ABSTRACT

Tierini D. Hodges, COLLABORATION IN THE LOOSELY COUPLED ACADEMY (Under the direction of Dr. David Siegel). Department of Educational Leadership, April 2016.

This dissertation examines how loosely coupled university units collaborate in the achievement of institutional wide goals. Today's higher education institutions are being asked to do more with less as resources have decreased and regulatory procedures have increased. Collaboration is being touted as a means to improve student learning, avoid redundant efforts and protect access and affordability. When considering that the future of higher education is noted to rely heavily on institutions' ability to foster collaboration amongst its many components, it is vital that more data is collected that explains how collaboration happens at a loosely coupled university. To examine this phenomenon, this study utilized a qualitative case study methodology to explore the collaborative efforts of the faculty, staff, and administrators at a large state university during their acquisition of a grant which required the institution to infuse entrepreneurial principles throughout the institution.

The data collected for this study revealed that when considering how loosely coupled university units employ concerted action, five elements proved significant in the achievement of institutional goals. The processes and performance of the units, the collaborative processes of the group, the commitment of the units to the institutional goal, the presence and management of conflict, and the presence of a superordinate goal delineate what constitutes collaborative goal attainment at this large, loosely coupled research university. The significance of these themes was determined by their congruence to the evidence gathered from reviews of the literature outlining group dynamics and collaboration in higher education. The findings of this study provide data that can aid institutions in engaging their loosely coupled units in collaborative action in the achievement of institution- wide goals.

COLLABORATION IN THE LOOSELY COUPLED ACADEMY

A Dissertation

Presented to

The Faculty of the Department of Educational Leadership

East Carolina University

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Doctor of Education in Educational Leadership

by

Tierini D. Hodges

April, 2016

COLLABORATION IN THE LOOSELY COUPLED ACADEMY

by

Tierini D. Hodges

APPROVED BY:

DIRECTOR OF DISSERTATION:_____
David Siegel, PhD

COMMITTEE MEMBER:_____
Caitlin Ryan, PhD

COMMITTEE MEMBER:_____
Crystal Chambers, PhD

COMMITTEE MEMBER:_____
Michael Harris, PhD

CHAIR OF THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP:

_____
William Rouse, Jr., EdD

DEAN OF THE GRADUATE SCHOOL:

_____
Paul Gemperline, PhD

DEDICATION

This dissertation is dedicated to all of the students who are in pursuit of (or considering the pursuit of) a doctorate degree. May this dissertation be a testament to you that it can be done. Know that all of your hard work is not in vain, and a done dissertation is indeed a great dissertation!

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Praise the Lord! Oh give thanks to the Lord, for He is good; his love endures forever.

~Psalm 106:1

I must first give thanks to my Heavenly Father for without his love, grace and mercy I would not have accomplished this magnanimous undertaking. I am because He is. Thank you to my family and friends for your patience, loving support, and continual prayers throughout this process. I would also like to thank Mr. Kevin Murad for sticking by my side during the sleepless nights and tearful (and fearful) days. Thank you for helping me to stay emotionally stable, mentally sane, and financially afloat. Thank you, Ms. Stephanie Todd, for praying me through this process, for reading/editing the many pages of my chapter drafts, and for reminding me that I am smart when this process made me feel otherwise. Thank you, Mrs. Shawnte Elbert, for always being a listening ear and a spiritual safe haven. But most importantly, thank you for helping me park for free on campus so I could access the library! Many thanks to Dr. Shelly Hoover-Plonk for always being so positive and keeping us focused on the silver lining throughout our dissertation journey together. Thank you to Dr. David Siegel for believing in me and telling me that the scholarly community needs my voice, even when I struggled with finding the words to say. Thank you for believing in my research interest and helping to shape my nebulous idea into a unique dissertation study. Thank you, Dr. Crystal Chambers, for your tough love, unyielding honesty, and helping me achieve academic excellence. Thank you, Dr. Caitlin Ryan, for helping me to get out of my own way and for reminding me to "say it as if you were explaining it to your grandmother". For all that everyone has given, I offer my deepest gratitude. Thank you.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

Background of the Study

For any institution of higher education, the production of knowledge is central to its existence and identity (Weick, 1983); however, for various reasons ranging from financial implications to government regulations, universities now operate in a climate where cost is heavily scrutinized, quality is often questioned and accountability is the exhortation du jour. Institutions are being asked to do more than produce knowledge, but to also promote access, affordability and attainment by curbing college costs, provide value and prepare students for career success (The White House, 2015). Today's institutions are urged to maintain efficiency and transparency to meet these newly defined accountability goals. However, because institutions of higher education are complex entities, often comprised of different colleges, schools, and departmental components, questions arise regarding how these multifaceted institutions have proceeded in getting their varied institutional components working together to drive the institution forward in the achievement of goals aimed at ensuring institutional success. When considering how institutional components work together, it can be useful to first examine how these components are connected.

Coupling describes the idea of interdependence between components of a larger system (Mankovskii, 2009). Tight coupling occurs when components are interlinked in such a manner that changes made in one component produces direct and/or equal changes in another component (Birnbaum, 1988). A chief requirement of tight coupling is that all components within a system fit together to produce predictable and precise outputs. For example, tight coupling is common in automated systems (Birnbaum, 1988), like McDonalds®, that has several locations but products are made the same way regardless of which location you visit. Conversely, loose coupling refers

to a manner of coupling where components maintain a significant degree of autonomy (Mankovskii, 2009). Weick (1976) defined loose coupling as allowing elements to be responsive to one another while maintaining evidence of separateness and identity. He later expounded upon this definition and identified loose coupling as being a situation where elements affect each other suddenly (rather than continuously), occasionally (rather than constantly), negligibly (rather than significantly), indirectly (rather than directly), and eventually (rather than immediately) (Weick, 1982). Glassman's (1973) research highlights that the loosely coupled relationship is created when components of a complex system, with various levels of operation(s), are semi-autonomous to one another. For example, an institution of higher education, with its many components that maintain their own identities and degrees of logical separateness, is an apt representation of loose coupling (Birnbaum, 1988). Studies into loose coupling have identified that the linkage of institutional components to each other and to the institution comprise multiple responsibilities that enable the institution to function (Birnbaum, 1988). However, examination of exactly how loosely coupled institutional components link together to function as one entity in the achievement of university directives is an under-explored topic in higher education.

Statement of the Purpose

Weick (1976) noted that loose coupling is often practiced when resources are in excess, an end can be produced by several means, and when there is a lack of coordination and an absence of regulation. However, in the wake of 2008's economic calamities and its effects on the United States, resources have decreased, regulatory procedures have increased and there are fewer means available to reach specific institutional ends. In such a climate, institutions of higher education have been heavily scrutinized on a variety of indicators ranging from teaching and learning to fiscal efficiency (Zumeta, Breneman, Callan, & Finney, 2012). Institutions are being

asked to do more with less while protecting the quality of education being provided. Expectations from external constituents, such as state/federal regulating bodies and regional accreditation agencies, require institutions to provide more detailed evidence that demonstrates the quality of programs offered and the prudence of resource utilization (Bers, 2012). Institutions have been mandated to demonstrate stronger commitments to productivity and cost effectiveness in the provision of post-secondary education and/or training (Duderstadt, 2012). These mandates that were born out of the recent economic depression expand beyond fiscal planning and require institutions to set and achieve "bold goals" in both the efficiency and productivity of institutional programs, operations and auxiliary enterprises (Duderstadt, 2012, p. 585). The National Center for Public Policy and Higher Education (2009) highlights that institutions should require colleges to collaborate and share resources as a means to protect access and affordability. State policymakers are looking toward collaboration as a solution to avoid redundant efforts and duplication in spending (Eddy, 2010). Therefore, institutions of higher education are being required to trade their historical semi-autonomous methods of operations for more collaborative processes that serve to reduce duplex services, provide creative solutions to problems and increase accountability (Eddy, 2010). This new reality that is today's higher education enterprise elevates the priority of collaborative action amongst institutional components and could pose a direct challenge to the semi-autonomous functioning that is often synonymous with loose coupling. The purpose of this study is to investigate what happens when loosely coupled institutional components work collaboratively to achieve university wide bold goals. Data collected from this study can aid institutions in future goal achievement.

Significance of the Purpose

Collaboration between institutional components is noted to improve student learning and matriculation, as well as enhance economic development and provide the ability to pool resources that may be waning (Eddy, 2010). Unfortunately, little data is available that examines how collaboration happens in a loosely coupled environment. However, the data available does appear to point toward the notion that a loosely coupled organizational structure may prove detrimental to collaboration within higher education institutions. Weick (1976) stated that loose coupling becomes the primary focus within a system when decentralization, infrequent inspection, planned unresponsiveness, causal independence, poor observation and an absence of theoretical linkages are present. Birnbaum (1988) labeled loose coupling as a "slick way to describe waste, inefficiency or indecisive leadership" (p. 39). Meyer and Rowan (2006) indicate that amid the increased calls for accountability, a shift toward tighter coupling and narrowly controlled practices in loosely coupled organizations has ensued. In a study examining loosely coupled collaboration, Chu (1995) found that loose coupling can have direct negative effects on collaboration that primarily stem from the ambiguities in communication and fragmentation of the environment. Though general agreement for a particular goal and/or goal attainment strategy may exist among loosely coupled system components, if the understanding of the appropriate level of support, participant roles and functions is ambiguous, it can result in a lack of collaboration (Chu, 1995). Adams (1973) depicted the loosely coupled academy as a system of academic tribes that share power and form allegiances to implement change. He suggests that the fundamental allegiance of members will be to the smallest unit to which s/he belongs; resulting in members often viewing other tribes as representing "alien interests", or being "intransigent or disorganized" (Adams, 1973, pp. 9-10).

These depictions of loose coupling highlight a fostering of separation between institutional components instead of fostering collaboration. Conversely, loosely coupled organizations are noted as being better able to adapt and survive than their tightly coupled counterparts (Lutz, 1982). The tightly coupled institution is theorized to minimize individual discretion (Aurini, 2012); a notion that flies directly in the face of the nature of the university where the loose coupled flexibility has almost become analogous with academic freedom (Lutz, 1982). While one can reasonably assume that collaboration takes place on any college campus- at least between individuals, if not also between institutional components to some degree- what is not certain is whether a loosely coupled organizational structure allows for the ease of collaboration, or whether it renders collaboration difficult. When considering that the future of higher education is noted to rely heavily on institutions' ability to foster collaboration amongst its many components, it is vital that more data is collected that explains how collaboration happens at a loosely coupled university.

Research Question

Research into how loosely coupled institutional components become goal-directed around one common institutional initiative is scant. Ascertaining a comprehensive understanding of how collaboration takes place within a loosely coupled system may aid higher education institutions in creating an environment of cooperative goal attainment on campus. In an effort to supply research to the limited data available into this line of inquiry, this study will investigate institutional collaboration and institutional goal attainment within a loosely coupled environment. The focus of this research will center on the primary question: How do loosely coupled university units employ concerted action for the achievement of institutional wide goals?

To examine this phenomenon, this study will explore the collaborative efforts of the faculty, staff and administrators at a large state university during the application process, and subsequent acquisition, of a grant awarded by a private education foundation. This university wide initiative required the collaboration of several university units. For the purposes of this study, university units will be an all-encompassing term used to describe the organizational units within the case university. This includes, but is not limited to, university departments, schools, colleges, committees and task forces.

The focal university is a complex system with multiple units that would provide a rich environment in which to examine loose coupling. The funds associated with this education grant made it highly sought after by colleges and universities across the United States. The grant was designed to change the way colleges and universities prepare students for success in the American economy by infusing entrepreneurship principles into college life (Farrow & Kasarda, 2009). The uniqueness of this grant and its requirement for campus collaboration provides the fortuitous opportunity to examine how a loosely coupled university with several institutional units was able to collaborate to achieve an institutional wide goal. As previously noted, research that investigates how university units work together to achieve institutional goals is scant. The limited availability of research into this topic may be in part due to the fact that observation of this phenomenon is difficult, namely because occasions where one can examine several university units collaborating on a single institutional initiative in a time- limited environment is rare. However, the initiative undertaken by the case university provides an exceptional opportunity to examine this topic in a case study format.

