equally integrated into the college community, the participants employed several different strategies. These strategies included deliberate attempts to be collaborative, removing roadblocks for employees, as well as distributing decision-making responsibilities. To demonstrate value in the individual, the contribution of a single campus, as

well as the overall mission of the institution, several participants noted an institutional alignment

of initiatives within a "one-college" framework, a focus on strategic planning, and the use of data.

The following section of this chapter will present the data and results in detail. This

includes descriptions of how participants experienced tension grouped by the previously

established themes. Additionally, each subsection addresses how some of the participants attempt

to overcome the stated tensions.

Presentation of the Data and Results

The results of this study are based on a dataset that included participant experiences of the

phenomenon of intercampus tension in multicampus institutions. These experiences highlighted

the importance of this research. While one participant noted that tension has a limited impact on

her institution, others articulated support of this research observing that intercampus tension slows

progress on initiatives even to the point of paralyzing the launch of an academic honors program or

a new academic program that directly fits an institution's mission.

For the participants in this study, tension is an everyday occurrence in multicampus

environments. While single campus institutions may experience tension between divisions or

between faculty and administration, multicampus institutions have an additional dimension of

geography that separates campuses. One participant noted that multicampus administrators do not

only work with a fixed number of employees at one location, but rather that same number of

employees at several locations. Participants all noted that each location has a different personality.

Those campus personalities, combined with faculty and staff at multiple locations, exacerbate

tension throughout the institution, at least some of which is intercampus in nature.

At the root of these tensions is an employee's sense of belonging to a particular campus

and distrust of employees on other campuses. Participant C explained how employees question an

administrator's commitment to a particular campus while Participant G similarly noted when

working with campus personnel, "I wasn't one of them." Administrators are not always immune from this campus loyalty, especially when they have campus responsibilities. Participant C noted she is "very protective – my campus" while Participant D noted, "I love my campus." The following subsections address the six primary themes through the experiences of the participating administrators.

Competition for resources. In a multicampus institution, not only are resources distributed by department or by groups of departments, but also by campus. As campuses vie for institutional resources, employees publically support their campus and often react to how resources are allocated. Competition for resources involves more than financial resources. Enrollment, online courses and programs, chosen locations of new academic programs or launching of new initiatives, and decisions to expand or renovate facilities are all important resources to campus employees.

Tension surrounding the allocation of financial resources falls into two main categories. The first category involves how an institution actually allocates financial resources while the second is a perception of how funds are distributed. The institutions represented in this study allocate budgets differently with primary budget decisions made at the dean or vice president levels. Both of these categories may lead to intercampus tension or even tension between academic and student affairs departments. Regardless of who are the primary budget decision-makers, feelings of inequity often fuel intercampus tension.

Much of this tension may not be directly attributable to the method of allocating financial resources but is rather a perception of inequity between campuses or departments. Several participants noted that over the past several years, reductions in state level allocations and falling enrollment have affected the overall budget of the institution. Administrators have accounted for the reduced revenue by prioritizing and in many cases, reducing departmental and campus budgets.

These decisions have led to a tension regarding the equity of funding different campuses and departments. Participant H stated that employees have asked, "Why is all the money going to *[campus]*?" This can lead to assertions of campus inequity due to the administrator's preference for a certain location.

This tension may be magnified in institutions with both rural and urban campuses. Participant I noted that in her institution, rural campuses feel entitled to greater support from the institution when compared to urban campuses. The employees of the rural campuses perceive that their campuses should not have funding cut because of the general lack of ability to garner outside financial support and fewer options to grow enrollment. Additionally, communities with rural campuses often feel that the institution is obligated to support the development of the community's workforce. From an administrator without an affiliation to a single campus, this could be perceived as campus loyalty driving the argument for additional resources.

Beyond perceptions of inequity, the budget decision-making process can increase tension within the institution. Participant C's institution has undergone two organizational changes over the past several years. When Participant C arrived at the institution, she described the process as "the campus administrators would come together a couple of times a year, and box it out for who had the most money." This led to alliances between administrators and increased tensions between not only campuses and programs, but also administrators.

Other institutions base allocation of financial resources on full-time equivalent enrollment. While this process mirrors several state allocation models in public education, it can lead to severe tension. This allocation model not only creates a competition for enrollment, but also influences the ability for newer campuses to grow. A participant noted that this funding model restricts the ability of programs on smaller campuses to hire full-time faculty and as a result, the program can suffer from a lack of advocacy. Meanwhile, an established campus, even with declining

86

enrollment, may have a significant financial basis to operate programs with a much higher percentage of fulltime faculty.

Administrators in institutions where budget is allocated simply on the basis of enrollment perceive a distinct and overt competition for enrollment. Participants in these types of institutions noted that the campuses tend to compete with each other more than with other local institutions. Additionally, all employees are keenly aware that losing a student to another campus is equivalent to losing funding. Similarly, Participant F noted that at her institution, there is the same program at two different campuses. The faculty of the program, located at two different sites, believe that they are in direct competition with one another for enrollment, even if the data does not indicate this type of competition. Having larger enrollment or stronger programs can in itself be a source of tension.

Several participants stated that competition for new programs or initiatives is akin to competing for enrollment. The participants described the foundation of this competition as an underlying belief that new academic program will equate to more enrollment, a stronger campus, or even a more prestigious campus. When an institution decides to explore offering a new credential, participants said the faculty and staff immediately inquire about where the new program will be offered. This tension can vary depending on whether or not an institution replicates programs across multiple campuses; some institutions will only offer one program at a single site while other institutions will offer the same program at multiple locations.

The competition for new academic programs at institutions where programs are not replicated can be strong. This tension is exhibited through strong advocacy to deliver the new program on a particular campus due to perceived increased enrollment as well as an investment in other start-up resources. In institutions where programs are replicated, there can be a different set of tensions. Multiple participants noted that faculty qualifications are a particular source of tension

in replicated programs, especially in an institution that has both rural and urban campuses. Rural campuses can have difficulty in finding qualified faculty; as a result, the campuses often support reducing faculty requirements to teach in a specific discipline. Meanwhile, campuses that do not have a shortage of qualified faculty advocate against the change.

Similar to new programs, participants noted that existing student support or co-curricular programs could lead to intercampus tension. Multiple participants cited specific examples about how programs are operationalized differently across different campuses. In some cases, a lack of a campus champion for the program may affect the campus' ability to offer the program, creating an inequity between campuses. Other participants noted that some students are required to travel to other campuses to receive particular services. Regardless of whether or not the campus is just a couple of miles away, employees may still advocate for replicated services based on campus loyalty.

Participant A stated, "There was a little bit of tension and there was a little bit of conversation around why do they get to do this but we don't get that option." Several participants articulated that their employees often display the same feelings of neglect. This also extends to academic programs where larger enrollment often means increased diversity in course offerings. When a campus has smaller enrollment, there can be a tension around whether or not certain courses are offered. Some participants described asking students to take courses online due to small demand for particular courses on a campus.

Over the past several years, online courses and programs have exacerbated competition as well as tensions related to enrollment. Several participants have experienced organizational structure changes that involved the offering and oversight of online education. Some institutions have a designated physical campus associated to deliver the online courses while others have a separate virtual campus. Regardless of changes to overall structure, the enrollment and funding of

online courses and programs has created a tension. Having direct control of online programs is a specific source of campus pride, not only because of enrollment with less overhead, but also a perception that the campus can deliver a better online educational experience.

This competition for resources is particularly important for employees of smaller campuses. Smaller campuses often do not have as diverse of course or program offerings as campuses with larger enrollment. As Participant A noted, "students end up getting nudged into online classes when they don't want to be in those online classes," creating not only a tension for the students, but also for faculty who are accustomed to working with students who choose to be online. This nudging can be source of frustration and a feeling that the campus cannot fully support its students.

The perceived inability to support students can also lead to a fear that their location will be closed. This is understandable given the reduction in the budget of many institutions and the changing financial realities of higher education. One participant noted that this is not only limited to small campuses, but can also occur when other decisions are made that appear contrary to the best interest of the campus. As a result, this tension can often be perceived as a protectionist stance to protect one's campus.

Participant C noted that competition for programming turns into competition for resources to support that new programming. This often may include facility renovations or new building projects, enhancing the status of a campus. One participant even noted that it feels like one campus "is getting all the love." However, there are other tensions associated with facilities. Participants explained how students complain about student fees related to facility use. Many of the institutions represented in this study have sports or athletic facilities on only certain campuses. Although these facilities are not on all campuses, students may be charged the same fees as a student on a campus that has full athletic facilities.

Tensions related to competition for resources may become apparent to participants in a variety of ways. When the tension is based on a perceived inequity, there can be a political divide and confrontation within both the institution and the external community. Tension over financial resources can also be a source of rumors. These rumors often imply favoritism of one campus over another. When administrators form alliances to garner more financial support, tensions can increase between programs, campuses, and even other administrators. When a campus distributes funds based primarily on student enrollment, the potential growth of campuses programs may be stymied due to a lack of resources to appropriately staff and build the academic discipline. Participant D stated, "It [tension over resources] makes it so that we are less likely to try things that would have some benefit for students" while Participant F described it as "neutralizing the momentum that the institution has around its strategic priorities."

Participants also offered advice about mitigating tension in specific areas. Participant A indicated that the tension associated with allocation of financial resources has improved at her institution. The institution's chief financial officer increased the transparency in the budgeting process by welcoming any employee to observe and listen to budget hearings. Employees who attend the budget hearing were able to hear rationale for budgetary decisions and speak directly to any criticism that one campus was treated differently than another campus.

Differences in campus culture. Within each institution, campuses exhibit a unique set of traits that many participants referred to as "personalities" or campus cultures. While the personality of one campus may exhibit more complaining than another, the campus culture is generally not a source of tension in itself. However, when assumptions are made about individuals based on the personality of their home campus, campus loyalty emerges, and intercampus tension is a likely outcome.

Several participants in the study referred to each individual campus culture as a campus "personality." This campus personality is based on a variety of factors such as academic program offerings, the local community and neighborhood of the campus, and student demographics. This personality provides an identity for employees and a lack of personality may lead to unanticipated tensions.

The culture of a campus is often based on academic program offerings. Participant A and Participant B both have campuses that focus on the health sciences. These campuses adopt traits of the health science profession. Participant G and Participant K both have campuses that focus on professions such as law enforcement, firefighting, and paramedics. Similarly, these campuses have a no-nonsense attitude that is representative of those professions. Other campuses have a focus on liberal arts. When these campuses have sufficient enrollment, they often have a great breadth in course offerings. Several participants noted that this breadth of course offerings can lead to intercampus tension when a smaller campus does not have the enrollment to support similar offerings.

Beyond academic offerings, other forms of programming affect campus culture. For example, some campuses have athletics programs while others may offer an art focus. Some newer campuses have been built around emerging higher education trends including more learning labs and collaborative spaces. Some tensions can emerge when a campus leader wants to morph the explicit or implicit mission of the campus. At Participant D's institution, a campus leader wanted to become the new arts campus, either augmenting or replacing an informally designated arts campus in the same institution.

Student demographics also have an impact on campus culture and are often reflective of the demographics of the neighborhood. Institutions represented in this study include urban colleges, rural colleges, and institutions with a blend of urban and rural campuses. Some of the campus

locations are in communities with distinctly a lower socioeconomic status. Students with a lower socioeconomic status may have different needs. For example, Participant A described transportation as key challenge and often results on students spending more time on campus.

Similarly, some of the campuses are located in diverse neighborhoods and the student population reflects the surrounding community. Participant F noted that in more diverse neighborhoods, her institution offers primarily workforces and healthcare programs. Participant A described a sense of struggle among faculty when they teach classes on multiple locations and switching between an affluent, college-ready population to a population that is more diverse and less academically prepared.

Employees on each of the campuses play a distinct role in the campus culture. Several participants referred to a particular campus at their institution as being a "family." Others noted that specific people on certain campuses create an atmosphere that strongly influences a campus culture. Additionally, administrators can influence the culture of the campus with much of that impact related to the participant's leadership style.

While campus culture may seem like an immaterial concept to the operation of the entire institution, several participants noted the importance of campus culture and described how employees more with their particular campus location than with the institution as a whole. Participant D reflected on the importance of campus culture to some administrators in her institution, "I'm entertained in a way by how fiercely the administration, especially the campuses, insist on defining the culture of each campus as though that is something that is precious and special." Participant E described the result of the campus culture and campus identity as a source of "allegiance and loyalty to their campus." In turn, this loyalty quickly turns into an "us versus them" mentality and naturally defines a set of what Participant E described as "turf issues."