Theoretical Frame

A primary resource for any institution of higher education is the people that comprise the many university units. Because of the ideas, interactions and intricacies that are generated between these many individuals, it is important that these elements be considered in this study. Given this, group dynamics will be utilized as the theoretical frame for this study with the aim of ascertaining an understanding of how collaboration is executed among the individuals who constitute loosely coupled university units. Being the primary field of investigation into the nature of group processes, laws regulating group development and conformity behavior (Shaw, 1961), group dynamics will best aid this study in highlighting and understanding the many ways and means of group behaviors that lead to collaboration. A goal of this study is to utilize group dynamics theory to aid in the development of a model of collaboration. This model will serve to illustrate how collaboration takes place on a college campus. Upon review of literature on group dynamics, and its wide breadth of knowledge, the initial premise is that collaboration is an exercise of balance between several variables. These variables, taken from group dynamics theory, include group formation, cohesion, groupthink, group processes/performance, conflict and power.

Fielder (1967) defined groups as a set of individuals who share common fate-individuals who are interdependent in the sense that an event which affects one member is likely to affect all. Individuals often form groups, or are organized into groups, if a situation arises that cannot be changed and/or addressed by on person acting alone (Zander, 1985). Large complex organizations coordinate much of the work of several people by utilizing groups; whose members are expected to participate, work well with others, present ideas clearly and effectively as well as disseminate information appropriately (Ellis & Fisher, 1994). One of the main

purposes of a group is to collaborate and be useful to members and/or nonmembers (Zander, 1985). Change, being a key characteristic of groups, is ever present as group members are constantly being changed by both internal and external stimuli that can change the group's needs, goals and purpose (Ellis & Fisher, 1994). However, despite any changes that may ensue, the group's purpose remains a public promise among the individuals that they will give an earnest attempt to reach the prescribed goal through collaborative activity (Zander, 1985).

The extent to which members of a group identify with and work toward a common goal is one measure of group cohesiveness (Berent, 2004). Libo (1953) indicates that cohesiveness denotes the group's attractiveness for its members, thus resulting in the forces acting on members to remain connected to the group. While group cohesion can aid in group goal attainment, a negative consequence of a highly cohesive group is that members no longer attracted to the group may be influenced to remain in the group and/or perform certain behaviors due to the excessive forces pressed upon these individuals. When these pressures become overpowering, groupthink occurs (Forstyh, 1983).

Janis (1973) defines groupthink as a mode of thinking among group members whose desire for unanimity dominates their motivation to appraise the consequences of their actions. Resulting from high conformity pressures (Forsyth, 1983), groupthink can be enacted in groups inadvertently. A leader unintentionally applying constraints that prevent members from fully exercising critical thinking and/or openly expressing doubts about a course of action can result in group think (Janis, 1973). When considering collaborative goal attainment, it is helpful to consider whether or not groupthink was a dynamic present amongst group members as it aids in determining if collaboration was the result of one prevalent force that permeated the group, or the result of an integrated/shared group process.

Group processes are the crux of group performance and productivity. Group processes include all productive and non-productive actions taken by the group in response to task demands (Shaw, 1976). Along with group processes, task demands (the requirements imposed on the group by the task itself) and resources (all task relevant abilities, knowledge, skills and/or tools maintained by group members) are noted as being equally important in impacting group productivity (Shaw, 1976). The holistic approach to group dynamics stresses the importance of communication and unified action as playing a critical role in groups being able to formulate, work toward and achieve goals (Forsyth, 1983). Additional characteristics that improve group performance include, having group goals, group problem solving and brainstorming (Forsyth, 1983). Nonetheless, no matter how well a group may perform, the probability that the group will encounter conflict is high.

Brewer (2007) noted that individuals often value, favor and conform to their own membership group over other groups to which they do not belong. This preference to a group creates an in-group (the group to which one belongs) and out-group (everyone else), which ultimately leads to bias between the two groups. Intergroup bias can take a range of shapes from prejudice to stereotyping (Hewstone, Rubin, & Willis, 2002). Bias turns into conflict when the competition over scarce resources or competing goals takes precedence above overall goal attainment (Brewer, 2007). Conflict can also result from a show of dominance within the group by one or more members (Foresyth, 1983). This dominance can also be equated with power.

The amount of power one possesses can determine the degree of security s/he feels when interacting within a group (Zander, Cohen, & Stotland, 1959). Defined in terms of one's ability to influence, power is noted as the ability for a person, group, part of a group, norm or role to exert influence over a person or group of persons (French & Raven, 1959). Power, influence and

authority are present in any social interaction, regardless of how large or small the social entity (Cartwright, 1959). Given this, power is an important component of group dynamics that will aid in understanding the manner by which collaboration occurs. By utilizing group dynamics to examine interactions between different university units, one may be able to better understand how these units are able to traverse any dividing barriers to achieve a common goal.

Organization of the Remainder of the Study

Literature relevant to providing a more in depth review of collaboration in higher education, group dynamics theory and loose coupling will be presented in Chapter 2. Chapter 3 will detail the qualitative case study methodology used to investigate the research question. This chapter will also discuss the procedures for data collection, data analysis and strategies utilized to ensure the validity of the study. Chapter 4 will present the study's findings and Chapter 5 will present a discussion of the study's conclusions, implications for practice and recommendations for future research.

CHAPTER 2: REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The Great Recession of 2008 left in its wake a multitude of concerns that higher education institutions are still grappling with today. During the economic collapse, state appropriations were severely reduced, resulting in the largest decline in state revenues to date (Oliff, Palacios, Johnson, & Leachman, 2013). University endowments fell anywhere between 25-30% (Bienen & Boren, 2010) which forced institutions to cut spending and/or raise tuition to cover the financial gap (Oliff et al., 2013). The United States slipped from 1st place in the world for undergraduate degree attainment to now ranking 12th (The White House, 2015). To compound the matter, questions regarding higher education affordability, access and accountability reached a feverish pitch as the economic crisis encouraged families and public officials to elevate their once silent concerns to anxieties that are frequently vocalized (Hamill, 2010).

The public scrutiny of higher education primarily centers on the concern that rising tuition costs have outpaced the average family income at a rate that exceeds price inflation (Heller, 2009). Many Americans indicate that higher education institutions could spend much less while maintaining high quality in the education provided. Additionally, obtaining a post-secondary education is still viewed as necessary despite the fact that it is thought to be unattainable for most (National Center for Public Policy and Higher Education, 2009) and out of touch with career specific vocational training (Bienen & Boren, 2010). In response to public concerns, commitments have been made to increase transparency and accountability within higher education. These commitments have resulted in the implementation of a number of accountability measures, such as the college scorecard aimed at providing the public information on college cost, value and quality (The White House, 2015). This leaves many institutions caught

within the “iron triangle” of controlling increasing cost, providing access to the growing demographic of students and maintaining and/or improving educational quality (Immerwahr, Johnson & Gasbarra, 2008, p. 3) while also seeking ways to make college more accessible, affordable and attainable (The White House, 2015). One response to the external and internal pressures facing higher education institutions today has been to take a more collaborative approach in its many operations. This literature review will provide insight into intra-organizational collaboration and its implications for higher education institutions. Next, components of group dynamics theory, to include group formation, cohesion, groupthink, group processes/performance, conflict and power, will be discussed. Lastly, a brief summary of group collaboration within a loosely coupled environment will be provided.

Collaboration in Higher Education

Higher education institutions are complex systems with various internal constituencies that are interdependent and must interact with one another. The viability of institutions to meet the needs of their various constituents relies heavily on how these interactions take place (Ruben, 1995). In the past two decades there has been increased acknowledgement among higher education leaders regarding the necessity of collaboration to fulfill the institutional mission and maintain institutional effectiveness (Kezar & Lester, 2009). More specifically, pressure for administrators to collaborate reached an all-time high after the Great Recession, with the focus of this pressure being on maintaining efficiency throughout the university (Sabo, 2010). External constituents, to include accreditation agencies, foundations, business, industry and government agencies (Kezar & Lester, 2009), are forcing higher education institutions to engage in collaborative efforts as they are now deemed a necessity due to the competitive environment that currently exists (Coleman & Bandyopadhyay, 2011). The United States Department of Education

(2006) indicates that collaboration in higher education can increase access, lower costs and improve performance. Collaboration is also noted as being vital to knowledge creation, research, student learning and improved organizational functioning (Kezar & Lester, 2009). Collaborative approaches are noted to frequently yield more informed decisions than what might come from an individual approach (Coleman & Bandyopadhyay, 2011). Sabo (2010) highlights that collaboration allows for the creation of a system where administrators can learn from each other and share information that may aid in the reduction of analogous mistakes. While one can reasonably assume that individuals on a college campus have, at one time or another, found themselves at some level(s) of working together, this does not necessarily constitute intra-organizational collaborative effort.

Collaboration consists of an interactive and collective approach to working relationships that require joint planning, joint rules, power sharing, norms and structures that yield a reliance on each other to achieve joint goals (Kezar & Lester, 2009). It is assumed that collaboration happens more readily within intra-organizational relationships than within inter-organizational relationships (Mena, Humphries, & Wilding, 2009). However, in a study to examine the intra-organizational collaboration between academic and student divisions at Big University, Chinn (2013) found that the development of an effective threat assessment system did not result in authentic collaboration between the two divisions. Though the two divisions were able to work cooperatively on the initiative, authentic collaboration was not achieved because they did not share in the decision making and accountability for the final product (Chinn, 2013). Mena, Humphries and Wilding (2009) found that belonging to the same organization and having common ownership within said organization does not result in close collaboration.

Collaboration is not a prevalent practice in the academy (Kezar & Lester, 2009). The process of collaboration in higher education is noted as being disorganized, not clearly defined, difficult to manage and often the result of unplanned events or actions. Additionally, the collaborative process is cited as often being slow enough to result in collaborative inertia (Diamond & Rush, 2012). One of the main struggles to collaboration in higher education is the manner by which institutions are organized. Being organized in departmental silos and bureaucratic or hierarchical administrative structures impedes collaboration because it limits the flow of communication across the organization; communication is instead funneled up the chain of command (Kezar & Lester, 2009). Ruben (1995) identified that silos operate as vertical structures that facilitate the interactions within a unit while simultaneously creating barriers to interactions and/or cooperation between units. Conversely, Diamond and Rush (2012) found that intra-organizational collaboration is not a linear process but rather multi-layered and multi-faceted with unclear starting and finishing points. However, higher education has traditionally been organized in a cross-functional manner where units operate in relative isolation to one another. The result is that individuals and/or units detach from the overall institutional mission, work processes fragment and compartmentalization evolves (Ruben, 1995). Diamond and Rush (2012) indicate that tensions are present in the willingness of individuals within a hierarchically structured organization to promote cross-departmental collaboration. This tension is specifically great when the collaboration is initiated from the top down (Diamond & Rush, 2012). In a study conducted by Chu (1995) it was found that fragmentation occurs when the perceived needs and/or inequities of one unit are not regarded as significant by another element. This erodes institutional collaboration due to the lack of support and reciprocity one loosely coupled institutional unit may receive from and/or provide to another loosely coupled institutional unit. In

some occurrences, the relationships between these units become adversarial as units perceive themselves in competition with each other for students, faculty, operating funds, physical facilities, visibility and institutional prestige (Ruben, 1995). In a study investigating intra-organizational collaboration, links were found between the lack of agreed understandings, beliefs, values of those involved and the quality of collaboration. Intra organizational collaboration was viewed as being risky and/or challenging to the prevailing organizational culture (Diamond & Rush, 2012). Florczak and Buenting (2012) have also identified that the existing label of 'professional' as being a possible barrier to collaboration.

Research outlined that professionals are those who have mastered knowledge related to their particular practice and/or field of expertise. This usually implies that professionals exists in silos and have boundaries, which are staunchly protected, that stipulate who can exist within said silos of their professional expertise (Florczak & Bunting, 2012). Fragmenting the campus by specialties introduced the development of goals and values that were discipline specific and viewed as more significant than the overall mission and goals of the institution (Kezar & Lester, 2009). As specialization proliferated, so did the development of specific cultures that differed drastically between academic departments. These differences created tensions between departments and weakened cross disciplinary collaboration (Kezar & Lester, 2009). The frame of reference that each professional has can differ greatly between professional groups and has the potential to create boundaries between the collaboration of these professional groups (Florczak & Bunting, 2012). Becher and Trowler (2001) indicated that the manner by which particular groups of academics organize their professional lives are related in important ways to the intellectual tasks on which they are engaged. This can lend coherence and permanence to academics' social practices, values and attitudes across time and place (Becher & Trowler, 2001). Though the

barriers to collaboration are great, the logic supporting the necessity of collaboration is greater. However, the question remains as to how to make this work, as well as how to limit the many failed attempts at campus collaboration (Kezar & Lester, 2009).

More integrated institutions that facilitate cross-functional and/or cross-divisional collaboration, coordination and teamwork are best for improving the alignment of individual units with the institutional mission and improving overall quality (Ruben 1995). Kezar and Lester (2009) indicate that a collaborative university embodies collaboration within its mission, employs a participatory style of leadership and rethinks traditional disciplinary boundaries and structures. However, in the traditional loosely coupled university, collaboration is said to go largely unnoticed until needs are no longer being met (Chu, 1995). The failure to instill a culture of collaboration is thought to stem from the fact that institutions are attempting to force collaboration into a culture that promotes individual work (Kezar & Lester, 2009). Individuals within these environments can become jaded by continual failed collaborative initiatives and believe it impossible to transcend the individualized approach to work on their campus (Kezar & Lester, 2009). Because the success of collaboration largely depends on the actions and/or behavior(s) of the individuals that compose the institution and its many units, examination of how individuals working in groups interact with each other to meet institutional goals is important. Being the study of individuals interacting in small groups (Luft, 1970), group dynamics is a befitting theory to aid in understanding how loosely coupled university units collaborate to achieve institutional goals.

Group Dynamics

Group dynamics emerged as the primary means to study the active, energized and vibrant, evolution of groups (Forsyth, 1983). Rooted in a wide range of fields that have been

traditionally separate (Cartwright & Zander, 1960), group dynamics overlaps such disciplines as social psychology, sociology, and psychiatry (Luft, 1970). Groups have sometimes been mislabeled as a collection of individuals that stand separate from the group, or as an independent entity whose existence is detached from the individuals who compose it (Bonner, 1959). Instead, Bonner (1959) proposes that groups are a dynamic whole composed of interdependent individuals who are in a cooperative relationship and are moving toward an agreed upon collective goal.

Group Formation

The quotidian nature of groups and the unavoidability of belonging to one or more group make groups one of the most important factors of life (Johnson & Johnson, 1987). Individuals form groups for a variety of reasons, such as belongingness, social status and/or to accomplish something that one could not do alone (Bonner, 1959). Freud's (1922) theory of group psychology proposes that individuals form groups to satisfy a basic biological and psychological need that would otherwise remain unfulfilled. The formation of groups is often evident in family, business and educational settings (Johnson & Johnson, 1987). Farrell (2001) introduced the concept of collaborative circles for groups which highlights that groups usually consist of peers who share similar occupational goals and vision(s) that consists of a shared set of assumptions about their respective discipline and what constitutes good work. Individuals are also thought to form groups based on certain personal characteristics. For example, it is thought that interaction with competent individuals ensures future success while helpful people assist with problems and social people make interaction enjoyable (Forsyth, 1983). Forsyth (1983) indicates that forming groups with individuals who possess these characteristics ensures a rewarding group experience while minimizing any costs to the individual.

A majority of human problem solving, along with endeavors that were once considered individualist task, now happen in groups (Chizhik, Shelly, & Troyer, 2009). This highlights the prevalence of groups in almost every aspect of life, making membership to more than one group highly probable. However, the various memberships that an individual has to various groups may or may not relate to one another, which can result in tension. Though individuals in groups are often of equal status and equal resources, a matchmaker can sometimes bring individuals from various silos to a common place for a common goal (Farrell, 2001). This bringing together of individuals from various groups to form new groups can result in tension as two or more groups could place divergent expectations on the individual that may result in conformity pressure and/or temporary membership in less permanent groups (Jenkins, 1961). An overlapping member construct where individuals are required to maintain active participation in more than one group often results in the individual selecting allegiance to the dominate group over secondary or temporary group(s) (Jenkins, 1961). The goal oriented nature of groups, prevalence of groups and the tendency of individuals to belong to more than one group makes group dynamics the ideal theory to investigate the manner by which institutional units work together to achieve a common goal.

Group Cohesion

A cohesive group is characterized as one in which members all work together for the common goal (Cartwright & Zander, 1960). Group cohesiveness can impact group productivity as cohesive groups will be more productive than non-cohesive groups (Forsyth, 1983). Barbieri (2012) found that group cohesion is significant to goal setting and goal acceptance among group members. The cohesiveness of a group is also synonymous with group morale as the more cohesive a group the better members feel about the group (Blake & Mouton, 1961). Utilizing

group-focused individual goal setting methods were more apt to elevate intrinsic motivation, feelings of success, confidence and accomplishment (Barbieri, 2012). Group cohesion also makes the group more resilient in overcoming stimuli that have the potential to impede goal directed action (Schachter, Ellertson, McBride, & Gregory, 1968). Members of highly cohesive groups are noted to be more energetic in group activities, are concerned about the success or failure of the group and work hard to achieve group goals (Shaw, 1976). In a study to examine the roles of group goals and group efficacy, Whitney (1994) found that high efficacy groups are more committed to difficult goals. Additionally, committed and cohesive groups outperformed less committed and cohesive groups (Whitney, 1994). Group cohesion has the potential to unite all group members under a common effort and reduce any individualistic motives and desires. This stabilizes productivity levels among group members and makes goal attainment more probable (Forsyth, 1983). However, eradicating the individual in favor of a highly cohesive group can have an adverse effect via the fostering of groupthink.

Groupthink

In a group, every sentiment and act is contagious to the degree that individuals will sacrifice personal interest to the collective interest, even if the collective interest is contrary to his own nature (Freud, 1922). The sacrificing of ones' beliefs for the contagious ideals of a group is the basis of groupthink. Janis (1973) first coined the phrase after reflecting on the Bay of Pigs incident during the administration of President John F. Kennedy. Surprised by the extent to which cohesive groups of decision makers would adhere to group norms and pressures for uniformity, Janis realized that a concurrence seeking tendency is what drove even the most intellectual and shrewdest of men to override their motivation to appraise the consequence of their actions (Janis, 1973). Groupthink is the result of an irrational emphasis on maintaining

unity and cohesiveness (Forsyth, 1983). Groupthink is more likely to occur when membership in the group is valued and the issue being discussed is complex (Woodruff, 1991). Decisions made via groupthink are noted as being ill considered, impractical and unrealistic (Forsyth, 1983).

Janis (1973) identified eight symptoms that are present in cases of groupthink: a shared illusion of invulnerability amongst members; collective rationalizing to discredit warnings; an unquestioned belief in group's inherent morality; stereotyped views of rivals as evil, weak and/or stupid; direct pressure against any member who expresses arguments against group stereotypes; member self-censorship to achieve concurrence that weakens critical thinking practices; a shared illusion of unanimity and the emergence of self-appointed mindguards (members who protect the group from adverse information). Loyalty to the group requires members to avoid raising controversial issues, questioning weak arguments or preventing "soft headed thinking". Members regard loyalty to the group the highest form of morality (Janis, 1973, p. 21).

While most studies into groupthink have been conducted outside of higher education, Klein and Stern (2009) utilized six of Janis' symptoms of groupthink to highlight the presence of groupthink in the academy. Though the academy is slightly different from the settings utilized to study groupthink, many of the same tendencies and failing of groupthink are present in the academy as well. Academics view those within their respective academic tribe as loyal, whereas those outside the tribe are viewed as lacking knowledge and credibility (illusion of invulnerability). Belonging to an academic profession is infused with dedication to scholarship, learning, science, etc. and becomes part of one's identity. Heightened uniformity makes group overconfident and ideas are taken to extremes (belief in inherent morality). Academic professions develop elaborate scholastic philosophies to justify omission of challenging ideas (collective rationalizations). Academics categorize critics under various labels such as

conservatives, the Left or Right (sterotypes of out-groups). Norms and consensus make it impolite to alienate colleagues so criticism is muted (self-censorship). The dissenter is exiled from the group. Sensitivity to tension leads to the creation of tighter vetting practices, expulsion of members, increased uniformity and intellectual deterioration (direct pressure) (Klein & Stern, 2009).

Groupthink is noted as being easy to control or even eliminate when one is aware of what to look for. Woodruff (1991) proposes a seven step solution that leaders can utilize to combat groupthink. Leaders are encouraged to reward critical thinking, not mistake silence for consent, divide large group into smaller groups to critique ideas, refrain from stating opinions too early, give individuals time to think about major proposals, seek greater exposure for ideas by seeking the counsel of an expert and run a pilot program to test initiative (Woodruff, 1991). This solution to groupthink follows the primary thought that groupthink and/or excessive cohesion are detrimental to group's process and performance. However, a study conducted by Lena (1985) indicated that cohesion had a positive effect on the group as members who liked one another, had worked together previously and had more opportunity to establish themselves as a concurrent seeking in-group were more vigilant in the information gathering and evaluation stages of decision making. Additionally, impartial leaders of these groups were noted as being more conducive to the information sharing process as self-censoring was evident among groups who had partial leaders. Cohesiveness was found to not exacerbate the negative effects of groupthink (Lena, 1985). Choi and Kim (1999) found that concurrent seeking and defective decision making, key characteristics of groupthink, were not significantly associated with reported group performance. Additionally, some symptoms of groupthink, such as group identity, were positively and significantly related to group performance (Choi & Kim, 1999).

Group Processes and Performance

Forsyth (1983) indicated that groups are systems that receive inputs from the environment and processes the information received via internal communication to produce the appropriate outputs. It is this function of processing input to generate a product that makes the understanding of group process vital to understanding how groups work. Group process is defined as the emerging characteristics that form the identities of groups which can include the manner by which groups exchange information, communicate, and make decisions (Ephross & Vassil, 2005). A key fact that should be remembered is that every group will have its own process as the pattern of forces upon the group, interpersonal relationships, and group structure may differ for each group (Jenkins, 1961) thus affecting the processes for the group. However, the processes of a group are critical to determining the success of a group. Luft (1970) highlighted that when groups form to accomplish a particular task, what often happens is that members concern themselves with the content of the task and never think about the process of the task. One consequence of processes being ignored is that various problems can arise that have no direct relation to the content; for example, barriers in communication may arise despite language being clear. The participant-observer must learn to consider the process and content in a non- judgmental manner before the group is to proceed and/or succeed in its prescribed task (Luft, 1970).

An important and ongoing aspect of group process is contracting. Starting at group formation, contracting should serve as a working framework that outlines the expectations of group participants, group participants' expectations of the group and specific roles (Ephross & Vassil, 2005). Contracts can include references to behaviors, authority, power, participation and responsibilities that ensure group success (Ephross & Vassil, 2005). Burton (2000) found that an

absence of role designation paired with environmental conditions, such as time, brought unarticulated group norms and status to the surface. When a contract is used, it helps groups align member performance with previously agreed upon process expectations. For example in a study conducted by Jones and Lambertus (2014), it was found that group size, performance expectations and actual performance were significantly correlated. This resulted in an understanding that performance is not proportional to the number of people working within the group. Performance correlated instead to how group members connected their individual performance with the expectations previously outlined (Jones & Lambertus, 2014). In addition to group process, group environment should also be considered important to group success.

Group performance is heavily dependent on its task environment. The environment has an impact on the individual and can affect personality and behavior within the group (Collins & Guetzkow, 1964). Using the example of a teacher in the classroom, Lewin (1997) highlights that group atmosphere can affect productivity. Success is not only contingent upon a teacher's skill level, but also on the atmosphere created in the classroom. When the atmosphere was one of democracy, co-operation, innovative problem solving and spontaneous free movement of members the group was successful at its prescribed task (Lewin, 1997). Group leaders are urged to foster a climate that allows openness, risk taking and communication in an environment that feels safe (Coleman & Bavdyopadhyay, 2011). Group members need not focus solely on the given task, as this will result in nothing more than a collection of individuals who remain separated despite closeness of proximity, but instead should spend time developing interpersonal relationships as this is what generates group efficiency (Collins & Guetzkow, 1964). A key way to establish an environment that promotes productivity and the interpersonal connectedness is through communication (Collins & Guetzkow, 1964).