Although this set of tensions was described as a tension being between faculty and staff at different locations, some participating administrators also demonstrated allegiance to their primary location by referring to it as "my campus." One administrator who did not have a home campus noted that she and other administrators sometimes felt left out not having a "hub of loyalty." While several of the participants did not have a home campus, most of the participants have been promoted through the ranks of their own institution, transitioning from one primary campus to a college-wide position. Due to intercampus tensions over resources, Participant D felt that it is important for college-wide administrators to remain a campus agnostic and essentially make decisions that are not affected by campus loyalty.

Intercampus tension can be a result of assumptions about campus cultures or even assumptions about an administrator's loyalty. Academic rigor or the perceived value of academic offerings can create tension between campuses. These assumptions create a sense of difference between the campuses and perpetuates the individuality and potential animosity between campuses. Administrators are not immune from these assumptions. Some of the participants in this study admitted to making assumptions about certain campuses. Additionally, campus-based employees sometimes question an administrator's loyalty. Participant C described the conversation with a campus-based employee as "Are you with us? You are one of them, not us." Participant B noted that there is also difficulty for administrators when they have to overcome assumptions and associated tensions while navigating different internal politics and internal dynamics of each campus.

This questioning of campus loyalty can be affected by communicating institutional priorities. It is difficult to communicate a single message to the entire institution in a timely manner. As a result, Participant H noted the importance of a consistent message from the president, vice presidents, and the deans.

[We] worked really hard to figure out how we get the message out . . . When we left the meeting, we had bullet lists that we wanted to take back. It was one of the things that I struggled with, was how do you get the message down, and *[what]* person it needs to come from. *[We]* have worked to get a system where they know what they can pass on, which is pretty much everything, because I am very open.

Without detailing a consistent message, it is possible, if not probable, that employees would find inconsistency in messaging and that inconsistency could generate the appearance of a hidden agenda and be the source of rumors.

While not truly an intercampus tension, there is tension between individual campuses and administration of college-wide functional areas. Participant C offered specific examples of college-wide duties such as accreditation or student learning outcome assessment. These functions are often administered on a college-wide basis to ensure consistency and aggregation of results between campuses. However, as Participant C noted, individuals with those responsibilities "didn't have any connection with day to day operations at the campus" and those administrators did not understand why faculty would not immediately respond to requests or specific procedures. This lack of understanding can fuel a disconnect between campus employees and college-wide employees. Participant D described the same type of issue from the perspective of a college-wide administrator who needs to influence campus-based deans. At Participant D's institution, the campus-based deans do not necessarily care or understand initiatives originating from college-wide employees, but are focused on their campus and their own set of academic programs.

Local demands. Tensions related to campus culture often focus on internal campus factors that differ between campuses. Factors external to the campus and institution also affect intercampus tension. These external factors, including workforce development initiatives, participation in city or regional planning, or even presence at local events, add to the unique

94

characteristics of each campus, presenting a tension between the campus and the central administrative structure.

Multicampus institutions operate campuses in distinct neighborhoods, cities, or even regions. The participants in this study noted that this could create differential needs across the campuses within the same institution. Participant D's institution has specific individuals whose role it is to engage the local community. As a part of engaging the community, the individual wants to be responsive to community; however, the individual may choose to promote an initiative that strengthens the leader's portfolio and not necessarily the institution.

Addressing local needs can require a lot of time for administrators. Several noted their engagement with local organizations such as a chamber of commerce, high schools, and local businesses. For a single administrator, these interactions may need to be repeated in multiple communities. Beyond the time commitment, if an administrator cannot attend a local event, the institution may be accused of not supporting the campus and the local community's needs. Participant F noted, "it is sometimes difficult because there are a great many forces at work."

In an attempt to mitigate intercampus tension associated with campus culture, several participants articulated the importance of understanding the campus context of any particular situation. Participant E noted, "I have to be aware of and understand what their needs and sort of pressure points are and what the unique characteristics of their population might be." After a long history of teaching at her institution and soon after a promotion to dean, she described the basis of her actions, "I did things that substantively and symbolically communicated to the people in my division that I was not just aware of those differing cultural forces but also comfortable navigating those forces."

Participants noted several challenges with honoring the individual campuses and the unique cultures or personalities of each campus. The largest challenge for these administrators includes

completing all job responsibilities while having a requirement to travel frequently between campuses. Beyond recognition of the individual campuses, administrators also addressed the importance of valuing the employees in a multicampus institution. As this is more closely related to employee isolation, it is reviewed in a later subsection.

Degree of centralization. For a multicampus institution, both degree of centralization and organizational structure may mitigate or exacerbate feelings of campus isolation and intercampus tension. This subsection focuses on the effects of both centralization and decentralization while the next subsection focuses on organizational structure. Although there is some overlap, each factor influences intercampus tension in unique ways.

Institutions that were more decentralized with a higher degree of campus autonomy noted specific reasons for the structure. Participant I noted that campuses need more autonomy over academic programs to be responsive to the needs of local communities. Additionally, this approach avoids managing academic programs in collaboration with distant campuses. Participant I described the prospect of collaboration between campuses as "they just don't have enough in common where you could imagine that they could work together in a collaborative or collegial way." That decision and statement were interesting for two reasons. First, it reflected the institutions goal to reduce or eliminate the replication of academic programs but also acknowledged the existing tensions between campuses.

In organizations that were highly decentralized, the individual may have more input in local decision-making, increasing the individual's connection to the campus. While this can be a positive, it can also result in intercampus tension when either unproductive competition emerges or when a campus morphs its missions and the campus' priorities become misaligned with institutional priorities. Because campus autonomy presents challenges for institutions, half of the

96

institutions represented in this study have varied administrative and staff structure, as well as institutional processes to address tensions resulting from centralization.

Participant C's institution was decentralized several years ago before centralizing many processes. Reflecting on the institution's past, Participant C stated:

> We were operating as our own individual colleges, we didn't even have data, people were pulling different reports. We couldn't compare because my campus would pull numbers one way, there weren't data definitions. You had a different structure, so every campus administrator had their team; things were being done differently.

When there is not centralization of data definitions and reporting, unproductive intercampus tension emerges. Symptoms of the tension include employees arguing about being the stronger campus when there is not a basis of shared definitions, metrics, or performance indicators.

This centralization of data definitions is key to how the participants approach differences between campuses. Participant G, Participant H, and Participant K all described how their institutions use data to inform decisions. Using data for these participants can increase transparency and reduces the potential for rumors. Additionally, Participant C noted that the institution could choose to focus on data that does not stress intercampus competition, potentially avoiding tensions associated with campus enrollment. Without centralization of data processes, these administrators would be missing a key element of their leadership approach.

Although Participant C's institution has since became more consistent in process, there are challenges when processes become too centralized. In Participant C's community, a stakeholder approached both her institution and another institution about offering a specific service. Participant C's institution took much longer to respond than the other institution. Participant C attributed that lack of responsiveness to both organizational structure and the degree of

centralization. This led to a perception that the institution does not support the campus, nor does it support the needs of the local community.

Several participants noted the desire or balance between centralization and decentralization. Participant K described this as a "balancing act" while Participant C referred to the process of trying to find a balance as a "pendulum." For many participants, the institution will have a balance when all campuses are focused on a singular institution mission and vision while still being able to react to local issues. Participant F describes this to employees as "while we are a one college - a unified, single college - we do have different campuses and different units that are driven by different interests, at least some of which are local." This statement gets at the crux of the problem described by other participants and attempts to unify the specific needs of employees as both individuals and members of a campus community.

Organizational structure. While organizational structure and degree of centralization are related, participants described the unique effects of organizational structure on intercampus tension. Several of the participants described how their institutions have adapted processes to mitigate ill effects of centralization, but these also involved changes in organizational structure with half of the institutions in this study recently undergoing at least one significant reorganization of administrative structure. Several other institutions have varied position responsibilities to address similar issues related to employee isolation, lack of consistency in processes, and inability to react to local needs. The results described in this section focus on specific tensions related to organizational structure.

It is important to note that different aspects of the organization are often structured differently. The organizational structure of administrative services and business offices tend to reflect the highly centralized processes of those divisions while academic divisions tend to have an organizational structure that allow for more autonomy. While the organizational structure within a

division may affect the experience of an employee within an institution, the overall organizational structure and decision-making processes affect the ability of institutions to provide a consistent experience to customers and to react to local needs.

The consistency of experience was a critical factor in mitigating intercampus tension. Both Participant C and Participant K noted that it is critical for students to have a consistent experience, regardless of which campus the student attends. Participant K noted that "consistency is critical for the student to have a positive experience" while Participant C noted that her institution focused for 10 years on developing processes and structure. During the past 10 to 15 years, Participant C, Participant D, Participant E, and Participant K reported additional demands for not only a consistent student experience but also consistency in key administrative functions like data reporting, data definitions, and student learning outcome assessment. From inconsistencies in these areas, intercampus tension arises at both the student and the staff levels. Students may feel slighted with a lack of services on their home campus while staff may become engaged in intercampus arguments about campus performance, even when performance metrics are not defined consistently.

A certain degree of centralization was described as necessary for having consistent services. In addition to consistency of process, it is also important to consider how the replication of positions affect the consistency experience for students and employees. This unfortunately comes at a financial cost, limiting the ability for institutions to gain the potential efficiency associated with multicampus institutions. As a result, several institutions described organizational structures that prioritized additional campus employees that provide additional consistency in the student experience. However, these institutions were less likely to replicate positions that affect services for employees.

In Participant C's institution, high-level administrators are responsible for certain duties on their home campus but lack overall decision-making authority. Besides the institution's lack of flexibility to answer local requests, other tensions arise. While Participant C does not supervise many of the people on her campus, dissatisfaction between an employee on the campus and a distant supervisor directly affects her ability to execute her responsibilities. As a result, she must work through another administrator at a different location to help resolve personnel issues on the campus where she has responsibility. From the employee point of view, this can be an isolating experience.

It can be an issue where employees need to resolve an issue with an administrator that is not located on the same campus and may not understand the context. To overcome this issue, participants described the importance of collaboration in a multicampus institution. In any institution with shared governance, collaboration is critical; working in a multicampus environment makes collaboration more challenging. While Participant E noted that collaborating on an initiative in a multicampus environment "takes time and energy and is frustrating." Participant E also warned that even though an administrator could push an initiative through, if the person doesn't get feedback and create buy-in, it can be "hurtful." This is especially critical in a multicampus institution where an initiative may succeed or fail at a particular campus depending on buy-in.

Participants also described that it was important for all faculty and stuff to understand that collaboration is necessary at all levels. Participant D and Participant I identified faculty qualifications as a key issue that requires cross-campus collaboration between faculty. Participant D jokingly stated, "We have to beat them over the head" to remind the faculty that decisions need to be discussed across divisions and deans. Participant I indicated the importance of this

collaboration in ensuring that academic programs are sustainable, taught by qualified faculty, and are adaptable for local needs.

Although collaboration can help mitigate tensions associated with both organizational structure and campus differences, it is often not enough. Collaboration efforts often require administrators to make a decision that could be interpreted as campus favoritism. To overcome this perception, participants described the importance of garnering support for current and future decisions through exhibiting transparency in action and communication. Several administrators stated the importance of admitting one's mistakes. Participant K stated, "If you make a mistake, you fess up to it," and Participant F noted "it is very important to acknowledge when a judgement call I have made didn't work out as well as I had hoped or when, because of whatever evidence or argument . . . I am very explicit about those sorts of issues." Participant B also felt that if the mistake comes from one of her employees, it is her responsibility to "take the bullet" and that it "is my duty as the leader is to say, even if they are at fault, I have to step up and say, 'you know what, that is on me.'" Admitting these mistakes not only acknowledges when the administrator makes a poor decision but also makes her more human and easier for employees to relate to her.

Beyond just admitting mistakes, Participant J noted the importance of transparency in decision-making. "I never just stop with 'no.' I say 'no and here is why' or I say 'no. BUT, we can do this instead.'" Similarly, Participant A explains why decisions are made and actively communicates the decision-making processes while Participant F noted, "I think that also helps people see what my thought process is as a leader and because it's reasonably transparent, I think it allows people to settle down because they know what to expect."

Another issue related to organizational structure includes the designation of the main campus. While a main campus is required to be designated by both accreditation agencies and the federal government, it could be a source of tension in multicampus institutions. Several

participants described how institutional leadership attempts to minimize the designation of the main campus and refer to all campuses as equal. Other participants clearly referred to the main campus as the "mothership."

The main campus is where the top administrators are located. Almost jokingly, Participant B described it as where the "big things happen" (quotes identified by the participant). That statement identified the perception that the main campus is favored or is the basis for which the institution makes decisions. For employees of the main campus, this is a source of pride. For other campuses, the concept of a favored campus, or a "mothership," is a direct challenge to the value of the other campuses.

Large campuses may wish to compete for the status of the main campus. When the enrollment of another campus rivals or exceeds that of the main campus, there can be tension regarding a belief that decisions should be made for the best interest of the largest. This perceived tension is based on an ill-founded premise that employees and administrators should have loyalty to a single campus, regardless of the institution's priorities.

The question of preferential treatment is not unique to institutions that acknowledge one campus as the only main campus. Institutions promoting the equality of all campuses within the institution still have tension related decision-making and the location of top administrators, even if the administrators are on different campuses. Participant H stated that she perceives employees feel "she is just X campus, so she just knows them better and likes them better."

Not only does the organizational structure and degree of centralization affect intercampus tension, but also may mitigate or exacerbate feelings of employee isolation. Each participant experienced tensions related to a lack of flexibility and inability to incorporate faculty and staff input when processes are highly centralized. Additionally, the organizational structure may affect

102

the timeliness of resolving employee issues. These issues, along with other issues that affect intercampus tension due to employee isolation, are reviewed in the next subsection.

Employee isolation and decision-making. As previously stated, multicampus administrators often have responsibilities for college-wide initiatives as well as certain campus-based responsibilities. Additionally, these administrators have direct reports located on different campuses. A lack of direct contact between the administrator and employee can alter the perceived availability of the administrator and lead faculty and staff to feel isolated.

It is clear that the underlying tensions associated with employee isolation is not being involved in decision-making processes and feeling that individual employee input is not solicited or not valued. Participant B described it as "those that are at other campuses, very much feel, not disrespected but forgotten about, not part of the conversation." Participant J also noted that it is critical to keep people in the loop to mitigate feelings of isolation. When employees feel left out of the conversation, there is a lack of buy-in and the results are likely not going to be as successful if there is widespread input.

Several of the institutions have attempted to combat feelings of isolation through increased transparency, collaboration, and communication. Although collaboration is more challenging in a multicampus environment, participants described collaboration efforts as being inclusive. Participant B described this process as, "We want everyone to feel valued and that we feel like we have the ability to answer requests from different advocacy groups."

Although these efforts can have good intentions, Participant D described that not all employees are open to inclusive and collaborative discussions. When tensions rise, attempts at collaboration may not be enough.

We ended up driving everyone into a room until someone caves. Until they came to a

consensus. Or maybe we vote. Although we were ready to take a vote when we came to

consensus . . . we take it off into a corner and talk it to death until it's solved.

This degree of tension can inhibit institutional progress towards goals as well as provide difficulty

in advancing new initiatives leading to the potential stagnation of institutional improvement.

Collaboration can require a significant amount of travel for administrators. Participants in

this study described a typical day as consisting of several meetings. These meetings are often on

different campuses requiring up to an hour of driving time. In addition to time spent in a vehicle

or in meetings, participants described the importance of meeting individually with employees

throughout the organization. Participant G noted "there is just something to be said for that knee-

to-knee, face-to-face time" while Participant C stated, "when you have people offsite, you still

have to have that relationship and you have to build that one-on-one time."

To overcome time constraints and lost time due to travel, participants use different

strategies to engage employees. Participant C uses travelling for meetings as an opportunity to

connect and be visible on other campuses. Participant F travels to different campuses and

announces specific times for employees to drop in and discuss whatever is on the person's mind.

Participant G uses her calendar to prioritize time for each campus and Participant H ensures that

employees have a safe place to vent frustrations. Similarly, Participant F stated that people need to

"vent about their frustrations and their anxieties, and their concerns," implying that administrators

need to be available and maintain confidentiality. Being available for employees and maintaining

confidentiality in the conversations not only reduces feelings of isolation between staff and

administration, but also allows staff to provide input into decision-making. When this time is not

afforded to employees, participants described how rumors emerge and can drive additional

intercampus tension.

According to the participants, demonstrating value in an employee and reducing isolation requires an administrator to listen. Specific to a multicampus environment, leaders must understand the contextual situations of the different campuses when listening to employees. Participant J noted the importance of listening in building rapport with employees while Participant I noted the importance of listening and giving people the opportunity to share areas of agreement or areas of concern prior to decision making. Participant A found listening especially important to first understand how faculty are experiencing differences between both campuses and student populations before determining how she can best support the employee.

The participants did not stop at just being available for the employees and listening to their concerns, but took it a step further to demonstrate value in employees. Participant B noted, "the ultimate show of trust is to place someone in a position with all the support and resources they need to let them do the job." Through empowerment, participants believe that employees are able to shine and perform their tasks well. Participant A's preferred approach is to ask questions and guide others to fix problems on their own. Participant G "enjoys giving people the ability to make their own decisions." This approach to working with employees, along with providing support and removing obstacles for the individual, participants demonstrate value in individual employees.

For the supervisor of a middle manager, administrators can empower supervisors and employees to make decisions without interrupting institutional processes or the chain of command. Having an administrator usurp the power from a middle manager can be isolating. Participant H maintains openness to employees without violating the chain of command by first asking if the employee has spoken to her supervisor. Similarly, Participant B said, "I always have an open door and I'm happy to meet with folks, but the first question I'm going to as is have you talked to your associate dean?"

From the perspective of the participants, employees can feel isolated from administrators in several other cases. Participants feel that they need to demonstrate competence in their work while others continue to be involved in teaching to maintain a connection to faculty through the shared experience of the classroom. The key for participants in all of these cases is to communicate and be responsive. For example, Participant C stated, "I'm going to tell you what I am going to do, then I am going to do it, then I am going to tell you that I did it."

Participating administrators articulated different strategies to increasing physical presence on multiple campuses. Several participants rotate college-wide meetings to different locations in an effort to be inclusive of the employees on different campuses, but also increase informal interactions with employees in the context of their own campus. To better understand the context of each of the campuses, Participant C uses travelling for meetings as an opportunity to connect and be visible on other campuses. Participant F travels to different campuses and announces specific times for employees to drop in and discuss whatever is important to that individual while Participant G uses her calendar to prioritize time for specific campuses.

Overcoming employee isolation requires administrators to acknowledge how employees identify with their home campus. The participants noted not only have to learn the culture of one campus, but all campuses within the institution. Instead of only navigating the culture and processes of a single campus, multicampus administrators must take additional time to effectively understand the cultures and processes of each individual campus in addition to the entire institution. Acknowledging these differences and incorporating these differences into decision-making process is critical in combating feelings of isolation and lack of voice in decision-making. Additionally, travel and physical presence can help an administrator learn campus cultures, develop relationships with employees, engender trust, improve communications, give employees voice, and reduce isolation of employees.

Other institutions purposefully move decision-making to a lower hierarchical level. This in turn increases the value of a single individuals input. Participant B's institution allocates budget dollars to the dean who is then responsible for allocating to her programs. Employees within her division advocate for specific program areas but it is Participant B's responsibility to allocate with little oversight from other administrators. This includes distributing financial resources to campuses and ensuring that, at least from her perspective, the resources are distributed fairly. The process at Participant B's institution is more highly distributed than the process at other participant's institutions.

Chapter 4 Summary

Through an understanding of how multicampus administrators perceive and react to intercampus tension, as well as how intercampus tension relate to factors such as organizational structure and leadership style, institutions can potentially increase efficiency and effectiveness. The results presented in this chapter were based on a phenomenological approach that included interviewing 11 participants using electronic video conferencing software or digitally recorded phone calls. All of the participants were well versed in the politics of leadership across multiple campuses.

Through coding and analyzing of the interview transcripts, several themes developed. These themes include:

- Intercampus competition for resources

- Differences between campus cultures

- Local demands on each of the campuses within the institution

- Degree of centralization,

- Organizational structure

- Feelings of isolation

Throughout the interviews, the participants identified the sources of tension as well as how they lead in a multicampus environment.

The next chapter includes a discussion of the results along with a presentation of conclusions. Throughout this discussion, there is an analysis of how well the research questions were answered is included. While these results were comprehensive, recommendations for future research inquiries into leadership at multicampus institutions is included.

Chapter 5: Discussion and Conclusion

Introduction

Multicampus institutions purport to save costs through the efficiency of operating multiple campuses by expanding access to additional communities. However, intercampus tensions might derail efforts, limiting the ability for institutions to meet efficiency or access goals. Understanding how multicampus administrators perceive and react to tensions is critical to understanding how to strengthen multicampus institutions. Little research has examined leadership in multicampus institutions. This study included several contextual elements related to intercampus tensions, including how participants perceive organizational structure and leadership as contributing factors to that tension.

This chapter includes an examination of the results in the context of the research questions, including an evaluation of the research along with the limitations of the study. Included will be both personal insights and interpretation of the participants' experiences. Additionally, these experiences will be compared to the existing literature on multicampus institutions, multicampus leadership, and higher education leadership.

The next section in this chapter includes a summary of the results and highlights of related literature. The discussion incorporates personal interpretation of the findings from Chapter 4 while relating findings to the original research objectives as well as including practical and theoretical implications. A comparison of the results to the literature follows, including how the study relates to the community of practice, how the results relate to the literature, and how the results related to the community of scholars. The subsequent section includes the limitations of this study in both design and execution. The final two sections include implications of the results and recommendations for future research.

Summary of the Results

Using a phenomenological design, this study includes an examination of multicampus administrators experience with intercampus tension. The primary research question focused this study: How do administrators experience intercampus tension in a multicampus higher education environment? Secondary research questions were formulated to directly address specific stressors of intercampus tension noted in the literature of multicampus institutions.

- What leadership strategies do administrators employ to mitigate tension in a multicampus higher education environment?

- How do administrators experience tension related to differing regional needs and organizational structure?

- How do administrators perceive leadership styles and trust as factors in intercampus tension?

Theory and significance. There is a projected shortage of higher education administrators with retirements expected to increase in upcoming years (Aspen Institute and Achieving the Dream, 2013; Campbell, Syed, & Morris, 2010; El-Ashmawy & Weasenforth, 2010). New leaders will face many challenges including reduced state allocations (McGuinness, 2012). One solution to overcome reduced revenues is to increase efficiencies through sharing administrative services between institutions in a multicampus environment (Brubaker, 2016; Zeeman & Benneworth, 2017).

This study focuses on leadership at multicampus institutions. Although there is research focused on leadership at single-campus institution and even organizational structure of multicampus institutions, there is a lack of research on leadership at multicampus institutions. Leadership literature contains several different leadership theories and models (Day & Antonakis, 2012; Dinh, Lord, Gardner, Meuser, Liden & Hu, 2014). These studies have focused primarily on

behaviors, traits, and actions of leaders. Multicampus studies have not directly approached the

topic of leadership. The majority of research on multicampus institutions address organizational

structure and intercampus tension (Gaskell & Hayton, 2015; Timberlake, 2004) while other studies

have focused on tension in branch campuses (Aglargoz, 2017; Mills & Plumb, 2012) and degrees

of centralization (Gaskell & Hayton, 2015; Pinheiro & Berg, 2017; Vartiainen, 2017). One study

addressed higher education leadership within multicampus institutions, focusing specifically on

decision-making processes (Timberlake, 2004).

Madikizela-Madiya (2018) found that managers located on a different campus as the

employee often demonstrate a heightened level of oversight. This level of oversight disrupts

normal campus operations and may restrict interactions between faculty on different campuses.

Madikizela-Madiya (2018) further described that a manager's inability to be vulnerable can strain

relationships between administrators and faculty on different campuses. This lack of vulnerability

reduces the mutual faith Tierney (2006) described as a necessary condition of trust.

Tension between campuses in a multicampus institution is a significant problem (Pinheiro

& Berg, 2017; Zeeman & Benneworth, 2017). Literature indicated that tension may arise through

the relationships between a de facto flagship campus and satellite or branch campuses (Gaskell &

Hayton, 2015; Vartiainen, 2017). Researchers have isolated that some of the tension may be a

result of uncertainty and institutional identity (Kavanagh & Ashkanasy, 2006; Maguire & Phillips,

2008), differing missions and local needs (Bailey & Morest, 2004; Vartiainen, 2017), or feelings of

isolation (Aglargoz, 2017; Gaskell & Hayton, 2015).

As multicampus institutions continue to develop in the higher education landscape, it is

critical to understand how existing leaders perceive and attempt to mitigate tension between

different campuses. Tension between campuses can undermine financial efficiencies gained by

shared services and limit institutional ability to react and adapt to changing political and academic

111

environments. Furthermore, both current and new administrators may benefit from understanding how other administrators perceive and react to intercampus tension.

       Summary of findings. Participants in this study attributed intercampus tension to several different factors. A major factor includes competition for resources including facilities, enrollment, programming, and financial resources. Other factors include differing campus cultures and the need to satisfy local community needs. These community needs and campus cultures is impacted by how the institution is structured and the degree to which the institution is centralized. The organizational structure and degree of centralization affect how quickly an institution can respond to local needs. In turn, organizational structure and the degree of centralization can lead to tension depending on the degree to which the institution can satisfy local needs while implementing a particular strategic direction of the institution. Additionally, employees of multicampus institutions often feel isolated from managers and the decision-making process.