When considering group success on prescribed tasks, the communication structure is an important element to examine because it establishes order and provides the medium by which all future process will occur (Wheelan, 1994). Communication is the process by which one individual stimulates meaning, meaning that is the same or analogous, in the mind of another; thus effective communication is the process of sharing meaning (Verderber, 1982). Within a group, communication works to establish leadership, morale, problem-solving efficiency, cohesion, and group integration while serving as the vehicle for the discussion of goals, values, norms, beliefs and other group issues (Wheelan, 1994). The survival of the group is thought to heavily depend on adequate communication (Luft, 1960) and effective group performance relies on the maintenance of optimum patterns of communication (Bavelas, 1968). Burton (2000) found that communication channels were critical to accelerating the clarity of the shared vision, and setting the context by which knowledge exchange would happen among group members.

Group performance is also improved on various types of tasks if group members pay close attention to the content of group communication and how messages are perceived by other members in the group (Forsythe, 1983). A communicative relationship is developed between group members through continual interaction (Ellis & Fisher, 1994), and the continual communication between individuals in a group involves an ongoing process of defining relationships within the group (Napier & Gershenfeld, 1987). Ironically, a group's communication structure begins to develop during the early stages of group interaction in a climate that is marked by tension, anxiety and ambiguity. Members tend to be overly polite and conventional in their communication to ward off any potential group rejection (Wheelan, 1994). Difficulties in communication may result from threats, real or imagined, felt by members (Luft, 1960). Many of the communication fallacies that occur revolve around the notions that all group

problems stem from breakdowns in communication, that more communication is better, that communicating to others in the group is easy, or that the onus of group communication is on one person (Ellis & Fisher, 1994). Another barrier to effective group communication is the prevalence of false assumptions. False assumptions can range from assuming that one member derives the same meaning as another member (Napier & Gershenfeld, 1987), to assumptions held by members about each other, and the ensuing actions and/or judgments that stem from stereotypes (Wilder & Simon, 1998). Successful collaboration among loosely coupled institutional groups must incorporate a common understanding from all constituents as to the purpose and importance of the collaboration (Chu, 1995). The content that is being collaborated on and the procedure for which this collaboration will happen must be communicated completely and disseminated frequently. One specific component that should be communicated to all group members at the onset of group formation are group goals.

Goals are present within groups in two ways: group goals and individual goals. What constitutes a group goal is its position as a future state of being desired by enough group members to drive the group forward in achievement of the goal (Johnson & Johnson, 1987). Groups without clearly defined goals are thought to be "afloat without a rudder" (Jenkins, 1961, p. 5). Forsyth (1983) noted that group effectiveness is dependent upon clear and unambiguous goals. Group goals serve as group directives, as the agent that coordinates group member efforts. More importantly, group goals are the motivation for the behavior of the group. Without goals, group members may not be motivated to take action (Johnson & Johnson, 1987). While this is the prevailing thought about group goals, Schlackman (2002) found that goal orientation measures were not significant predictors of individual behavior, group productivity or individual achievement. Nevertheless, group goals are common place within group processes.

Individual goals are also often present within group processes. Individual goals that are homogeneous with regard to members agreeing on group goals are noted as aiding in group productivity (Johnson & Johnson, 1987). Effective group relations promote that the group can serve as a resource to individuals to develop personal initiatives, feel independent in their delegated responsibility and realize their unique contribution to the group (Bradford & Lippitt, 1961). However, individual goals that are heterogeneous to group goals interfere with group functioning (Johnson & Johnson, 1987). In a case study of individuals within a small business, Robinson (2002) noted that despite an articulated need to function like a team to meet company goals, participants continued previous group behaviors that diverged from team-oriented behaviors. In addition, members were reluctant to adopt new behavior patterns and persisted in presenting identities that were rooted in their individual sub-group memberships (Robinson, 2002). This study highlights the notion that despite acceptance of a group goal, group members may maintain individual goals and/or identities that run contrary to the agreed group process for goal attainment. If individual goals dominate group goals, the result is a group that lacks unity or solidarity (Forsyth, 1983). Mierlo and Kleingeld (2010) found that individual goals can interfere with the cooperative process, performance and goal attainment of groups. More specifically, when compared with goal types of individual goal, group goal, individual and group goal and non-specific goal, groups with individual goals showed higher evidence of competition and lowest evidence of cooperation. Individual goals that are not made known to other group members can readily become hidden agendas.

The agreed upon goals and tasks are the public agenda (Bradford, 1961). Personal goals that are not unknown by all group members are hidden agendas (Johnson & Johnson, 1987). Hidden agendas are often present in every group (Johnson & Johnson, 1987) and can be

conscious or unconscious for an individual member or the group (Bradford, 1961). Hidden agendas often stand in stark contrast to group goals and are noted as decimating group performance (Johnson & Johnson, 1987). Once the performance of a group has diminished, group productivity, or lack there-of, can become a central point of debate.

Critics of groups, more specifically working together in groups, maintain that groups can be ineffective at meeting goals, solving problems, forging products or performing tasks (Forsyth, 1983). Groups are thought to be impulsive, unreliable, irritable and open to influence (Freud, 1922). Common anecdotes include the notion that a group of people keep minutes and waste hours; and that a collection of people who can accomplish nothing individually form a group that decides that nothing can be done (Ellis & Fisher, 1994). This inefficiency is stated to be due to the amounts of time wasted on idle discussion, or because the "unfit" were "appointed by the unwilling" to do the work necessary (Forsythe, 1983, p. 141). Meetings were seen as being detrimental to group work as members regard these as being expensive, boring and happening too frequently. Meetings were also regarded as an arena for participants to become embroiled in conflict (Forsyth, 1983).

Group Conflict

The social exchange theory of group dynamics highlights that individuals in groups are often uncertain about the rewards and costs that will stem from the activities of a group. This uncertainty can serve as fuel for tensions that may arise in groups (Forsyth, 1983). One source of tension is the feeling of being "thrown together with a bunch of strangers" and being required to divulge personal and/or professional views and values (Forsyth, 1983, p. 71). When members enter a group, tensions and anxiety are high because the situation is new and roles are not clearly defined. There is uncertainty as to whether the group will be safe, what the rules for procedures

will be and if the members will get along well with each other (Wheelan, 1994). Once this tension subsides and the exchange of information ensues, the discovery of disagreements that exists between participants can result in a slow-down of interaction, communication and group progress (Forsyth, 1983), which leads to conflict.

When group purpose is not effectively communicated to all parties, conflicts can arise and the overall effectiveness of the group is negatively impacted (Chu, 1995). The perceptions of conflict vary between constructive and destructive. The constructive view is that conflict is thought to be necessary to groups in order for a safe environment to be established via the development of trust (Wheelan, 1994). This trust is rooted in the fact that members are provided the opportunity to be honest about who they are/what they believe; and though this honesty might result in conflict, members are not abandoned or hurt for their differences (Wheelan, 1994). Conflict also promotes a deeper understanding of the issues being discussed, improves the quality of the decisions being made and increases the interest and motivation of the group (Ellis & Fisher, 1994). The destructive view of conflict is that it is often distasteful to group members which results in increases of anger, frustration and overall bad feelings about the group. Conflict is noted to have a direct impact on group cohesiveness, which leads to the destruction of the group, because members will seek other alternatives since membership in the group is no longer viewed as rewarding (Ellis & Fisher, 1994).

Group conflicts can begin with disagreements over an interpretation of or inferences of a fact and/or over a definition. Conflict also arises over a choice among goals, actions or means of achieving goals (Verderber, 1982). Forsyth (1983) proposes the six step stage of conflict in groups: interaction, disagreements, confrontation, escalation, de-escalation, resolution. A group's routine interaction moves toward the identification of disagreements and leads to confrontation

on these differences. Conflicts are thought to build and become more difficult to resolve as competing value systems become integrated into the issue(s) (Verderber, 1982). So rather than moving from confrontation to conflict resolution, many groups move instead to an escalation phase where the group becomes entangled in a conflict spiral marred with misunderstandings, distrust, frustration, hostility and reciprocity.

Misunderstandings and distrust are noted to escalate conflict in groups when the behaviors and/or motives of a group member is misunderstood by other group members, and also when group members fail to trust each other to make choices that will benefit all group members (as opposed to only themselves). Frustration and hostility stem from group members inability to achieve specific desired goals due to environmental restraint or personal limitations. This frustration can quickly turn into aggressive interaction with other members which boils over into hostility. Hostility only serves to escalate the group conflict as hostile members can be belligerent, argumentative or display verbal violence (Forsyth, 1983). Reciprocity, when positive, results in members coming to the aid of each other with the understanding that assistance will be returned. However, negative reciprocity serves to escalate conflict because members who feel harmed, overly criticized or victimized by another group member(s) will feel justified in counterattacking (Forsyth, 1983). A different perception of conflict escalation was presented by Robinson (2002) who found that rather than group members engaging in aggressive acts of conflict, group members would utilize various tactics to avoid conflict. When the group faced difficult situations and/or delicate issues, members would resort to smoothing over, rescue tactics and efficiency moves to avoid overt conflict, cover up disagreements and maintain control of the agenda (Robinson, 2002). Groups that decidedly avoid conflict allow it to produce

negative consequences and impede group effectiveness while effective groups know how to manage conflict (Amson, Thompson, Hochwarter, & Harrison, 1995).

If groups can withstand the disagreement, confrontation and escalation stages of the conflict resolution cycle, they then move onto the conflict reduction process which begins with the de-escalation stage. During this stage, group members may still be highly committed to their individual viewpoints, however, members also recognize that copious amounts of time and energy are being wasted in the continual debate. Decreases in anxiety produce increases in rationality (Forsyth, 1983). This is also called the cooling off stage as negotiations begin and trust is rebuilt from the communication of intentions and consistency in action (Forsyth, 1983). At a certain point, all group conflict reaches the sixth and final stage of resolution. It is important to note that the resolution stage does not imply that all group members are satisfied with the outcome; however, all group members recognize that goals cannot be attained if the conflict persists. Resolution can come from members withdrawing their demands, group leadership mandating a decision be made, members reaching a mutual compromise or dissolution of the group (Forsyth, 1983). If groups are unable to reach the resolution stage by their own accord, a third party intervention may be required.

In some group conflicts, a third party is required to clarify the source of conflict. It is important to note that while the third party can be external to the group, they can also be group members who are uninvolved in the conflict escalation. Studies show that the effectiveness of utilizing a third party to aid in conflict resolution is rooted in its ability to assist opposing group members make conciliations without any embarrassment (Forsyth, 1983). However, it is also noted that traditional third party techniques of mediation, arbitration and counseling are only effectual when conflict intensity is low; when conflict levels are high these techniques are seen

as ineffectual. Group leaders must also be cautions in introducing a third party into an ensuing conflict as group members may view this intervention as an unwelcomed intrusion and prefer to resolve matters on their own solidarity (Forsyth, 1983).

Conflict can happen intra or inter group. Intragroup conflict, conflict between members of a group, is noted to exist when the actions and/or beliefs of one or more group members differs with, and are resisted by, one or more other group members (Forsyth, 1983). Though the varying vantage points inherent with group participation can provide several options for group problem solving and solution selection (Blanchard, 2013), intragroup conflict is more often noted as being detrimental to group success. Intragroup conflict incorporates relationship conflict, cognitive conflict and process conflict (Granad, 2003). Intragroup conflict exists when there are interpersonal incompatibilities among group members. These can include tension, animosity and annoyance among members within the group (Jehn, 1995). Granad (2003) found that as relationship conflict increases, overall job satisfaction decreased. In a study by Jehn (1995), relationship conflict was identified as detrimental to group performance regardless of the nature of the task. Relationship conflict caused distress, encouraged withdrawal and impacted the group's ability to survive (Jehn, 1995). This supports the notion that intragroup conflict can have a negative effect on group performance. However, to understand intragroup conflict, it is critical to take into consideration the complexities that involve the values of relationships among individuals, subgroups and member perceptions of the situation (Chizhik, Shelly, & Troyer, 2009).

Almost, Doram, Hall and Spence Laschinger (2010) found that conflict is a complex process affected by dispositional, contextual and interpersonal factors. Though relationship conflict can elicit uncomfortable feelings and dejection among group members, which can inhibit

work satisfaction (Jehn, 1995), groups are urged to actively manage the intrapersonal conflict. Understanding the various social and psychological forces that affect a group can aid in group success (Jenkins, 1961). In a study investigating intragroup conflict among nurses, managing intrapersonal conflict did not mitigate the negative effects of conflict; however it did help group members experience greater job satisfaction (Almost et al., 2010). It is this management of the opposing intrapersonal tensions that propels groups forward in achieving their prescribed task (Chizhik et al., 2010).

When considering intergroup conflict, the conflict that may arise between groups, it is important to note that the catalyst to this tension is as drastically different as are the resolutions. Intergroup conflict is noted to stem from competition-primarily the competition over limited resources (Forsyth, 1983). When conflicts arise, the variables that are more often at the core of the conflict are competitive and cooperative attitudes (Verderber, 1982). The realistic group conflict theory proposes that if members of one group acquire a scarce commodity, the members of another group will go without this commodity; this have not group will devise ways to attain the desired resource while preventing the have group from reaching its goal (Forsyth, 1983). Deutsch (1960) describes it as contriently interdependent goals; when the goals for each of the individuals and/or subunits in a group are defined in such a way that the attainment of their independent goal will to some degree restrict the other individual and/or subunits from their goal attainment. It is common for individuals within groups to be cooperatively interrelated to the overarching goals of the group but competitively interrelated to those goals that directly benefit themselves and/or the unit to which they belong (Deutsch, 1960). This competition between groups, or members of a group, can result in a situation where the focus is no longer on the performance of the group but rather on the performance of the individual members, or a

particular group, and their ability to be the best (Blake & Mouton, 1961). Studies show that in business oriented situations, groups became overly involved in determining which group was best and preoccupied with the notion of winning (Forsyth, 1983). Conflict between groups, even when rooted in objective situational factors, can create subjective biases that will further separate opposing factions of group members. This aided in maintaining the identity and boundary lines that separate groups because groups tend to emphasize their differences rather than their similarities (Forsyth, 1983). Studies into group cooperation and competition found that group cooperation resulted in more coordination of efforts, diversity in the amount of contributions per member, mutual comprehension and communication, orientation and orderliness, greater quality of product and discussions and an overall favorable evaluation of the group (Deutsch, 1960). This gives credence to the notion that groups are more productive when members exhibit more cooperation, rather than competition, in their interrelationships (Deutsch, 1960). Group leaders are encouraged to create a cooperative atmosphere by recognizing competitive behaviors and addressing them promptly. Additionally, utilizing harmonizing statements promote cooperation by aiding members in recognizing their competitive behaviors (Verderber, 1982). One tactic to change intergroup conflict into intergroup collaboration is to engage the groups in a cooperative endeavor that reduces the previously established group boundaries (Worchel, Ferris, Samaha, Axsom, & Schweizer, 1978). An example of this would be the introduction of superordinate goals.

Superordinate goals are defined as goals that could only be attained if the groups involved work together as a team (Shaw, 1976). When faced with superordinate goals, group members are forced to forget previous disagreements and dividing lines to combine efforts with the aim of solving the more critical issue they now faced. The goal becomes an inducing agent

that can influence group members to engage in goal directed activities (Shaw, 1976). This requires cooperation between groups and is often a tactic used to unite opposing groups; however, research shows that once the common goal is achieved, groups are prone to return to their respective opposing positions (Forsyth, 1983). In the absence of a subordinate goal to induce cooperation and/or maintain cooperative action, one could reasonably question whether or not consistent group cooperation and/or collaboration is achievable. Studies indicate that previous intergroup competition, delineations and failures can make it difficult to eliminate former group identities during intergroup cooperation (Worchel et al., 1978). Cooperative efforts resulted in failure when opposing groups are unable to erase the history of competition (Worchel et al., 1978). In addition to conflict, power is a component of group dynamics that may aid in understanding how groups work together to accomplish common goals.

Power

Few interactions proceed far before elements of power and influence become evident (Forsyth, 1983). Nonetheless, it is often easier to talk about money or sex than it is to talk about power because of its negative stigma (Pfeffer, 1992). This prevalent ambivalence toward power is rooted in the thought that power can be acquired and utilized for malevolent means and that power ensures individual success (Pfeffer, 1992). Cartwright (1959) highlights that more often than not power is narrowly defined and should not be equated with Machiavellian interest or brute force. Power and authority are central concepts of institutions (Cartwright, 1959) and should not be diminished to merely an exercise in formal authority (Pfeffer, 1992). Though power is ambiguous with its meaning having a different connotation for a variety of people, it is most often associated with a process of behavioral or psychological change via social influence (Forsyth, 1983). Cartwright (1959) defines power both in terms of acts and forces: the ability of a

person to exert power with respect to the acts performed over a specific time, and the ability of a person to exert power with respect to the force applied over a specific time. French and Raven (1959) also proposed a two part definition of power: the ability to exert influence over a person and the person's resistance to the exerted influence. Power is the result of these two forces French and Raven's (1959) analysis of power within groups elevated the discussion of power beyond the task of prescribing a definition to the necessity of distinguishing between the different bases of power.

The relationship between the influencer and the person being influenced is composed of several variables that serve as the bases of power. The five identified bases of power are reward power, coercive power, legitimate power, referent power and expert power (French & Raven, 1959). Reward power is rooted in the influencer's ability to reward the person being influenced while coercive power comes from the influencer's ability to threaten and/or punish others if they fail to conform. Legitimate power stems from the influencer's legitimate right to exert influence and the person being influenced has an obligation to accept this influence. French and Raven (1959) indicated that the relationship between a parent and a child is an example of legitimate power. Referent power derives from a person's identification with, attraction to and respect for the influencer, and expert power exists when the person being influenced believes that the influencer possesses superior skills, abilities and/or knowledge (French & Raven, 1959). Once the realization that power is present in group life and an understanding of the many sources of power has been obtained, it is then appropriate to investigate power strategies and the power processes evident during group interaction (Forsyth, 1983).

Forsyth (1983) highlights that though the power an individual has is primarily obtained from the five power bases, in a group more specific means of social influence may become

evident. This social influence is described in terms of "how I get my way" (Falbo, 1977, p. 537). In a study investigating how individuals utilize power strategies to get their way in a group setting, Falbo (1977) found that 90% of subjects indicated utilizing at least one power tactic. The power strategies utilized varied greatly, as did the characteristics of subjects who utilized power strategies. These power tactics included activities that ranged from bargaining and compromise to deceit and threat. Subjects who indicated a higher need for approval were more likely to utilize strategies such as hinting and bargaining as their need for social approval resulted in choosing less direct and disruptive strategies. Conversely, subjects who indicated a lower need for social approval utilized strategies like threat and fait accompli. Strategies more likely to elicit social disapproval, like evasion and deceit were utilized by subjects who could withstand group pressure (Falbo, 1977). In addition to studies examining how members of a group use power to get their way, there is also literature that outlines how leaders use power.

According to the social exchange theory, which provides insight into the reciprocal influence process of leadership, a leader must establish power in incremental transactions that go beyond the bases of authority and formal incentive systems to obtain the commitment from the group that s/he is leading (Yukl, 1981). The extent to which a given amount of power is adequate depends largely on the leader's strategy for applying power; less power is needed by leaders that concentrate on the essential objectives and have the skills to use power effectively (Yukl, 1981). Failing to understand the dynamics of a situation may result in a misuse of power and influence, or using power when it is not necessary to do so (Pfeffer, 1992). Yukl (1981) suggests ways that leaders can utilizing French and Raven's five bases of power to effectively build power.

Referent power is developed when leaders show consideration for the needs and feelings of their subordinates and referent power is developed over time by gaining the personal loyalty

of subordinates (Yukl, 1981). Expert power is built when the leader maintains credibility and is confidence and decisive. Reward power is developed when the leader offers an attractive reward, is a credible source of the reward and keep his/her word in awarding said reward. Though a leader is provided legitimate power due to his/her position as leader, Yukl (1981) suggests that to build upon this power, leaders make legitimate requests of subordinates in a polite, clear and confident tone. Leaders should avoid utilizing coercive power, except when absolutely necessary, because it is likely to build resentment and destroy any referent power and/or commitment that might exists.

In most groups, a leader is not the only person with power. It is believed that groups are often dominated by a few powerful individuals (Forsyth, 1983). When considering this within the context of higher education, the powerful individuals that comprise the group can sometimes originate from units that are interdependent to one another. This interdependence of individuals, and/or the units they represent, results in the frequent utilization of power; power is more evident under these conditions because interdependence creates a need to exercise influence (Pfeffer, 1982). Akin to this is the notion that power becomes important to getting things done in organizations as much of the work that must be accomplished in any position requires the cooperation of others that do not fall within our given hierarchal command (Pfeffer, 1982). However, it is important to note that power is not contingent on hierarchy or only awarded based on one's official position on a hierarchy structure (Richman & Farmer, 1974). In a study conducted by Buchko (2013), it was found that power obtained via negotiation plays a significant role in determining the hierarchy of individuals within an organization more so than the power bestowed via the organizational chart. More accurate indicators to diagnose power within an organization include various items such as departmental representation on important

interdepartmental teams/committees/task forces, the location of the department on campus, average size of offices for individuals within the department and salaries of those within the department (Pfeffer, 1982). Pfeffer (1982) noted that accomplishing tasks in organizations requires individuals to be able to diagnose the relative power of the various participants and the patterns of interdependence. In higher education, influence in the form of the ability to get something done without coercion or direct command is thought to be more important than formal authority or power (Richman & Farmer, 1974). This could be due to power being diffused and participation being fluid in higher education institutions. However, participation in power can be productive and effective if roles are clear and processes are effectively defined and articulated (Richman & Farmer, 1974).

The prevalence of power, the various bases of power and the many tactics and uses of power make it a force that groups must contend with when considering institutional goal attainment. However, it is power's reliance upon interdependence, and how this interdependence provides incentive for collaboration and the coordination of activities (Pfeffer, 1982), that makes power vital to illuminating how loosely coupled entities work together.

Loose Coupling

The notion of coupling, specifically loose coupling, came into prominence via the writings of organizational and social psychologist tasked with investigating reform and the problems of change in public schools during the 1970s (Hallett & Ventresca, 2006). Introduced as a description to challenge the common image of an organization, coupling directed analytical attention to inter-organizational relationships (Hallett & Ventresca, 2006), and encouraged the examination of both the interdependence and indeterminacy of interaction patterns between system units (Orton & Weick, 1990). One of the earliest attempts to delineate loose coupling in a

system can be dated back to the work of Glassman (1973) who, being driven by the desire to achieve a holistic view of living systems, utilized the concept of coupling as a means to describe groups, society and organizations. In these early observations, the degree of coupling and interaction between variables was said to be dependent upon the number of activities that the variables shared. The dependence or independence of said variables was thought to be the factor that determined the looseness or tightness of the coupling relationship (Glassman, 1973) Birnbaum (1988) believed loose or tight coupling between subsystems to be dependent upon the extent to which they share common organizational elements. Loose coupling is thought to be the result when common factors between two elements are weak in comparison to the factors that influence the entire system within which the elements reside (Birnbaum, 1988). Conversely, tight coupling is the result of an automatic control system with interconnected elements that quickly responds to input (Glassman, 1973). While on the surface, a tight coupling structure appears to be the most efficient, it may not be the best option for institutions of higher education, particularly amid competing priorities and limited resources (Chu, 1995).

Higher education institutions are noted as being assembled, reconfigured, edited and negotiated via the coupling process (Hallett & Ventresca, 2006). This process is described as being neither seamless, inevitable or determined by broader social judgments. Instead it is a process that guides administrators toward attending to several resources for assembly, recognition of activity, and remembrance of broader cultural myths which provide order and rules for action (Hallett & Ventresca, 2006). Some scholars maintain that it is this coupling process that has assisted institutions of higher education in its effectiveness. Given the size and complexity of most institutions, it becomes necessary to organize in a manner that allows for semi-autonomous decentralized components to act on information received (Weick, 1982b).