       How leaders make and communicate decisions regarding satisfying local needs can offer support and value to campuses. A lack of communication can alienate and isolate employees on distant campuses. Additionally, the location of administrators and how often administrators visit locations can have a distinct impact on feelings of isolation or tension surrounding decision-making. As a result, participants feel a need, or even a requirement, to travel to the different campuses on a frequent basis.

       While one participant noted that she perceived tension has having a limited impact on her institution, others noted that it slows progress toward the institution's strategic goals. This slowing of progress increases the need for institutional administrators to travel to other campus locations. When on campuses, administrators must be prepared to listen and directly address questions and rumors that perpetuate intercampus tensions. Additionally, administrators must quickly learn and understand both the culture and processes of each individual campus.

Related to intercampus tension are the concepts of leadership style and building trust within the institution. Participants relied on distributed leadership, empowerment, and servant leadership to remove roadblocks for employees, demonstrate trust in employees, and increase the effectiveness of teams. Important leadership competencies include the ability to listen, foster relationships, as well as being collaborative and inclusive in decision-making. Furthermore, the participants noted that institutionally, alignment of initiatives within a "one-college" framework with a focus on data-driven decision-making and strategic planning could help reduce tension.

Discussion of the Results

The previous chapter included a presentation of the themes from this study. In this section, personal interpretation supplements those results and addresses how well the original research questions were answered, addressing both the practical and theoretical implications of the results. The primary and secondary research questions form the basis of the following subsections.

How administrators experience tension. In the presentation of the results, themes were identified as sources of intercampus tension. These themes included competition, differing campus cultures, differing local needs, organizational structure, degree of centralization, as well as feelings of isolation. Tension arising from competition was also based on several factors including allocation of financial resources, ability to offer new services or academic programs, facility improvements, as well as an intercampus competition for enrollment. In addition to these sources of tension, administrators described implicitly and explicitly how they experienced tension.

Participants experienced tensions related to campus culture when working with other campuses. Employees identify with their individual campus and demonstrate pride in offering specific academic and co-curricular programs. Other employees identify with the campus atmosphere. Participants described different campus atmospheres such as "even-keeled" (Participant H), "a smaller family sort of feel" (Participant J), or "very matter of fact, and very

113

much like a health care facility" (Participant B). Regardless of the atmosphere, employees demonstrate pride that supports and reinforces the campus culture. As an example, one campus that Participant G described as a "close-knit family" has a commitment to solving problems together while Participant C noted that a campus with a family atmosphere has the highest rate of giving to the college's foundation.

Within these campuses, administrators experienced tension as a reaction to anything that threatened the campus or the standing of the campus within the institution. Participants described this protectionist stance as territorialism, regardless of whether a decision directly affected the employee. Similarly, this is a possible reason of why an 'us versus them' mentality emerges when campus personnel work with administrators on a different campus. When Participant D described her faculty, she stated,

> We are competing with each other and I don't like how this feels when we get together and
> we have to be all-protective about our territory. And that doesn't matter to me if I'm
> teaching what I want to teach.

When employees exhibit loyalty to a single campus in a multicampus institution, employees may become protective of not only their own work of and livelihood, but also the well-being of other campus employees and the overall success of the campus. This leads to campus employees arguing for resource investment at the campus level, even when that decision may not support the institutional mission or planning. Additionally, employees may interpret a negative decision that affects the campus as a personal attack, even if it does not affect the individual.

This emphasis on the campus over the institution was evident in several participant statements. Participant C noted that she was asked, "are you with us" instead of being asked if she was representing the institution. This emphasis on the campus over the institution is apparent with any discussion about competition for resources. If it is financial resources or location of new

114

programming, the participants perceive that employees feel animosity or left out when decisions are made that reduce campus resources. Alternatively, if a campus is given the responsibility of launching a new program, a new facility, or even additional financial resources, the campus may be perceived as having more value or the employees having more value to the institution.

Employees clearly identify with the characteristics of their home campus. However, some campuses, as Participant F noted, "are suffering from a kind of lack of personality." Participant A noted that at her institution, this lack of personality was accompanied by leadership challenges. Contrasting a campus with dominant characteristics with a campus lacking personality, employees do not identify with their home campus. Participant F has worked to develop a sense of identity for those employees while Participant A noted that a lack of identity at her institution has been accompanied by "leadership challenges." Both of these participants felt that employees struggle with understanding how the campus fits within the institution when a local identity is absent. This can perpetuate the campus and can affect institutional metrics such as persistence and completion.

This focus and identification on campus culture may arise from cultural dissonance. Harman (2002) described difficulties in cultural integration at newly merged institutions, especially when the campus cultures are not complementary. While employees may fear assimilation into the larger institutional culture, participants clearly identified the desire to maintain both integrated and differentiated cultures on each campus. In the case of the participants' institutions, strong campus cultures may resist any perceived changed that affects the campus culture, much like tribalism in social groups.

Campuses were not the only area where employees demonstrated a strong association or basis for an identity. Although Participant C and Participant G described campus personalities and indicated a sense of connection to individual campuses, both also described a sense of belonging to an employee's division. Participant C and Participant G described this sense of divisional

115

belonging as a source of tension between divisions within the institution, similar to the 'us versus them' mentality between campuses.

When tensions arise, several participants described the emergence of rumors. These rumors often focus on unfunded initiatives or lack of funding for campuses. Participant A described these rumors as being "overtly defensive" while Participant G described the "back talk" at her institution. Participant H noted that without explanations, employees sometimes drink from the "paranoid water fountain." To mitigate these rumors, several participants include time in meetings for employees to ask questions and for administrators to address rumors directly.

Several contextual factors affect the experiences of administrators. The next two subsections contain an exploration of the themes of organizational structure, degree of centralization, and regional needs. The final two subsections address how administrators perceive trust as a factor in intercampus tension and what actions the participants take to mitigate tension.

Tension related to differing regional needs and organizational structure. During the data analysis phase, both differing regional needs and organizational structured emerged as two independent themes. Additionally, participants experienced a third, related tension. This theme included involved the institution's degree of centralization. Much as the tensions described in the previous subsection, tensions related to these three themes can also be described by campus loyalty or cultural dissonance.

Differing local or regional needs contribute to the unique qualities of a campus. External demands on the campus provides employees with a differentiated purpose from the rest of the institution. To meet external demands, institutional administrators must decide whether the institution supports the campus acting on these external requests. Participants carefully identified that participation by institutional leaders can demonstrate value in an individual campus. If administration is not responsive to local needs, regardless of the reason, tensions arise. If the

116

institution does not prioritize meeting regional demands, this may decrease the employees' perception of the value of the campus to the overall institution.

This issue of perceived campus value is magnified at smaller campuses. From the participants, it is clear that smaller campuses question whether or not the campus might be closed, potentially affecting the livelihood of all employees on the campus. In this case, the perceived value of the campus to the institution as a whole is critical. The decisions and responses by institutional administrators are a paramount consideration of employees on smaller campuses.

Organizational structure is a central concept and problem in multicampus institutions. Several participants described changes in organizational structure as their institutions try to serve multiple communities while balancing institutional processes. Because of the interrelated nature of organizational structure and balancing campus autonomy with centralized processes, both concepts will be addressed in the subsequent paragraphs.

Campus autonomy and centralized processes have a perceived impact on intercampus tension. Several participants described the importance of centralized processes that include equitable student services as well as consistent data definitions, data reporting, and student learning outcome assessment. With a lack of centralization in these areas, participants experienced intercampus competition and tension related to definitions or processes. Participant C described this tension as "We didn't even have data. People were pulling different reports, we couldn't compare because my campus would pull numbers one way—there weren't data definitions." This campus comparison at the employee level was central to intercampus competition and helped reinforce employees' identification with a particular campus.

Other issues with decentralization include lack of coordination between campuses. Participant D noted that a lack of coordination could lead to arguments over which campus will offer a new program as well as qualifications for faculty to teach a particular subject area. Both of

117

these issues result in tension that reflect the identity of the involved campuses. Additionally, campus-based institutional leaders have a strong desire to shape the identity of their campus, although some of the decisions require institution-wide approvals.

Institutions with a high degree of centralization are not immune from tension. Participant C described that as her institution became more centralized, leadership encountered challenges with being responsive to local needs. When leadership structures were strongly centralized, responding to local needs needed to involve several people on different campuses, all with busy schedules. As a result, Participant C perceived that response time was unacceptably slow. Additionally, when an employee had an issue that required supervisor intervention, the supervisor was often at another location, slowing resolution of the issue. These issues result in employees not feeling supported or valued at the campus level.

Organizational structure and the degree of centralization at the institution are related (Gaskell & Hayton, 2015). For instance, a lack of local campus leadership can hinder the ability for a campus to have greater autonomy (Gaskell & Hayton, 2015). Participants noted that within the more centralized aspects of the institution, local campuses do not have a particular leader and supervisors are more likely to be located at a different site, requiring additional travel requirement for those supervisors. This has direct implications for how employees communicate with administrators and may affect whether or not employees associate administrators with a particular campus identity. This is what can lead to the question of Participant C, "are you with us?"

Several participants in this study indicated that their institutions are using a structure that attempts to blend the approaches with a site manager or site lead. The site manager is not an administrator and often has a focus of facilities, but is a communication node for campus personnel and administrators. Several participants noted that these site managers might play an integral role in campus communications with institutional administration. Additionally, some institutions place

118

administrators at every location, either with or without a site manager. Participants at institutions with this type of structure are open to helping employees they do not directly supervise. The same participants perceive that other supervisors are comfortable having their employees work with other supervisors. This type of structure allows an administrator to become a participant and advocate of the campus, diffusing some intercampus tension.

Tension and leadership style. Participants in the study identified key elements of leadership for multicampus administrators. These elements included key competencies as well as key principles of both the distributed and servant leadership models. These leadership competencies and principles reinforce employees' sense of campus or division identity. Additionally, the leadership elements help employees find and develop campus value within the institution. The next several paragraphs will examine the key leadership competencies before examining the principles of distributed and servant leadership.

Participants identified the key leadership competencies as the ability to be collaborative and inclusive, the ability to listen, being direct and transparent, and aligning actions with the institutional mission. Although participants noted that both collaboration and being inclusive in a multicampus institution is challenging and time consuming, Participant E noted that if an administrator is not inclusive, achieving buy-in can be difficult and decisions can be "hurtful." This is not surprising based on the need for employees to both be a part of a campus identity and to feel valued. When administrators are not collaborative or inclusive, they run the risk of employees perceiving that their voice as a collective campus is not important. If one campus is included in the decision-making process, employees may perceive one campus being more important than another campus. Participant E noted this in her daily work, "I need to put together a committee and oh my god, everyone is from *[campus]*. Now we need to recruit people from the different campuses so the campus *[employees]* will feel represented in this big college-wide discussion."

119

Listening was a second critical competency identified by all participants. In descriptions of this competency, participants identified the importance of being available to help employees as well as listening to understand the context of the situation. Participant F described this as being "aware of those differing cultural forces" and being "comfortable navigating those forces." By taking the time and energy to listen for understanding, the administrators are demonstrating their value in the employees, the campuses, and the unique characteristics of each campus. By acknowledging the differences between campuses, employees may be able to better identify with their campus and understand how administrators value that campus.

Six participants also cited the need for administrators to be direct and transparent in communication. Several participants noted that decisions, taken out of context, often result in rumors. Participant F described the cause of rumors as "when you don't provide people enough information to contextualize what is happening, they will make up a story to contextualize." When viewed through the lens of valuing employees and employees identifying with a campus, directness and transparency may help alleviate feelings that the campus was not included in the decision-making process. Additionally, being direct and transparent can help with consistency of message as described by Participant A and Participant F. Logically, this helps campus employees contextualize the decision and feel valued even when they were not included in the decision-making process.

Seven participants also articulated an importance for administrators to align actions with institutional mission and student success. Participant G noted that when working with external communities or new initiatives, it is important to "figure out how it works in the mission, if it works in the mission." Participant F stated, "The number one tool in your arsenal is to evaluate whatever that situation is in the light of the large and local missions that you have." If an institution has direct and transparent communication and the processes to support systematic

decision-making to align initiatives, there is a perceived sense of fairness for campuses and the campus employees.

Beyond leadership competencies, all participants described key principles within distributed leadership. When administrators have employees on multiple sites, participants described the importance of delegation and empowering employees. At both Participant K's and Participant H's institution, empowerment of individuals at the campus level incorporates widespread articulation and dissemination of the strategic plan. Additionally, as institutions develop faculty and other employees into administrator roles, the hiring managers demonstrate value in those specific employees.

More than half of the participants perceived servant leadership as an important method of leadership at multicampus institutions. Building and sustaining relationships, helps demonstrate value in employees beyond their contribution to the institution. Additionally, as Participant H, Participant I, and Participant J noted, removing roadblocks for employees help create a collective approach to decision making and improves support for initiatives. In the context of campus identity and value, this places importance on the individual campus, acknowledging that there needs to be some local variation to accommodate for campus differences.