Though tighter coupled systems are more homogenous and can readily disseminate information, it is advised that in complex systems with many elements, like a university, not all elements become tightly coupled to each other (Birnbaum, 1988). Tighter coupling restricts the institution from maintaining an adequate level of sensitivity to the internal and external environment (Birnbaum, 1988), while loose coupling allows for greater sensitivity and flexibility to the environment. This flexibility is thought to aid institutions in their problem solving practices (Weick, 1982b); namely because it allows institutional units to explore all avenues and viable solutions to a problem while maintaining collegiality (Birnbaum, 1988). Institutional units have varying roles, including interacting with and satisfying both internal and external stakeholders, which can result in competing and contradicting demands (Newton, Ewing, & Collier, 2014). Loose coupling is noted to allow an institution to integrate several conflicting goals while awarding legitimacy and trust to each (Aurini, 2012). Loose coupling also provides a resolution to any contradictions in that it allows units to introduce alternatives without undermining the overall institutional directive (Newton et al., 2014). Weick (1982b) notes that a loosely coupled institution does not necessarily indicate that the institution is vulnerable due to the fact that individual units can remain loosely coupled to some units while maintaining tightly coupled to other units in an effort to adapt. Organizations are typically characterized by a functional interdependence in which, under normal circumstances, every unit within a system works for all other units (Morgan, 2006). This highlights the notion that a university and its many loosely coupled units can still work together to achieve institutional goals. However, this idealistic view is thought to be the exception rather than the norm as most organizations are not as functionally unified as organizational units are often capable of, and routinely practice, "living separate lives" (Morgan, 2006, p. 68).

Within an organization, it is essential for units to have and maintain common properties if they are to interact and have relationships. The criticality of these relationships is rooted in the fact that the state of each unit is controlled by, conditioned by or reliant on the state of other units (Weick, 1982b). The notion that organizations can work functionally unified is very popular; and although there are instances where high unification is observable via units working selflessly for the organization as a whole, more often than not what is readily apparent is conflict and cliques (Morgan, 2006). When considering loosely coupled institutions, the depiction is that of events that develop unevenly, discontinuously, sporadically, unpredictably or never develop at all (Weick, 1982b). These descriptions of loose coupling challenge the prevailing assumption that organizations function with intentional plans, clear means-ends goals, responsiveness and coordination (Hallett & Ventresca, 2006); a thought that may have instilled an unsavory attitude toward the loosely coupled organization.

Universities have been regarded as insufficient organizations that lack the structure necessary to operate in a goal oriented and efficient manner (Bleiklie, 2012). Goals appear unclear, changing, and in conflict as often times the actions in one institutional unit are only loosely linked to the action in another unit (March, 1982). The loosely coupled educational institution has been characterized by weak ties, ritualized activity and inconsistent responses (Hallett & Ventresca, 2006). Additional characteristics of the loosely coupled university includes decentralization, the relative lack of coordination, and conditions in which there are few regulations or formal procedures along with ignoring of the regulations and/or formal procedures that do exist (Horne, 1992). Aurini (2012) noted that loose coupling is viewed as a monumental practice that assumes all day to day institutional practices are disconnected from administrative

structures and policies. This is why effective management of the day to day practices within a loosely coupled institution is critical.

Because much of what higher education institutions produce is more elusive and less tangible, loosely coupled institutions are sometimes harder to manage (Weick, 1976). However, administrators are encouraged to utilize symbolism to incorporate meaning to actions and directives as well as centralizing the institution directives on values and principles (Weick, 1982a). The communication of values and feedback is critical and managers of loosely coupled systems are encouraged to spend time symbolically communicating the institutional vision and goals to constituents, aid in the development of means to incorporating the institutional vision and goals within the daily activities, and assist others in interpreting how the activities of all constituents are interconnected under one common language (Weick, 1982a). Effective management of a loosely coupled system should include research into the development of conceptual tools capable of preserving the system, clarification of the institutional units that are available for coupling, investigation into the coupling patterns that currently exist within the institution, analysis of the ration between the function and dysfunctions of loose coupling, and an evaluation of how constituents make sense of loosely coupled environments (Weick, 1976).

Managerial eloquence is also important in a loosely coupled system as this is the vehicle that managers should utilize to ensure effective communication and sharing of information about institutional goals and objectives (Weick, 1982a). The negative effects of loose coupling may be ameliorated though the engagement in discussions on institutional values (Chu, 1995). Managers in loosely coupled systems must also pay special attention to the ties that bind the system together and the issues on which constituents agree, as this is the borderline at which loosely coupled systems can quickly become systems of anarchy (Weick, 1982a). Responsiveness to

these particular factors also assists an administrator in identifying what elements hold the system together and provide direction (Weick, 1982a). To maintain socialization as a form of cohesion within a loosely coupled system, administrative managers must know the background of his/her constituents to anticipate when and where coalitions will form; and where necessary, these coalitions should be destabilized when it runs the risk of imposing contrary definitions to organizational allies, enemies, boundaries, situations and actions (Weick, 1982a). In addition, a lack of cohesion can result in constituents becoming uncertain captives of a silo to which the individual will make large accommodations that will ultimately undermine the educational goals of the institution (Weick, 1982a). Although unattained institutional goals may have gone unnoticed in previous years, today's higher education enterprise and it's loosely coupled nature is being heavily scrutinized; which has resulted in demands for a more conventional, top down, command oriented, tightly coupled management style of higher education over its loosely coupled counterpart (Meyer, 2002). For some, an understanding of loose coupling provided clarity into why universities continue to operate under familiar regimes despite increasing policy reforms and environmental pressures to change (Hallett & Ventresca, 2006); however, this understanding is no longer a sufficient justification for the glacial pace of change. Mack (2012) indicates that the manner by which an institution organizes administratively and academically should be reviewed. The loosely coupled bureaucratic organization is noted as being potentially ill prepared for the challenge of addressing the new imperatives of an "information-rich global environment" in which institutions are expected to confront change strategically and pro-actively, while also questioning whether a traditional top down leadership and management style is adequate in its responsiveness (Meyer, 2002, p. 518). At one time, there was available "slippage" in the loosely coupled management of an institution which allowed individuals,

colleges and departments, to go their own way in the interpretation of the institutional mission and the pursuit of self-interest. However, in this new, more demanding environment, that approach is deemed insufficient and will no longer work (Newman, Couturier, & Scurry, 2004 p. 202).

Very few studies have investigated how a university manages its many loosely coupled units in the achievement of institutional wide goals. However, the literature does afford a thorough understanding of collaboration, group dynamics and loose coupling that will serve as the base upon which examination into this phenomenon can ensue.

CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY

This chapter presents the manner by which the research question was further investigated, and will include information on the research design, case selection, participant selection, data collection, data analysis, validity, threats to validity and limitations. This study seeks to discern a deeper understanding of how university units in a loosely coupled environment work together to accomplish institutional goals and will hinge heavily on understanding the interactions between the various university units. Additionally, the study will discern if and/or how the complexities of these interactions led to the end results.

Yin (2012, p. 4) highlights that a desire to ascertain an in-depth understanding of a situation in the real world context with the aim of producing an "invaluable and deep understanding" is the primary motivation of case study research. The case study is also considered the research method of choice when the phenomenon being studied includes complex interactions and the inclusion of said complex interactions are vital to understanding the phenomenon (Yin, 2003). Given this, I will utilize a single case study method, which will provide me with in-depth knowledge of the topic as it relies on the participant accounts and perspectives (Patton, 2002).

Aligning the case study with theory is vital to case study research due to the fact that this paring aids in specifying what is being explored, relates the research design to relationships found in literature, and generalizes research results to other cases (Yin, 2003). Group dynamics theory, which is rooted in the observation and understanding of group behavior, will aid in strengthening the case study method, provide further insight into the group interaction among the various university units, and also provide a base for understanding the complexities of the interactions.

Research Design

An instrumental embedded single case study design is the best method that allows me to view this phenomenon in a real world scenario. The study qualifies as a single case design because one university serves as the single unit of analysis for this study. However, since the focal university comprises several loosely coupled units that are integral to the case, the units serve as sub-units of analysis. These sub-units are embedded within the overall study of the focal university. Data collected from the various sub-units inform the research question (Yin, 2003). This study is also an instrumental case study. Denzin and Lincoln (2003) highlight that in instrumental case studies, the case is the vehicle that facilitates the understanding of something more than the case itself. The case utilized for this study is a large state university's acquisition of a highly sought after education grant. While the primary aim of this study is to learn how loosely coupled institutional units work together to achieve institutional goals, the examination of a university's grant acquisition process allows me to observe collaboration in a loosely coupled environment where various units worked together to obtain a common goal. The grant acquisition process serves as the vehicle that enables me to view this particular phenomenon. However, while the case primarily serves in this capacity, I also utilized case particulars to enrich the data collected.

The case university, which will be called Palm State University (PSU), is a flagship research institution founded in the south during the 1700s. With a student enrollment of approximately 29,000, PSU is well known throughout the United States for its academic excellence, diverse student body and engaged alumni. Though there are several institutions in the State University System (SUS), PSU was one of the original institutions to form the SUS and is the oldest public institution in the state.

The grant-awarding organization is among the largest private foundations in the United States. For the purposes of this study, this organization will be called The Sebastian Education Foundation. A primary value of The Sebastian Education Foundation is that a quality education is the foundation for the self-sufficiency that prepares today's youth for success in college and life. To promote this founding principle, The Sebastian Education Foundation created a grant that would award several higher education institutions up to several million dollars to transform the way colleges and universities prepare students for success in the American economy by infusing entrepreneurship principles throughout the university. In an effort to achieve this transformation, The Sebastian Education Foundation required grant recipient institutions to make curriculum adjustments that liberated entrepreneurship training from the confines of the business school, placing the onus on several university departments instead of one. This caveat sometimes elicited controversial responses and divided reactions on a college campus; however, grant acquisition required the participation and collaboration of several academic and administrative units throughout the grant application process as plans for curriculum adjustment had to be outlined in detailed. These contextual conditions provide an opportunity to examine a loosely coupled research university's ability to work together for a common goal despite potential bias, barriers and/or conflict.

Case Selection

The case selected for this study assured a productive context for studying the given research question by meeting the following requirements:

1. Several loosely coupled university units working toward one common institutional goal. The acquisition of The Sebastian Education Foundation grant required the collaboration of several PSU academic and administrative units. Although

collaboration on a college campus is not uncommon, this case allows the researcher to analyze an instance where the goal could only be attained via collaboration. Additionally, the stakes were high as grant acquisition would yield a significant amount of funds for this institution; which may have impacted collaboration.

2. The grant application/acquisition process was time sensitive. The time limitation of the case provides the researcher an encapsulated environment in which to view this phenomenon; as opposed to an ongoing case initiative where the results of collaborative efforts may be difficult to discern as goals may be continuous. Additionally, the grant acquisition takes place in the past and all activities related to the grant application/acquisition process have concluded. Because the end result of the case is known, the focus of the study can remain on understanding the process that loosely coupled institutions employ to achieve institutional wide goals (instead of focusing on whether or not the goal was attained).
3. Information found on the case hints at difficulty during the grant application process. Initial investigation of PSU's acquisition of The Sebastian Education Foundation grant revealed that after several attempts, the PSU administrators and interdisciplinary committees were unable to rally support among academic units to draft a grant proposal, resulting in a stalled effort. Three weeks prior to the application submission deadline, PSU sought the aid of a third party, which for the purpose of this study will be called The Ibis Institute, to resuscitate the flailing efforts and produce a competitive proposal. This information suggests that some level(s) of barriers and/or conflict was present in this case and that various measures were required to bring goal attainment to fruition. Examining loosely coupled units

engaging in collaborative efforts in a university environment where discourse, barriers, conflict, etc. are present provides a richer context in which to examine how loosely coupled university units employ concerted action(s) to achieve institutional-wide goals.

4. The nature of the grant, as well as the size, classification, etc. of the institution, was of great interest when selecting this case. The Sebastian Education Foundation is noted as wanting to change how higher education institutions behaved with regard to the adoption of entrepreneurship as a cross-campus initiative that flourished throughout the university, affecting students and faculty to create an innovation infused environment. However, institutions of higher education have a proclivity toward being bureaucratic, tradition-bound, and averse to risk and free market engagement (Farrow & Kasarda, 2009). PSU is a large state university that takes pride in its history and traditions (that can be traced back more than two centuries), its national presence as a leading research university and its legacy of excellence as reflected by prestigious association memberships and top rankings. One can reasonably assume that an institution of this size and prestige that appears to have functioned optimally for centuries, as evident by its numerous awards and prestigious affiliations, will display some reluctance to change. Given this, the introduction of a grant that sought to change how the institution behaved could cause some friction among university constituents. The controversial nature of this grant and the historical prestige of the institution provides a certain uniqueness to this case that makes it a significant site for study.

Selection of Participants

To be selected as a participant in this study, individuals were required to have current or previous affiliation with Palm State University, The Ibis Institute and/or The Sebastian Education Foundation, as well as the grant acquisition process at PSU. Individuals who were directly involved in the decision, planning and implementation process of the grant acquisition were invited to participate. This includes individuals who served on special tasks forces, committees and/or departments as well as department representatives who were charged with the responsibility of securing the Sebastian grant.

Selecting individuals with this direct involvement aids me in obtaining first-hand accounts of the grant acquisition process. Additionally, participants include upper-level administrators whose involvement ranged from ad hoc committee membership to serving as committee chairperson. This aids me in obtaining several vantage points on the process as upper-level administrators' perspectives on the collaborative action necessary for grant acquisition may differ from the perspectives of a committee, task force and/or department representative. The maximum number of projected participants for this study was fifty. The first five individuals invited to participate in the study were identified via public documents and website information on the grant acquisition process.

These five individuals were selected based on their experience with the grant acquisition process and/or their position at PSU, the Sebastian Education Foundation or the Ibis Institute during the time of the grant acquisition process. These individuals include the past Executive Director of the Ibis Institute and PSU's previous President, both of whom were at the helm during the grant acquisition process. The five individuals also include a Trustee member, a previous Sebastian Education Foundation Fellow (who is now a Senior Associate Director at

PSU) and the previous Vice President for Campus Initiatives at The Sebastian Education Foundation (who is now the current Executive Assistant to the President for Entrepreneurship at PSU). Through continuous research, three additional individuals were identified and invited to participate. These individuals included the previous PSU Vice President of Research and two College of Business Associates. All additional participants were identified by utilizing a snowball sampling technique (Cohen & Arieli, 2011) where current participants provided me with the names of others who fit the participant criteria. Initial contact with individuals was made via e-mail in which I introduced myself, the study, and made the request for participation. The email also ensured individuals that participant and responses would remain anonymous in all publications and/or presentations of the data collected. Participants were assigned the identifiers of 'Participant A, Participant B', etc. in lieu of their actual names. The Director of the Ibis Institute was given the pseudonym Dr. Harry Smith. All responses, documents, artifacts, etc. collected were coded to ensure participant confidentiality and anonymity during and after the study. In addition, all data collected was stored on a locked device that requires fingerprint and password verification to further protect participant identity. Following the e-mail invitation, individuals were also contacted by phone if a response to the initial invitation was not received within five business days. Phone calls were utilized as a means for me to personally speak with individuals about the study, invite individuals to participate, and answer any questions that they might have about their participation in the study.

Not all participants readily responded to the initial e-mail invitation. To follow up, I employed a bi-weekly contacting schedule where individuals were contacted via phone one week after the initial e-mail invitation, then again via e-mail two weeks later. This schedule repeated until a response was received. All individuals who indicated that they would not be willing to

participate were re-contacted after one month and asked to reconsider participation. I was also able to identify a gate-keeper that was willing to contact a few individuals on my behalf. The gate-keeper e-mailed a few key individuals-who previously declined my invitations- and encouraged them to participate.

All appropriate IRB protocols pertaining to participant selection and protection of human rights were followed. This includes the utilization of a participant consent form that notified participants, prior to participation, of the study's plan, potential risks, and potential benefits. Potential risks include the possible detection of the actual education grant and school utilized in the study. While I diligently obscured this information, the details of the case may lend hints to the actual name and location of the grant and the institution. Potential benefits of this study include aiding other institutions in identifying practices that aid loosely coupled units in collaborating toward a common goal. The IRB form also informed participants that their participation is voluntary, that audio recording will be used during interviews to capture responses, and pseudonyms will be used to minimize risk. Though participant deception was not used in this study, the researcher debriefed participants at the conclusion of participant participation. This debriefing statement, in addition to thanking the participant, provided additional information into why the study was developed, what current research states about the topic, and how the participant's involvement aided in furthering research into the topic.

Data Collection

As suggested by Yin (2012) the sources of evidence used in this case study research were interviews, direct observations, archival records and documents. The data collected for this study were primarily derived from individual interviews. Interviews were conducted over the course of four months. A total of twenty-five individuals were invited to participate; fourteen accepted the

invitation and were subsequently interviewed. Interviews concluded after the fourteenth participant because data saturation had been achieved; new, conflicting, or unexpected data were no longer being revealed. All fourteen participants are either currently connected to Palm State University, the Ibis Institute, and/or the Sebastian Education Foundation, or were previously connected to Palm State University, the Ibis Institute, and/or the Sebastian Education Foundation during the time of the case. The fact that eleven participants were male and only three were female did not concern me given the fact that the higher presentation of males is reflective of the overall population of individuals connected with the case. Also, participants' position titles and departmental affiliations spanned the range of those represented in the case. Position titles included two university Presidents, a Vice President, a Vice President for Entrepreneurship, three Executive Directors, an Associate Dean, two Directors, an Associate Director, an Administrative Director, a Professor and the Chair of President's Circle. Departmental affiliations included College of Business, Office of Technology Development, Corporate and Foundation Relations, Academic Affairs, Research and Economic Development, School of Government, The President's Office and the Ibis Institute. One participant, currently affiliated with the university, was also previously affiliated with the Sebastian Education Foundation.

In addition to the fourteen participants, I was able to speak with two individuals currently at the Sebastian Education Foundation. They serve as the Director of Entrepreneurship and the General Counsel Representative. While they were unable to sit for a full interview, we were able to have a discussion regarding the nature of the grant, the impetus of the Sebastian Education Foundation for creating the grant, and some of the criteria used to determine which campuses were awarded the grant. The data gathered from these discussants was included in the study's findings.

An interview protocol, found in Appendix A, guided and informed the series of questions study participants were asked. I developed my interview protocol using open-ended questions that serve to supply data to answering my research question. These open-ended questions focused on understanding group formation, collaboration/collaborative processes and conflict/conflict resolution processes among the various university units involved in the grant acquisition process. Questions also sought to ascertain information about the selection and composition of involved units (i.e. what departments, committees, etc. were brought to the table and why), as well as discern the level and nature of interaction exhibited by each unit involved. Each participant was interviewed at a location of their choosing or via electronic methods to include telephone and video conferencing (also at their choosing). I asked each participant if they were willing to provide me with a follow-up interview. If so, I utilized this as an opportunity to provide participants with a transcript of their initial interview to review and, if necessary, ask additional questions that served to clarify information gathered in the initial interview, interviews with other participants, and/or data collected from documents.

Interviews followed a general interview guide approach. Though an interview protocol was used to maintain structure and consistency of interviews, a general interview guide approach allows more flexibility and adaptability in ascertaining information from participants (Turner, 2010). Using this approach is noted as allowing researchers the ability to maintain control over the interview when gathering data regarding the specific research topic while also allowing the researcher the freedom to ask participants follow-up or probing questions based on their responses to pre-constructed questions. It also allows the researcher to change the order or structure of questions, which lends itself to a more personal approach with each participant (Turner, 2010) and can result in richer responses. Utilizing the general interview guide approach

allowed me to ask additional questions, based on participant responses that may have slightly ventured away from the structured protocol. This flexibility of the interview aided in collecting additional data that the interview protocol did not anticipate. The average interview length was 32 minutes with the longest interview being 57 minutes and the shortest being 11 minutes. The number of interview hours for this study totaled 7 hours and 53 minutes. Each interview was transcribed, which resulted in 97 pages of transcription. Standard Written English was utilized in the reporting of participant quotes which resulted in minor editorial changes.

Direct observation is noted as one of the most distinctive features of case study research (Yin, 2012). However, since this case takes place in the past, I am unable to directly observe the participants in the course of their interactions. Nevertheless, direct observation was used in this study to gain an understanding of the physical environment associated with this case as this may influence the interactions of units within this case. A study conducted by the University of Michigan (2012), found that physical proximity of colleagues influenced collaboration. After examining passive contacts between colleagues inhabiting the same building, the study found that colleagues are 33% more likely to collaborate. This percentage increases to 57% for colleagues occupying the same floor in said building. The study also examined the daily overlapping walking patterns (i.e. trips to the elevator, restroom, etc.) of building inhabitants and found that for every 100 feet of overlap, collaboration increased by 20% (University of Michigan, 2012). Observation of the campus physical design can provide context to the interactions that emerged in the case. Utilizing direct observations as a data collection method aided me in understanding the physical environment when developing a narrative about the cultural environment that is as close to neutral and factual as possible. I was able to visit Palm State University campus on two occasions to observe the layout of the grounds, location of the

various buildings, and flow of walking and driving traffic. This direct observation aids me in drawing inferences between university unit collaboration and the proximity of said units on campus.

Documents and archival records were utilized to further assist in understanding the story of the case. Denzin and Lincoln (2003) indicate that while a case should tell its story, the researcher decides what that story is by determining what information will be pursued and reported. Including documents and archival records aided in constructing a more holistic story of the case as well as provide a firmer basis upon which to draw conclusions (Yin, 2012). Documents and archival records provided specifics that might not be obtained in interviews. For example, specific dates/times, meeting locations, meeting attendance, assigned duties, participant roles, deadlines, directives, group tasks, etc. are data that was collected from documents and archived records. These also served to fill in gaps where interview participant memories failed as well as served as another point of information for participant accounts to be cross-referenced. Interview participants were utilized to aid in the collection of documents and archived records. Each was asked if any documents and/or archival records related to the grant acquisition process were in their possession and/or where I might obtain access to this data at the institution. Additionally, university departments were used to obtain documents and archived records that are maintained by the institution. Copies of documents and archived records were collected at my expense. A total of 63 documents and archived records associated with the case were collected. These documents included, but are not limited to, e-mail correspondences, meeting notes, meeting agendas, official memorandums, administrative records, press releases, prospectus, phone messages, drafts and finalized copies of the grant proposal, the grant announcement, assessment results, and budget forms. These documents and archived records

were collected from interview participants, Palm State University, The Sebastian Education Foundation and the Ibis Institute.

Data Analysis

The constant comparative analysis method was utilized when analyzing the data collected. Primarily connected with grounded theory, the constant comparative analysis method was designed to aid researchers in generating theory that is closely connected to the data collected (Glaser, 1965). However, in a study conducted by Fram (2013), it was highlighted that the constant comparative analysis method can be utilized outside of the grounded theory approach when a theoretical framework was present. Given this, and its multiple applications for any type of qualitative data collected to include observations, interviews, documents, books, etc. (Glaser, 1965), the constant comparative analysis method was selected to aid in the data analysis of this study.

An emic approach was used in this study to view the behavior patterns of participants using local concepts as a lens. Providentially, the constant comparatively analysis method is noted as aiding researchers in maintaining an emic perspective by focusing on the data at a concrete level (Fram, 2013). By utilizing an emic approach it allowed me to ascertain an understanding of how collaboration happens in a loosely coupled environment from the vantage point of the various university units. Utilizing this approach also aided in refraining from presupposing outcomes, but instead allowed various themes, patterns and concepts to emerge from the data collected.