Tension and trust. Participants identified difficulties with trust in a multicampus institution. When administrators have responsibilities over several locations, trust is a factor especially when an administrator is located at a different campus. As with tension issues related to organizational structure, feelings of isolation can not only exacerbate tension but could also affect trust between campuses and trust in institutional leadership. Participants noted that building trust is key in a multicampus environment.

Participants described building trust through taking action, being responsive, and demonstrating responsibility. Participant C noted that an administrator needs to follow-through on

121

their promises while Participant B stated, "it's earning trust by doing." Participant F believes that reputation matters and employees know her as someone they can count on. Being responsive to requests from stakeholders is important for administrators according to Participant B. Participant K reminds stakeholders what was suggested and the actions taken as a response to those suggestions. Several participants said that it is important to recognize when a project or decision did not go as planned and to admit mistakes.

Not only do these competencies build trust between the administrator and the employee, it reinforces the importance of direct and transparent communication. If actions are not aligned to rhetoric, or if mistakes are not acknowledged, trust may be eroded. For employees, actions often speak louder than words and a lack of action may exacerbate tensions between campuses or between administrators and campus employees.

Participants also used regular interactions as a method to build trust. Building trust through these interactions helps develop not only trust in the administrator, but also helps the administrator understand each campus' culture and understand the context of each campus. This context is critical for the administrator to understand what Participant H described as the "hot buttons" for each campus. Through this understanding, an administrator is better able to reinforce the value and identity of each campus and the employees of that campus.

Discussion of the Results in Relation to the Literature

To examine intercampus tension and the participant's reaction to that tension, 11 experienced multicampus administrators were interviewed throughout this study. The results of this study support many themes from the literature on multicampus institutions. As previously stated, several sources have documented intercampus tension as a significant problem in multicampus institutions (Aglargoz, 2017; Gaskell & Hayton, 2015; Mills & Plumb, 2012; Pinheiro & Berg, 2017; Timberlake, 2004; Vartiainen, 2017). Intercampus tension is affected by

122

internal factors, such as organizational structure and degree of centralization (Gaskell & Hayton, 2015; Pinheiro & Berg, 2017; Vartiainen, 2017), as well as external factors, such as local demands (Bailey & Morest, 2004; Vartiainen, 2017). Multicampus institutions may become more efficient with a better understanding of these tensions along with how administrators mitigate tension. The subsequent subsections isolate the results within the themes of the study attributes as presented in Chapter 3. Additionally, each subsection includes emerging themes that were not explicitly identified in the current literature on multicampus institutions and intercampus tension.

How administrators experience tension. There is a dearth of research on multicampus institutions. In the existing research, tension is a result of feelings of isolation (Aglargoz, 2017; Gaskell & Hayton, 2015), differing campus cultures (Kavanagh & Ashkanasy, 2016), and competition or lack of clarity in regional versus institutional needs (Pinheiro & Berg, 2017; Vartiainen, 2017; Thor et al., 1999). The results from this study have supported and enhanced the knowledge on intercampus tension from the perspective of administrators. Like the literature, participants in this study perceive that tensions result from feelings of isolation, differing campus cultures, as well as misalignment between institutional and regional needs. This study furthered the understanding of how administrator's actions affect these tensions.

The most prominent theme was not addressed in current literature. Administrators perceived that tension was often the result of competition for resources. Specifically, intercampus tension arises from a perceived inequity in where facility improvement occur, where the institution chooses to offer new programs, and how financial resources are distributed. While this is not a specific tension noted in the review of current literature, it is also not surprising. Employees who identify with a particular campus are concerned about resources not only for their job or their division, but also for their campus tribe.

The literature on multicampus institutions also includes staffing and organizational structures as a source of tension (Anderson, 2011; Gaskell & Hayton, 2015) that is especially prevalent among smaller branch campuses (Aglargoz, 2017; Gaskell & Hayton, 2015). Participants indicated that this was common at their institutions, especially when supervisors or college leadership was at a distant location. Attempting to mitigate this issue, all participants stated that they would advise new multicampus administrators to visit and be present on all campuses.

Tension related to differing regional needs and organizational structure. The literature on multicampus institutions described how administrative structures affect feelings of isolation in multicampus institutions. Gaskell and Hayton's (2015) work indicated that when branch campus administrative structures include components of departments without strategic clarity, the branch campus lacks visibility and clarity. Participants described this as a central tension, especially when employees want to identify with their campus. This also propagates feelings that the institution does not value a campus or feelings that the campus is in danger of closing.

Multicampus institutions adopt several different organizational structures. Each of the institutions in this study had different organizational structures. Both Gaskell and Hayton (2015) and Timberlake (2004) noted that implementation of organizational structure can vary by degree and even between different departments within the same institution. Like the literature, participants articulated differences in organizational structure and degree of centralization between institutional divisions. Participants also described how organizational structure, combined with academic programming, effects campuses and intercampus relations, similar to Pinheiro and Berg's (2017) description.

Of the institutions represented in this study, only one institution prescribed to Gaskell and Hayton's (2015) first organizational structure where each branch campus includes its own

administrative structure. The majority of institutions employed a variation of the second model with a coordinated approach to services on each branch site, reporting to a central administrator, often at the main campus location (Gaskell & Hayton, 2015). Gaskell and Hayton's (2015) third model closely replicated the second model but with infrequent communications or meetings. With each participant placing a strong emphasis on communication between campuses, this was not an organizational structure used by the institutions in this study.

Pinheiro and Berg (2017) integrated both organizational structure and academic programming into a four-quadrant model. One axis is the degree of campus autonomy while the other axis is the degree of academic program replication between campuses. If the administrative structure is decentralized, there is a real possibility that each campus becomes completely independent and resists any organizational strategy (Pinheiro & Berg, 2017). This was the case in the most decentralized institution where Participant D stated that for college-wide initiatives,

> If they are not really that interested and they look at their time, and say "Shoot I am going to sit in a meeting for two hours and this is what I am going to get? No, I will do something else instead."

In the most centralized institutions, there is an issue with responding to local needs (Pinheiro & Berg, 2017). This was evident in the most centralized institutions. One of these institutions determined that this problem was significant and adjusted the organizational structure to be more responsive to local needs. Several researchers agree that it is critical for multicampus institutions to find a balance between centralization and autonomy (Padron et al., 1999; Pinheiro & Berg, 2017; Timberlake, 2004). This was definitely a desire of participants, to try to stop the "pendulum" closer to the middle.

Tension and leadership style. The participants in this study identified several leadership principles of distributed and servant leadership as well as several leadership competencies that are

important in multicampus institutions. According to Bolden (2011), distributed leadership theory "can be considered to incorporate shared, democratic, dispersed and other related forms of leadership" (p. 256) and studies leadership "as a social influence process through which coordination and change are constructed and produced" (Uhl-Bien, 2006, p. 654). Throughout the participant interviews, participants stressed leadership as a process that included influence and collaboration. Many participants included the importance of empowering employees and dispersing leadership, as well as adhering to hierarchical structures and supporting middle managers. Participant B noted that she empowers employees to make decisions on smaller issues and only wants to be involved if it was a "five-alarm fire."

The American Association of Community Colleges (AACC) developed a leadership competency framework that includes organizational strategy, resource management, communication, collaboration, advocacy, and professionalism (Campbell, Syed, & Morris, 2010). Within this study, participants regularly articulated and demonstrated the importance of communication, collaboration, and advocacy. Additionally, inclusivity was a theme for participants in this study. Bryman (2007) and Kavanagh and Ashkanasy's (2006) referred to that competency as being consultative. Wooldridge (2011) who suggested overcoming campus culture differences by focusing on developing a bottom-up collegial culture.

Participants also described several attributes of servant leadership. Servant-leaders value teamwork and care about the needs of their employees (Hawkins, 2009). Spears (2010) listed ten characteristics of servant leaders including listening, empathy, healing, awareness, persuasion, conceptualization, foresight, stewardship, commitment to the growth of people, and building community. Participants in this study focused on several of these characteristics including listening, empathy, awareness, conceptualization, commitment to the growth of people, as well as building community, especially at the campus level.

Additionally, Hawkins (2009) noted that each employee views leaders' decisions based on the personal experiences. Participants in this study placed a great deal of emphasis on learning the context of the situation before responding or making a judgment call. More than just understanding the context of the situation, several participants described the importance of giving context to a decision. Participant F noted that while a lack of contextualization is typically "a result of less than effective communication," proper understanding of the situation combined with explaining the reasons for a decision can "help people latch on to a vision of a better future."

In multicampus institutions, tension is a common occurrence and there are disagreements between individuals, departments, divisions, and campuses. Participant F stated that she believes training for all administrators should include conflict management. Several other participants provided examples of helping resolve conflicts at a distance or being an intermediary in several arguments. Participants noted that not all conflict is bad supporting Leffel's (2012) need to identify the type of conflict as task-based, relationship based, or process based. Participant C noted that "a little bit of competition isn't a bad things, it might keep us sharp." This is especially true of task-based competition in comparison to tribalism or relationship based conflict.

Tension and trust. Trust is not built by a management plan but is engendered and leaders should build "trust capital" (Jameson, 2012, p. 402). Multicampus administrators must engender trust with employees over several different locations and takes more than just inclusion and collaboration. Building trust capital was evident in several statements by participants including Participant B. Within Participant B's organization, she maintains availability while building trust capital with her direct reports. She stated "I always have an open door and I'm happy to meet with folks, but the first question I'm going to as is have you talked to your associate dean." Several participants made similar statements.

Participants acknowledged that building trust is difficult when managing from a distance. This acknowledgement affirms Kavanagh and Ashkanasy's (2006) findings that employees tend to be negative towards central leaders when compared to local leaders. Additionally, all participants identified the need to travel between campuses to be physically present. This perceived need is aligned with Maguire and Phillips's (2008) findings that many employees with organizational identity ambiguity were more likely to trust leaders who were geographically closer.

The participants noted that physical presence on different campuses increases both formal and informal interactions. Tierney (2006) noted that repeated interactions is the first component of trust. Participants also suggested that trust was reciprocal and incorporated a degree of faith and risk, aligning the participants' perceptions with Tierney's (2006) framework for trust. Participant C demonstrates responsibility and responsiveness as an important factor in building faith in her own competence when she stated, "I'm going to tell you what I am going to do, then I am going to do it, then I am going to tell you that I did it." Additionally, participants emphasized that they work diligently to align behaviors with communications, enhancing faith that what the administrator says will occur. When things don't happen as planned, Participant G noted that it is important to "explain the why."

Limitations

The chosen research design of any study has particular limitations. As a phenomenological study, the results of this study are not able to be generalized to all institutions. Although the results may not be generalized, other administrators could implement strategies based on their own institutional context and the experiences of the participants. Additional limitations of this study relate to the complex nature of the phenomenon and participant characteristics.

Intercampus tension is a highly complex phenomenon. The interaction of organizational structure, campus culture, and personalities of individual employees can influence how an

administrator experiences tension. These factors are also important with how the administrator attempts to mitigate tension at the institution. Although these tensions are complex and potentially create a limitation on this study, it is clear that administrators can identify factors within the organizational structure or campus cultures that can lead to intercampus tension. As a result, the administrator may require additional time, collaboration, or adapt decision-making processes to mitigate tension.

Participant characteristics also provide a limitation in this study. The participants all represent public institutions with a significant focus on 2-year degrees. Additionally, the majority of participants had previous experience at their institution, prior to receiving a college-wide or multicampus leadership appointment. While this may limit the applicability of this study to other types of institutions, the results are focused for 2-year public administrators, especially those who are promoted from within the institution.

From the interviews, it is also clear that organizational priorities and the institution's president set the tone for the participants. Although this may be the case, the participants were in an organizational layer between employees and the president. This structure provides a unique vantage point to understand how well the president's approach is implemented by administrators and received by employees. Combined with the fact that several participants had a long history of employment at the institution, they were able to compare and contrast different leadership approaches and different organizational structures over the tenure of several presidents.

Implications of the Results for Practice, Policy, and Theory

The results of this study have several practical results for current and future administrators of multicampus institutions, institutional policy, and the general theory of leadership in multicampus institutions. In the subsequent subsections, multicampus administrators may better

129

understand the practical and policy implications of this study. Additionally, the agreement and gaps between the results of this study and the extent literature concludes this section.

Implication of the results for practice. The results of this study include several practical applications for higher education administrators. This includes the potential costs and benefits of organizational structure and degree of centralization. Additionally, for both current and future administrators, the results indicate practical strategies that leaders can use to understand and mitigate intercampus tension.

Participants clearly indicated that there are trade-offs between different organizational structures and different degrees of centralization. An organizations structure should minimize isolation of employees, especially at remote or smaller campus locations. The organizational structure should promote teambuilding at the campus level at the campus level to build a sense of identity. However, this local focus should not exclude a need for institution-wide teambuilding. Through institution-wide meetings and team building, several participants indicated that employees of one campus could better understand the employees at another campus. Through this understanding, employees can understand the unique contributions of each campus towards a singular institutional mission. Additionally, the organizational structure should account for including campus voice in decision-making processes or provide an avenue for campus employee feedback. Each of those factors help employees identify with their home campus and provide an opportunity for employees to feel valued through serving the needs of the local community. Satisfying campus needs ultimately needs to be balanced with the institution's mission and strategic plan.

The degree of centralization in the institution should be balanced like the institution's organizational structure. When an institution is too decentralized, intercampus tension is exacerbated and there is a high degree of unhealthy competition between campuses. This

unproductive competition creates a situation where intercampus tension over allocation of resources stymies development of new programs or initiatives. Balancing centralization of definitions and processes with aspects of campus autonomy may mitigate some unhealthy competition.

It is possible for an institution to be too centralized. Participants noted that when processes become too centralized, institutions lack responsiveness to regional needs. Additionally, it appears that a high degree of centralization may ease some intercampus tension, but it may be replaced with tension between the divisions of the institution, especially student development services and academic affairs.

There are additional implications for how administrators employ leadership styles and competencies. For a new administrator, it is clear that she should expect to spend a significant amount of time traveling between campuses. Several participants noted this as the single most important piece of advice for a new administrator. These visits are critical for several reasons including being available and listening to employees across the institution as well as learning the culture of each campus. This face-to-face time with campus employees can help form a foundation of trust between the administrator and campus employees.

Due to the amount of time spent traveling between campuses, new administrators must adjust their leadership style to account for time lost traveling between campuses. Several participants noted that micromanaging is not possible as a multicampus administrator. As a result, the participants empower employees through distributing leadership to campuses and individuals. Several participants distribute this leadership and responsibility for the strategic plan to the campus level, helping ensure that local strategies are aligned with overall institutional strategies.

Distributing leadership may not be enough; not all employees will feel empowered to make decisions. Multicampus institutions have a complex organizational structure to meet the needs of

131

the entire institution as well as each of the campuses. This structure can be difficult to navigate and administrators can help empower employees through employing principles of servant leadership. Through helping employees navigate institutional processes and through removing roadblocks, there is potentially a long-term benefit of both developing employees and a greater degree of overall institutional capability.

Administrators should also be aware of communication and messaging. To avoid unnecessary intercampus tension, messaging should be consistent and timely. A consistent message is necessary both between administrators and between campuses. Additionally, administrators should be transparent with decision-making by describing the context and factors related to the decision. Transparency, consistent, and timely communications helps avoid rumors and tensions associated with perceived inequitable treatment of campuses. Transparency also helps demonstrate alignment between decision-making and the institutions strategic plan.

Finally, because tensions are a common occurrence at multicampus institutions, administrators may benefit from formal conflict management training. Effective conflict management can help administrators maximize productive competition while minimizing unproductive tension. Many of the key principles of conflict management can help leaders build relationships, focus on the institutional mission, and maintain impartiality in decision-making.

Implication of the results for policy. As discussed on the limitations section, the results of this study are not generalizable. However, the preliminary findings include a few key areas where further research could improve policy recommendations. The primary areas of policy implications include communication standards, budget processes, and strategic planning.

Participants of the study placed a high-degree of focus on communicating with employees. Participant F went so far as to say that when conflict arises, "[it] is a result of less than effective communication" while Participant G mirrored Participant F when she said, "misunderstandings is

132

often times a communications issue." I expected participants to have a small set of employees outside of the institutional hierarchy where the administrator would both collect and disseminate information informally. Participants clearly articulated their availability to listen to all employee concerns but they did not indicate using particular individuals for disseminating information. For disseminating information, Participant H described how her team of administrators consolidate the information that needs to be shared into bullet list formats, allowing each administrator to present the same information. Participants described the difficulty in communicating with employees over several campuses. While none of the participants favored on way of communication over another, they indicated a desire to use non-traditional communication methods such as blogs or video blogs. The motivation for wanting to change the method of communication stems from the ineffective use of email and the impracticality of institutions-wide meetings. Studying the effectiveness of non-traditional communication methods, or improving the effectiveness of email, could lead to a recommendation for whether or not administrators should tightly restrict informal dissemination of information.

With resource allocation being a primary source of tension, institutions may benefit from inclusive and transparent budget allocation processes. Fundamentally, participants described how employees make assumptions about why institutional leaders allocate resources. Participant A described how her institution includes open budget hearings to inform the college community on what information is used when the President's cabinet makes budget decisions. Without providing a context for decisions, Participant F said, "they [employees] will make up a story to contextualize." This is exactly what appears to be happening at the majority of the participant's institutions.

The final implication for policy involves planning. Prior to this study, I believed that participants would struggle with maintaining focus on the institutional mission while allowing

individual campuses to satisfy regional needs. This was a struggle evident in the results. What I did not expect was the degree to which the participants focused on their institutions as "one college." Several participants have a strong focus on strategic planning and alignment of mission, vision, and values across the multiple campuses. With a strong plan and messaging, Participant F stated that her institution wants the college "to function in terms of its values and self-presentation to the world as a single college and not as multiple colleges under a kind of unifying administrative umbrella."

        Implication of the results for theory. In addition to implications for practice and policy, the results of this study have implications for the theories on intercampus tension and multicampus leadership. The results of this study align with the previous research on intercampus tension multicampus institutions. In addition, competition for resources was a theme not previously addressed in multicampus literature. Beyond intercampus tension, there is a more diverse body of research on higher education leadership. The participants confirmed several leadership competencies as well as confirmed the reliance of administrators on distributed and servant leadership.

        Sources of tension in higher education have previously been restricted to institutional differing missions and local needs (Bailey & Morest, 2004; Vartiainen, 2017), identity and campus culture (Kavanagh & Ashkanasy, 2006; Maguire & Phillips, 2008), as well as organizational structure and degree of centralization (Gaskell & Hayton, 2015). The results of this study confirms and provides additional context to these sources of tension. In addition, this study adds resource allocation as a primary cause of intercampus tension.

        All the participants consider the implications of college-wide decisions or actions through the lens of differing campus cultures as well as differing missions and regional needs. Over half of the participants indicated that the addressing local needs is important in demonstrating the value in

134

the local campus but must also be aligned with the institutional mission. As Gaskell and Hayton (2015) described, organizational structure can lead to isolation of employees. While four participants directly confirmed feelings of isolation among employees, all participants physically visit different campuses to connect with employees. Additionally, all but one participant attributed organizational structure or degree of centralization to feelings of inequity between campuses. Participants also described that these factors are intertwined with campus identity and campus culture.

Higher education leadership literature has provided a wealth of information on leadership competencies (Campbell et al., 2010; Conover, 2009; Wallin, 2010). Much like previous studies, participants reinforced these same competencies. Participants clearly identified collaboration, organizational strategy, advocacy, and communication as key skills. Bryman (2007) included vision as a key competency. While many of the participants did not directly address this competency, Participant F demonstrated this competency when she attempted to reduce intercampus tension through helping "campuses develop more of a sense of their own identity."

Arena and Uhl-Bien (2016) described key personnel across the institutions as active facilitators of leadership and change. While the participants indicated a reluctance to use informal channels to disseminate information, this study did not elicit information about how key personnel across the institutions facilitate change. The design of the interview questions prompted the participants to focus on their own leadership, resulting in a lack of results in this area. To address this question, a case study may be a more appropriate method.

Others have worked to describe the process of leadership (Bolden et al., 2008; Dinh et al., 2014; Uhl-Bien, 2006). All participants described the necessity to travel between campuses, reducing the available time to complete tasks. As a result, participants focused on empowering employees through distributed or shared leadership. Participant A focused on developing

employees by "ask[ing] questions to let me figure out how to fix it" while Participant E works to a common understanding that "it's not my thing that has to get done, it's a thing that has to get done by the college." All participants focused on understanding the context of each campus, what they considered a continual process of leadership.

Trust was the final attribute of this study. All participants strongly confirmed Tierney's (2006) theory of trust requiring repeated interactions and five participants directly indicated that trust is shared or exchanged. When asked about recommendations for a new administrator, all participants stated that the individual must travel to all locations setting the groundwork for repeated interactions. Additionally, participants described the necessity to be available for employees to vent or ask questions, as well as rotate meetings between all campuses to facilitate informal interactions. Five participants described the reciprocity of trust. These participants explained how distributed leadership is not only a necessity but also requires the administrator to put faith in the employee. One of these participants explained how she will "take the bullet" if something does not go well. Not only did these five participants articulate how they trust employees, all participants described the importance of demonstrating responsibility and follow-through to be trustworthy. Additionally, participants described trust in terms of campus tribalism, which can be attributed to Tierney's (2006) cultural construction of trust.

Recommendations for Further Research

While the results of this study furthered knowledge related to multicampus institutions, there is much more to learn. This study approached multicampus leadership through an exploration of intercampus tension. As with any exploratory study, salient themes emerged that would benefit from an additional, focused study. Additionally, other forms of qualitative or quantitative inquiry could explore a holistic view of one institution or attempt to determine the impact of particular leadership styles or actions.

As many participants indicated, both major and minor structural changes were relatively common in multicampus institutions. While participants in this study were able to identify the reasoning and impact of such changes at their particular institution, a case study of a single institution could provide additional in-depth insights by including multiple individual viewpoints in the study. The impact of not only the reorganization itself, but also the time immediately preceding and immediately following the reorganization could focus on the benefits and challenges of reorganizing a multicampus institution. A further benefit of a case study would be to examine institutional documentation about the decision-making processes and communications involved with the reorganization.

Additional research into resource allocation, decision-making, and communication would benefit administrators at multicampus institutions. Resource allocation was not a specific area of tension noted in previous literature; however, the participants in this study indicated that as a primary issue leading to intercampus tension. With the ongoing issue of financial constraints in higher education (McGuinness, 2012), this will continue to be an ongoing issue. Without fully understanding the issue from the perspective of both leaders and other employees with fiscal oversight, little can be done to mitigate the issue.

Timberlake (2004) studied decision-making using a phenomenological study of eight participants and included a breadth of institution types as well as a wide-variety of personnel. The conceptual framework for Timberlake's (2004) study included a focus on organizational structure as it results to decision-making. Using this information and the results of tension in multicampus institutions, further study of collaboration as it relates to decision-making could provide administrators with insights on how to collaborate effectively and efficiently across multiple campuses.

Participants in this study also identified communication as a key difficulty in multicampus institutions. For building trust and gaining an understanding of campus culture, participants noted that face-to-face communication was preferred over virtual communication channels. All participants noted the challenge of communication and the difficulty of ensuring a consistent message that employees can and will use. As a result, all participants administrators have attempted to increase availability with more than half employing several different techniques of communicating. These techniques include a heavy reliance on both synchronous and asynchronous electronic communications to be both personal and timely so that all employees hear the same message at the same time.

Finally, the issue of conflict management training for administrators should be explored further. Participant F articulated a strong argument that conflict management skills should be a core competency for multicampus administrators. Because all participants noted that tensions arise between individuals, campuses, and divisions, a study that evaluated the effectiveness of conflict management training for multicampus administrators could provide insight for development of future multicampus leaders. One possibility might be to extend Stanley's (2007) study comparing employee perceptions of administrators with the administrator's conflict management style. While the study identified a sample of participants style with how the administrator perceived conflict, a

138

study on conflict management training for higher education administrators could advance leadership training for future administrators.

Conclusion

Multicampus institutions are an increasingly popular institutional structure (Brubaker, 2016; Pinheiro & Berg, 2017). The potential benefits of multicampus institutions include saving costs through consolidating administrative functions to serve several campuses (Aglargoz, 2017; Mills & Plumb, 2012). Additionally, multicampus institutions can expand access; access for students unable or unwilling to travel and access for communities that may have specific higher education needs (Aglargoz, 2017; Bird, 2011; Hoyt & Howell, 2012). However, the majority of mergers do not meet financial objectives (Maguire & Phillips, 2008).

Through a phenomenological design, 11 administrators in higher education were interviewed to explore intercampus tension in multicampus institutions. The participating administrators experienced intercampus tension as competition for resources as well as differing campus cultures and regional needs. Organizational structure and the institution's degree of centralization are important factors to consider when trying to understand how and why intercampus tension may emerge. As a result, administrators should be self-aware of their own leadership style in the context of the institutional structure.

Perhaps most importantly, new administrators should understand the context of each campus within the institution. Participants described the unique contributions of individual campuses to the overall unifying vision for the institution. New administrators should plan on spending time with campus personnel as well as learning the individual culture of each campus. By better understanding how other administrators perceive and address challenges in a multicampus, other administrators may be able to apply leadership strategies to create an efficient and effective institution.

References

Aglargoz, O. (2017). 'We are at this campus, there is nothing in this campus…': Socio-spatial

    analysis of a university campus. *Tertiary Education and Management, 23*(1), 69–83.

    http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13583883.2016.1207798

Alajoutsijarvi, K., & Kettunen, K. (2016). The 'dean's squeeze' revisited: A contextual approach.

    Journal of Management Development, 35(3), 326–340. http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/JMD-02-

    2015-0017

Anderson, M. (2011). The struggle for collective leadership: Thinking and practice in a

    multicampus school setting. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership, 40*(3),

    328–342. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1741143212436955

Arena, M. J., & Uhl-Bien, M. (2016). Complexity leadership theory: Shifting from human capital

    to social capital. *People + Strategy, 39*(2), 22–27. Retrieved from

    https://www.hrps.org/resources/people-strategy-journal/pages/default.aspx

Ashworth, P., & Greasley, K. (2009). The phenomenology of 'approach to studying': The

    idiographic turn. *Studies in Higher Education, 34*(5), 561–576.

    http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/03075070802597184.

Aspen Institute and Achieving the Dream. (2013). *Crisis and opportunity: Aligning the community

    college presidency with student success.* Retrieved from

    https://assets.aspeninstitute.org/content/uploads/files/content/upload/CEP_Final_Report.pdf

Bailey, T., & Morest, V. (2004). *The organizational efficiency of multiple missions for community

    colleges*. New York, NY: Community College Research Center, Teachers College,

    Columbia University.

Barua, A. (2007). Husserl, Heidegger, and the transcendental dimension of phenomenology. *Indo-Pacific Journal of Phenomenology, 7*(1), 1–10, http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/20797222.2007.11433942

Basham, M. J., & Mathur, R. P. (2010). Dynamic leadership development in community college administration: Theories, applications, and implications. *New Directions for Community College, 149*, 25-32. http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/cc.392

Bebko, P., & Huffman, D. (2011). Developing a typology of branch campuses: Findings from the NABCA campus and center administrator survey. *Metropolitan Universities, 22*(1), 48–64. Retrieved from http://journals.iupui.edu

Berry, G. R. (2011). A cross-disciplinary literature review: Examining trust on virtual teams. *Performance Improvement Quarterly, 24*(3), 9–28, http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/piq.20116

Bird, C. (2011) A perspective on the future of branch campuses. *Metropolitan Universities, 22*(1), 48-64. Retrieved from http://journals.iupui.edu

Black, S. A. (2015). Qualities of effective leadership in higher education. *Open Journal of Leadership, 4,* 54–66. http://dx.doi.org/10.4236/ojl.2015.42006

Bolden, R. (2011). Distributed leadership in organizations: A review of theory and research. *International Journal of Management Reviews, 13*, 251–269. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2370.2011.00306.x

Bolden, R., Petrov, G., & Gosling, J. (2008). Tensions in higher education leadership: Towards a multi-level model of leadership practice. *Higher Education Quarterly, 62*(4), 358–376. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2273.2008.00398.x

Bottorff, T., Glaser, R., Todd, A., & Alderman, B. (2008). Branching out: Communication and collaboration among librarians at multicampus institutions. *Journal of Library Administration, 48*(3-4), 329–363. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/01930820802289391

Brimhall, C. L. (2014). *Leadership strategies in high performing community colleges: A qualitative phenomenological study* (doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ERIC. (UMI Number: 3614176).

Brown, J. T. (2017). The seven silos of accountability in higher education: Systematizing multiple logics and fields. *Research & Practice in Assessment, 11*, 41–58. Retrieved from http://www.rpajournal.com/

Brubaker, H. (September 9, 2016). Jefferson and Philly U. reach final deal. *The Philadelphia Inquirer*. Retrieved from http://www.philly.com/philly/business/Jefferson-and-Philly-U-reach-final-deal.html

Bryant, A., & Charmaz, K. (2007). Grounded theory research: Methods and practice. In A. Bryant & K. Charmaz (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of grounded theory: Paperback edition* (pp. 1–28). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Bryman, A. (2007). Effective leadership in higher education: A literature review. *Studies in Higher Education, 32*(6), 693–710. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/03075070701685114

Campbell, D. F., Syed, S., & Morris, P. A. (2010). Minding the gap: Filling a void in community college leadership development. *New Directions for Community Colleges, 149*, 33–39. Retrieved from http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/journal/10.1002/(ISSN)1536-0733

Carlson, J. A. (2010). Avoiding traps in member checking. *The Qualitative Report, 15*(5), 1102–1113. Retrieved from http://www.nova.edu/ssss/QR/QR15-5/carlson.pdf

Carter, D. R., DeChurch, L. A., Braun, M. T., & Contractor, N. S. (2015). Social network approaches to leadership: An integrative conceptual review. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 100*(3), 597–623. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0038922

Conover, K. S. (2009). *Leadership competencies of branch campus administrators in multicampus community college systems* (doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ERIC. (UMI Number: 3360335).

Cordery, J. L., & Soo, C. (2008). Overcoming impediments to virtual team effectiveness. *Human Factors and Ergonomics in Manufacturing, 18*(5), 487–500.

Day, D. V., & Antonakis, J. (2012). Leadership: Past, present, and future. *The Nature of Leadership, 2*, 3–25.

Dinh, J. E., Lord, R. G., Gardner, W. L., Meuser, J. D., Liden, R. C., & Hu, J. (2014). Leadership theory and research in the new millennium: Current theoretical trends and changing perspectives. *The Leadership Quarterly, 25*, 36–62. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2013.11.005

Drew, G. (2010). Issues and challenges in higher education leadership: Engaging for change. *The Australian Educational Researcher, 37*(3), 57–76. Retrieved from http://link.springer.com/journal/13384

Eddy, P. L., & VanDerLinden, K. E. (2006). Emerging definitions of leadership in higher education: New visions of leadership or same old "hero" leader? *Community College Review, 34*(1), 5–26. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0091552106289703

El-Ashmawy, A. K., & Weasenforth, D. L. (2010). Internal leadership academy: Evaluation of one college's program. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 34*(7), 541–560, http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10668920701831233

Etikan, I., Musa, S. A., & Alkassim, R. S. (2016). Comparison of convenience sampling and purposive sampling. *American Journal of Theoretical and Applied Statistics, 5*(1), 1–4, http://dx.doi.org/10.11648/j.ajtas.20160501.11.

Finkelstein, S., Hambrick, D. C., & Cannella, A. A. (1996). *Strategic leadership: Theory and research on executives, top management teams, and boards.* New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Gaither, G. (1999). *The multicampus system: Perspectives on practice and prospects*. Sterling, VA: Stylus.

Gaskell, C., & Hayton, E. (2015). Distance administration: Multiple perspectives on multi-site institutions. *Perspectives: Policy and Practice in Higher Education, 19*(2), 43–48, http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13603108.2014.1001003

Gay, L. R., Mills, G. E., & Airasian, P. W. (2012). *Educational research: Competencies for analysis and applications*. Boston, MA: Pearson.

George, A. L., & Bennett, A. (2004). *Case studies and theory development in the social sciences.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Gigliotti, R. A. (2016). Leader as performer; leader as human: A discursive and retrospective construction of crisis leadership. *Atlantic Journal of Communication, 24*(4), 185–200. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/15456870.2016.1208660

Gossom, J. G., & Pelton, M. D. (2011). Branch campus leadership: Like running a three-ring circus? *Metropolitan Universities, 22*(1), 48–64. Retrieved from http://journals.iupui.edu

Gronn, P. (2000). Distributed properties: A new architecture for leadership. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership, 28*(3), 317–338. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0263211X000283006

Goulding, C. (2005). Grounded theory, ethnography, and phenomenology: A comparative analysis of three qualitative strategies for marketing research. *European Journal of Marketing, 39*(3/4), 294-308. http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/03090560510581782

Guest, G., Bunce, A., & Johnson, L. (2006). How many interviews are enough?: An experiment with data saturation and variablility. *Field Methods, 18*, 59–82. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1525822X05279903

Hansen, D. R., & Frederiksen, L. L. (2016). The 'crucified' leader: Cynicism, fantasies and paradoxes in education. *Studies in Philosophy and Education, 36*, 425–441. Retrieved from http://www.springer.com/education+%26+language/journal/11217

Harman, K. (2002). Merging divergent campus cultures into coherent educational communities: Challenges for higher education leaders. *Higher Education, 44*, 91–114. Retrieved from https://link.springer.com/journal/10734

Harmening, T. R. (2013). *Governance of academic planning in public higher education systems* (doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ERIC. (UMI number: 3559489).

Hoyt, J., & Howell, S. (2012). Why students choose the branch campus of a large university. *The Journal of Continuing Higher Education, 60*(2), 110–116. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/07377363.2012.687304

Harrison, B. (2008). *Life Story Research.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Hawkins, C. (2009). Leadership theories: Managing practices, challenges, suggestions. *The Community College Enterprise, 15*(2), 39–62. Retrieved from http://www.schoolcraft.edu/cce/community-college-enterprise

Hazy, J. K., & Uhl-Bien, M. (2015). Towards operationalizing complexity leadership: How generative, administrative and community-building leadership practices enact organizational outcomes. *Leadership, 11*(1), 79–104. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1742715013511483

Iacono, V. L., Symonds, P., & Brown, D. H. K. (2016). Skype as a tool for qualitative interviews. *Sociological Research Online, 21*(2), 1–15. Retrieved from http://www.socresonline.org.uk/21/2/12.html

Jameson, J. (2012). Leadership values, trust and negative capability: Managing the uncertainties of future English higher education. *Higher Education Quarterly, 66*(9), 391–414. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2273.2012.00533.x

Johnstone, D. B. (1999). Management and leadership challenges of multicampus systems. In G. Gaither (Ed.), *The multicampus system: Perspectives on practice and prospects*, (pp. 3–20). Sterling, VA: Stylus.

Jones, S., Harvey, M., & Lefoe, G. (2014). A conceptual approach for blended leadership for tertiary education institutions. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management, 36*(4), 418-429, http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/1360080X.2014.916469

Jones, S., Harvey, M., Lefoe, G., & Ryland, K. (2014). Synthesizing theory and practice: Distributed leadership in higher education. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership, 42*(5), 603–619. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1741143213510506

Kavanagh, M. H., & Ashkanasy, N. M. (2006). The impact of leadership and change management strategy on organizational culture and individual acceptance of change during a merger. *British Journal of Management, 17*, S81–S103, http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1467

Kirkpatrick, S. (2004). Visionary leadership theory. In G. R. Goethals, G. J. Sorenson, & J. M. Burns (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of leadership* (pp. 1616–1619). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. http://dx.doi.org/10.4135/9781412952392.n368

Kligyte, G., & Barrie, S. (2014). Collegiality: Leading us into fantasy - The paradoxical resilience of collegiality in academic leadership. *Higher Education Research & Development, 33*(1), 157–169. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2013.864613

Lamm, K. W., Carter, H. S., & Lamm, A. J. (2016). A theory based model of interpersonal leadership: An integration of the literature. *Journal of Leadership Education, 15*(4), 183–205. http://dx.doi.org/1012806/V15/I4/T2

Leffel, A., Hallam, C., & Darling, J. (2012). Enhancement of entrepreneurial leadership: A case focusing on a model of successful conflict management skills. *Administrative Issues Journal: Education, Practice, and Research, 2*(2), 13–25. Retrieved from https://www.swosu.edu/academics/aij/index.aspx

Lichtenstein, B. B., Uhl-Bien, M., Marion, R., Seers, A., & Orton, J. D. (2006). Complexity leadership theory: An interactive perspective on leading in complex adaptive systems. *Emergence: Complexity and Organization, 84*(4), 2–12. Retrieved from https://journal.emergentpublications.com/

Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1989). Ethics: The failure of positivist science. *The Review of Higher Education, 12*(3), 221–240. Retrieved from https://www.press.jhu.edu/journals/review-higher-education

Madikizela-Madiya, N. (2018). Mistrust in a multicampus institutional context: A socio-spatial analysis. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management, 40*(5), 415–429. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/1360080X.2018.1478609

Maguire, S., & Phillips, N. (2008). 'Citibankers' at Citigroup: A study of the loss of institutional trust after a merger. *Journal of Management Studies, 25*(2), 372–401. Retrieved from http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/journal/10.1111/(ISSN)1467-6486

McGuinness, A. C. (2012). The states and higher education. In P. G. Altbach, P. J. Gumport, & R. O. Berdahl (Eds.). *American higher education in the twenty-first century: Social, political, and economic challenges* (3rd ed., pp. 183–215). Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Mercer, J. (2009). Junior academic-manager in higher education: An untold story? *International Journal of Educational Management, 23*(4), 348–359. http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/09513540910957444

Mills, S. C., & Plumb, R. (2012). Evolving a university center to a branch campus: A case study. *The Journal of Continuing Higher Education, 60*(3), 143–156. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/07377363.2013.722422

Moerer-Urdahl, T., & Creswell, J. W. (2004). Using transcendental phenomenology to explore the "ripple effect" in a leadership mentoring program. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods, 3*(2), 19–35. Retrieved from http://journals.sagepub.com/home/ijq

Morse, J. M. (2000). Determining sample size. *Qualitative Health Research, 11*, 291–292. Retrieved from http://journals.sagepub.com/home/qhr

Moustakas, C. (1994). *Phenomenological research methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Mukhopadhyay, S., & Gupta, R. K. (2014). Survey of qualitative research methodology in strategy research and implications for Indian researchers. *Vision, 18*(2), 109–123. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0972262914528437

National Center for Education Statistics (2018). *2018–2019 survey materials: Glossary*. Retrieved from https://surveys.nces.ed.gov/ipeds/Downloads/Forms/IPEDSGlossary.pdf

Newman, I., & Benz, C. R. (1998). *Qualitative-quantitative research methodology: Exploring the interactive continuum.* Carbondale and Edwardsville, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.

Nicolson, R. (2004). The management of multicampus systems. *South African Journal of Higher Education, 18*, 346–358. Retrieved from https://www.ajol.info/index.php/sajhe/index

Nordin, N. (2012). The influence of leadership behavior and organizational commitment on

    organizational readiness for change in a higher learning institution. *Asia Pacific Education*

    Review, 13, 239–249. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s12564-011-9200-y

Opdenakker, R. (2006). Advantages and disadvantages of four interview techniques in qualitative

    research. *Forum: Qualitative Social Research*, *7*(4), http://dx.doi.org/10.17169/fqs-7.4.175.

Padron, E. J., Lukenbill, J. D., & Levitt, T. (1999). Miami-Dade Community College: Unified

    vision for a multicampus system. In G. Gaither (Ed.), *The multicampus system:*

    Perspectives on practice and prospects, (pp. 181–194). Sterling, VA: Stylus.

Pinheiro, R., & Berg, L. N. (2017). Categorizing and assessing multicampus universities in

    contemporary higher education. *Tertiary Education and Management, 23*(1), 5–22,

    http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13583883.2016.1205124

Pinheiro, R., Charles, D., & Jones, G. (2017). Translating strategy, values and identities in higher

    education: The case of multicampus systems. *Tertiary Education and Management, 23*(1),

    1-4, http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13583883.2016.1248858

Pinnegar, S., & Daynes, J. G. (2007). Locating narrative inquiry history. In D. J. Clandinin (Ed.),

    Handbook of narrative inquiry: Mapping a methodology (pp. 3–34). Thousand Oaks, CA:

    Sage.

Rose, K. J., & Bergman, M. (2016). Reaction to leadership and misplacement: How can this affect

    institutions of higher education? *New Horizons in Adult Education & Human Resource*

    Development, 28(3), 26–29. Retrieved from

    http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/journal/10.1002/(ISSN)1939-4225

Saldaña, J. (2016). *The coding manual for qualitative researcher* (3rd ed.). Los Angeles, CA:

    Sage.

Saunders, M. N. K. (2012). Choosing research participants. In G. Symon, & C. Cassell (Eds.), *The practice of qualitative organization research: Core methods and current challenges,* (pp. 37–55). London, UK: Sage.

Seidman, I. (2013). *Interviewing as qualitative research: A guide of researchers in education and the social sciences* (4th ed.). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Sewerin, T., & Holmberg, R. (2017). Contextualizing distributed leadership in higher education. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 1–15, http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2017.1303453

Shaw, K., & Bornhoft, S. (2011) Community support and relevance to community: Indispensable underpinnings for branch campuses. *Metropolitan Universities, 22*(1), 48–64. Retrieved from http://journals.iupui.edu

Shenton, A. K. (2004). Strategies for ensuring trustworthiness in qualitative research projects. *Education for Information, 22*, 63–75. Retrieved from https://www.iospress.nl/journal/education-for-information/

Smith, Z. A., & Wolverton, M. (2010). Higher education leadership competencies: Quantitatively refining a qualitative model. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies, 17*(1), 61–70. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1548051809348018

Soares, L., Steele, P., & Wayt, L. (2016). *Evolving higher education business models: Leading with data to deliver results*. Washington, DC: American Council on Education.

Spears, L. C. (2010). Character and servant leadership: Ten characteristics of effective, caring leaders. *The Journal of Virtues & Leadership, 1*(1), 25–30. Retrieved from https://www.regent.edu/acad/global/publications/jvl/

Spector, B. A. (2016). Carlyle, Freud, and the great man theory more fully considered. *Leadership, 12*(2), 250–260. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1742715015571392

Stanley, C. A., & Algert, N. E. (2007). An exploratory study of the conflict management styles of

    department heads in a research university setting. *Innovative Higher Education, 32*(1), 49–

    65. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10755-007-9035-y

Starks, H., & Trinidad, S. B. (2007). Choose your method: A comparison of phenomenology,

    discourse analysis, and grounded theory. *Qualitative Health Research, 17*(10), 1372–1380.

    http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1049732307307031

Thor, L. M., Schober, D. J., & Helminski, L. (1999). The Maricopa Community College District:

    A culture of deliberate transformation. In G. Gaither, (Ed.), *The multicampus system:*

    Perspectives on practice and prospects, (pp. 195–212). Sterling, VA: Stylus.

Tierney, W. (2006). *Trust and the public good.* New York, NY: Peter Lang.

Timberlake, G. R. (2004). Decision-making in multicampus higher education institutions. *The*

    Community College Enterprise, 10(2), 91–99. Retrieved from

    http://www.schoolcraft.edu/cce/community-college-enterprise

Tufford, L, & Newman, P. A. (2010). Bracketing in qualitative research. *Qualitative Social Work,*

    11(1), 80–96. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1473325010368316

Uhl-Bien, M. (2006). Relational leadership theory: Exploring the social processes of leadership

    and organizing. *Leadership Quarterly*, *17*, 654–676. Retrieved from

    https://www.journals.elsevier.com/the-leadership-quarterly

Underwood, R., Mohr, D., & Ross, M. (2016). Attachment style, leadership behavior, and

    perceptions of leader effectiveness in academic management. *Journal of Leadership*

    Education, 15(4), 100–116. http://dx.doi.org/1012806/V15/I4/R7.

Vartiainen, P. (2017). Campus-based tensions in the structural development of a newly merged

    university: The case of the University of Eastern Finland. *Tertiary Education and*

    Management, 23(1), 23–40. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13583883.2016.1205123

Vidovich, L, & Currie, J. (2011). Governance and trust in higher education. *Studies in Higher Education, 36*(1), 43–56. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/03075070903469580

Wallin, D. L. (2010). Looking to the future: Change leaders for tomorrow's community colleges. *New Directions for Community Colleges, 149*, 5–12. http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/cc

Wang, V. C. X., & Sedivy-Benton, A. L. (2016). Leadership misplacement: How can this affect institutions of higher education? *New Horizons in Adult Education & Human Resource Development, 28*(3), 14–25. Retrieved from http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/journal/10.1002/(ISSN)1939-4225

Webber, K. L, & Boehmer, R. G. (2008). The balancing act: Accountability, affordability, and access in American higher education. *New Directions for Institutional Research,* 79–91. http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/ir

Weinstein, R. B. (2013). Servant leadership and public administration: Solving the public sector financial problems through service. *Journal of Management Policy and Practice, 14*(3), 84–91. Retrieved from http://www.na-businesspress.com/jmppopen.html

Witt/Kieffer. (2013). Leadership traits and success in higher education: A Witt/Kieffer study. Retrieved from: www.aascu.org/corporatepartnership/WittKieffer/Leadership.pdf

Wolcott, H. T. (2008). *Ethnography: A way of seeing* (2nd ed.), Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira.

Wooldridge, E. (2011). Leadership in higher education: Some lessons from other sectors. *International Journal of Leadership in Public Services, 7*(3), 245–250. http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/17479881111187439

Yin, R. K. (2017). *Case study research: Design and methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Wirihana, L., Welch, A., Williamson, M., Christensen, M., Bakon, S., & Craft, J. (2017). The provision of higher education in regional areas: An integrative review of the literature.

Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management, 39(3), 307–319.

http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/1360080X.2017.1298196

Zeeman, N., & Benneworth, P. (2017). Globalisation, mergers and 'inadvertent multicampus universities': Reflections from Wales. *Tertiary Education and Management, 23*(1), 41–52. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13583883.2016.1243256

Appendix A: Interview Guide

The intent of this study is to examine intercampus tensions in multicampus higher education institutions. Tensions may be manifest in many different ways and the goal of this study is to better understand how higher education leaders perceive and react to those tensions. Interviews will be conducted via video conferencing to record both audio and visual data from the interview. For each interview, the date, time, and length of the interview will be written as well as the participant's name. Although the recordings will be the source of the transcriptions, I will also record limited notes on gestures, behaviors, or themes during the interview.

This appendix is separated into multiple sections. The introduction script will be read to each participant. The interview questions lists the primary questions that will be asked during the interview. Similar to the introduction script, the closing script will also be read to all participants. At the end of the appendix, a sample question-probe document is presented that describes one of the interview questions along with additional probes and sub-questions to stimulate conversation during the interview.

Introduction Script

Thank you for your time today. My name is Steve Erickson and I would like to interview you as a participant in the research study, Intercampus Tension at Multicampus Institutions: A Phenomenological Study. Throughout the interview, I will use the recording functionality in the software to record the interview. As a part of an electronic interview, I would appreciate it if you could please turn on your webcam to simulate an in-person interview.

This interview will be confidential; only I will have access to the recordings. Although the interviews will be held in strict confidentiality, there is a slight possibility that participants could be identified through demographic factors associated with your institution. After the interview, I will prepare an executive summary of the interview including the preliminary themes that emerge.

I will provide this summary to you for your review and you will be able to add to, clarify, or delete specific statements. During the interview, if you do not want to talk about a particular subject, you are able to skip the question or limit your response.

You have already signed the consent form; are you willing to continue participation in this study?

Interview Questions

1. Tell me about your journey into higher education administration.

2. Thinking about the first six months in your current position, describe your interactions with other employees at your institution.

3. Shifting to your institution, describe your college's organizational structure, especially as it relates to multiple campuses.

4. Describe the different campuses at your institution including similarities and difference on campus focus or regional demands.

5. Describe your approach to leading and managing employees on multiple campuses.

6. Describe how you have built rapport and trust with employees across the institution.

7. What areas of tension exist between campuses within your institution?

8. What effect do you believe intercampus tensions have had on your institution?

9. Describe how you or your institution could mitigate those tensions.

10. What advice would you give to an administrator transitioning from a single-campus institution to a multicampus institution?

Closing Script

That was the last question of the interview. Thank you for your time today and your willingness to participate in this study. After this interview, I will transcribe the recording and develop an executive summary of this interview. I will send that summary to you and would appreciate if you could review the document for accuracy. If you would like to add information at any point, please feel free to contact me. Thanks again and I hope you have a great

The Concordia University Doctorate of Education Program is a collaborative community of scholar-practitioners, who seek to transform society by pursuing ethically-informed, rigorously-researched, inquiry-based projects that benefit professional, institutional, and local educational contexts. Each member of the community affirms throughout their program of study, adherence to the principles and standards outlined in the Concordia University Academic Integrity Policy. This policy states the following:

Statement of academic integrity.

As a member of the Concordia University community, I will neither engage in fraudulent or unauthorized behaviors in the presentation and completion of my work, nor will I provide unauthorized assistance to others.

Explanations:

What does "fraudulent" mean?

"Fraudulent" work is any material submitted for evaluation that is falsely or improperly presented as one's own. This includes, but is not limited to texts, graphics and other multi-media files appropriated from any source, including another individual, that are intentionally presented as all or part of a candidate's final work without full and complete documentation.

What is "unauthorized" assistance?

"Unauthorized assistance" refers to any support candidates solicit in the completion of their work, that has not been either explicitly specified as appropriate by the instructor, or any assistance that is understood in the class context as inappropriate. This can include, but is not limited to:

- Use of unauthorized notes or another's work during an online test
- Use of unauthorized notes or personal assistance in an online exam setting
- Inappropriate collaboration in preparation and/or completion of a project
- Unauthorized solicitation of professional resources for the completion of the work.

Statement of Original Work (Continued)

I attest that:

1. I have read, understood, and complied with all aspects of the Concordia University–Portland Academic Integrity Policy during the development and writing of this dissertation.

2. Where information and/or materials from outside sources has been used in the production of this dissertation, all information and/or materials from outside sources has been properly referenced and all permissions required for use of the information and/or materials have been obtained, in accordance with research standards outlined in the *Publication Manual of The American Psychological Association*

_____
Digital Signature

  Steven Erickson
_____
Name (Typed)

  June 21, 2019
_____
Date