A case record and case study protocol were used to aid me in organizing the data collected into a comprehensive and concise pattern of meaning. The case record serves as an audit of all steps I took during the duration of this study and includes an interview synopsis that

was completed after each interview. The case protocol, cited as essential to case study research, consists of questions I asked myself about all data collected to give thoughtful consideration to all avenues of meaning that can be derived from the data collected (Yin, 2012). Following the suggestions of Fram (2013), I wrote memos during and after the data collection process, interviews, etc. in the case record about any reactions and initial thoughts I had. Maintaining a case protocol assists in preventing the proliferation of incorrect assumptions that prohibit the full understanding of participant experiences (Fram, 2013). Additionally, the case protocol aids in identifying confirming and disconfirming evidence, recurring themes, patterns and codes.

Auerbach and Silverstein (2003) suggest that the utilization of codes, as a procedure for data organizing, aids the researcher in discovering patterns that may not be easily identifiable due to the volume of text often associated with transcribed interview notes. Following this suggestion, this study utilized a priori codes to analyze the data collected. Group dynamics theory suggests several a priori codes that were used to aid in analyzing and understanding the data collected. More specifically, I examined the data to look for evidence of group processes and performance, collaboration, cohesion, conflict and competition to construct the initial analysis pattern for this study.

The group processes and performance a priori code was utilized to organize data collected that outlines the formal and informal processes and performance measures of the group. This includes a variety of information such as group formation, communication patterns and delegation of duties. Any information provided that supplies insight into the collaboration or collaborative efforts of university units were assigned the collaboration code. Cohesion, or the lack there of, is the a priori code that was used to describe the process that keeps the members of the university units connected or disconnected. Data related to group morale and solidarity were

assigned the code of cohesion. Additionally, data reflecting high cohesion (or the desire to attain cohesion) that has led to groupthink was organized under this code.

The conflict code is reserved for the data collected that highlights any incidences of conflict between or within university units. The presence of conflict is not often an easy topic to discuss. Because of this, I had to utilize tactics such as re-assuring participant anonymity and asking questions several times in several different ways at various points in the interview to uncover conflict. I would also try to avoid not using the word conflict with participants who appeared reluctant to admit to conflict. These participants usually painted the rosy picture of everyone working together without even the presence of a difference in opinion. In these cases, I would utilize words such as barriers, difficulties, stumbling points, etc. In other times, I would press the participants to reveal instances of conflict by stating that I was aware of the conflict. For example, in one interview after the participant gave a white-washed account of a situation that I knew was not so gleaming, I restated the question asking about specific details associated with the conflict. This tactic would sometimes yield more data, but other times the participant would shut down and become reluctant to speak any further about the event; in which case I would switch to a different topic. Additionally, politics emerged as a sub-theme that connected to the overarching conflict code. While this code may not appear as much in the data analysis as participants were reluctant to admit to instances of conflict, the data that is reported does highlight how conflict was effectively managed to generate positive results.

Competition explains data related to the instances where university units exhibit competitive behaviors during interactions. This is including, but not limited to, in-group/out-group behaviors, aggressive behaviors, and sabotage. Though competition was originally

established as an a priori code, review of the data revealed it to be more closely linked to the conflict in this case. Therefore, data connected to competition was organized as a sub-code.

In addition to a priori codes, I utilized emergent codes to analyze the data collected. After the initial a prior code review, I conducted multiple reads of the data to identify emergent codes that may provide additional context to the research question. To identify emergent codes, I utilized the constant comparative analysis method which outlines four specific steps; comparing incidents applicable to each category, integrating categories and their properties, delimiting the theory and writing the theory (Glaser, 1965). Borjie (2002) proposes a dyad for utilizing the constant comparative analysis method in the identification of codes. This dyad includes comparison of data within a single interview, between interviews within the same group, interviews from different groups, pairs at the level of the couple and comparing couples (Borjie, 2002).

For the purposes of this study, this dyad was modified to include the following steps: a single piece of collected data underwent a process of open coding in which each passage was studied to examine exactly what was stated then labeled with the appropriate category. Each categorized section was compared against each other to determine how they are similar, different or provide additional information about the code itself. The aim of this stage is to identify emerging categories and the message the data is conveying (Boeije, 2002). The next stage of comparison was to repeat this comparison process with two or more data from the same method. At this state, it was important to begin to look for patterns that may form among the categories which help identify typology (Boeije, 2002).

The third step of the dyad is rooted in data triangulation. Triangulation of the data collected aids in clarifying meaning from the data as well as verify the ability for an observation

or interpretation to be duplicated (Denzin & Lincoln, 2003). Since data for this study was collected from four different sources, I triangulated the data by comparing data collected from one method against data collected from a different method as a means to double check for consistency of findings. The goal of this step was to validate the data obtained from each source and develop a holistic picture of the phenomenon being studied (Boeije, 2002). Because data collected may be reflective of various hierarchical levels within the institution (i.e. interview participants may represent varying levels of institutional hierarchy), the final comparison was between pairs of data from different levels. Doing this provided an understanding of the phenomenon from various perspectives (Boeije, 2002).

After looking for relevant data and repeating ideas within the raw text, I compared the newly emerged data against the data previously organized in the aforementioned a priori codes. If the data did not align with a pre-identified code, I assigned a new code that is representative of the emergent data identified. In some cases, the data required the creation of a sub-code to the previously identified a priori or emergent code in lieu of creating a new coding classification. For example, for the a priori code group process and performance, I created a sub-code, leadership of the group process, which outlines how the group processes and performance was shepherded by a particular individual. There was significant data relating to the leadership of the group process, however, I wanted to maintain the connection of this data to the overall group process. Therefore, a sub-code was assigned to organize all of the relevant data pertaining to the group process leadership aspect. Lastly, I identified themes, theoretical constructs and theoretical narratives (Auerbach & Silverstein, 2003). The emergent themes identified were leadership of the group process, collaboration at palm state, commitment, senior leadership commitment, politics and superordinate goal.

NVivo Pro 11 software was utilized to organize and code all data collected. Interview audio recordings, interview transcriptions, discussant notes, documents, archived records and researcher observer notes were all entered into NVivo Pro 11, along with demographics for each participant, discussant, and all a priori codes. I then began the coding process which entailed me reviewing each data source looking for evidence of each a priori code. Excerpts from each data source were organized accordingly as it pertained to the various a priori codes. As new data was assigned to each code, it was first reviewed against the previous data already coded to ensure consistency. This processes involved several reads of the interview, document, archived records, and observation data as this comparing and contrasting was continuous throughout the coding process. Approximately 72 hours, which is broken down into a total of 9 days at approximately 8 hours each, were spent reading through and coding the entire data corpus.

Validity

Attempts to utilize concepts of validity associated with quantitative research in a qualitative study have proven operationally difficult (Norris, 1997). Nevertheless, this does not render validity concepts in case study research inapplicable, it merely requires that I reconsider their meaning and use (Norris, 1997). Since case study research is perceived to be one of the more subjective qualitative methods, researchers are urged to avoid subjective judgments (Riege, 2003). With regard to the topic being studied, one might assume that loose coupling impacts the manner by which university units collaborate to achieve institutional goals. Even so, I made every effort to remain objective and not presuppose subjective judgments to prevent validity fallacies and to not influence the direction of any results found in the study. To ward against subjective judgments, I used several design tests to ensure confirmability, credibility and dependability.

Confirmability in case study research is akin to construct validity as it pertains to maintaining neutrality and objectivity by determining if study conclusions are drawn from logical and unprejudiced means (Riege, 2003). To ensure validity in this measure, I utilized multiple sources of evidence in the data collection phase and triangulated data to analyze for meaning. Triangulating the data allowed me to strengthen the study findings.

Riege (2003) identified credibility as analogous to the notion of internal validity in that it involved demonstrating that the inquiry was conducted in a manner that ensures the integrity of the study. In addition to triangulation of data, literature suggests utilizing researcher self-monitoring and debriefing techniques (Riege, 2003). Given this, the aforementioned case protocol and case record were utilized as a self-monitoring system. Scott's (2004) conditional relationship guide, which suggests a series of questions aimed at warding against the researcher assigning incorrect meaning to the data collected, was also utilized. Once data analysis was completed, I took the identified codes and analyzed data through each question to ensure credibility. These questions include, what is (a priori or emergent code), when does (a priori or emergent code) occur, where does (a priori or emergent code) occur, why does (a priori or emergent code) occur, how does (a priori or emergent code) occur and with what consequence does (a priori or emergent code) occur or is (a priori or emergent code) understood (Scott, 2004). To avoid bias, answers to each question was derived from the data collected from documents, archived records or interview transcriptions (Scott, 2004). Lastly, data analysis methods and the conclusions drawn from these methods were presented to dissertation committee members, namely the methodologist and dissertation chair, for review to ensure the credibility of data analysis and findings. It is also important to note that I am not and have never been an employee of the study's case institution, grant-awarding foundation or third party institute. Also, I was not

involved in the implementation of the initiative being studied. However, I have over eleven years of professional experience in higher education to include academic affairs, student affairs, and enrollment management experience. This aids in bolstering the credibility of the study due to the fact that I do not have an allegiance to the case institution, which might impact the study and its study findings, however, I have significant experience in higher education, which might provide insight to the study and the study's findings.

Dependability is parallel to reliability and examines the consistency of the inquiry process to determine if the procedures and techniques used in the study maintained uniformity (Riege, 2003). To ensure reliability, all interviews were digitally recorded and transcribed for accuracy. The interview protocol established a specific listing of questions that was asked of each participant. A case record was utilized to provide a record of all steps taken during the data collection and analysis phases.

Akin to the validity of a study is the generalizability of the study's findings. The primary assumption is that because qualitative studies do not always utilize representative samples, study findings are not generalizable (Gobo, 2004). Many characteristics of qualitative research are inconsistent with achieving the parameters necessary for generalization; for example, a single case study design is incongruent with statistical sampling procedures fundamental for data generalizing (Schofield, 2002). Not surprisingly, many qualitative researchers view generalizability as a low priority and/or irrelevant to their research goals (Schofield, 2002). Given this, the classical view of generalizing is of little help to me as a qualitative researcher. Nevertheless, generalizing a qualitative study is indeed possible.

Gobo (2004) maintains that qualitative generalizability centers on the concern of general structures rather than single practices that only serve as an example of the larger structure. This

yields that generalization in qualitative research is such that the primary structural aspects of a study being noticed in other cases or events of the same kind or class (Gobo, 2004). One must consider what aspects of a situation are similar or dissimilar to the study findings while also considering to what aspects of the findings are these connected (Schofield, 2002). Lewis and Ritchie (2003) indicate that qualitative research findings are generalizable when done so within the right conditions. This notion led to the identification of three different types of generalizations: representation generalization, inferential generalization, and theoretical generalization. Representation generalization indicates that what is found in research sample can be generalized to the parent population. This method of generalizing is more commonly used in quantitative studies and receives less notice in qualitative research (Lewis & Ritchie, 2003). However, Gobo (2004) notes that qualitative research does not seek to generalize to a larger population. Rather the aim is to specify the conditions within which the phenomenon being studied exists, the interactions that pertain to them, and the resulting outcomes. Inferential generalization, study findings can be generalized to other settings beyond the sampled one, and theoretical generalization, draws theoretical parallels for general application, are more often utilized in qualitative research (Lewis & Ritchie, 2003). This study draws from these various types of generalizability methods when reporting data findings for practical and functional use.

Threats to Validity

Research is largely a human activity, particularly qualitative research where data collection and analysis are done mostly without the aid of technological software. The human element introduces human error as researchers are fallible and have the potential to get things wrong (Norris, 1997). Additionally, because qualitative case studies rely heavily on the accounts of other humans, it may be difficult for me to ensure criterion validity. This reality of the human

element and potential human error is the greatest threat to this study and could surface in a number of ways.

Though often associated with statistical error, two primary threats to the validity of any study are the identification of a relationship that in actuality does not exist (type 1 error), or to indicate that a relationship does not exist when in actuality a relationship is present (type 2 error) (Lamb, 2009). Researchers conducting qualitative studies can sometimes miss a relationship due to the insufficient wording of the questions included in the interview protocol, failing to identify opportunities to follow up with participants, or missing unexpected data due to strict adherence to pre-conceived expectations. Additional threats to validity can include mistakes such as the improper handling of field notes, the misplacement of the case record, or any unforeseen human mistakes that can result in incomplete or inaccurate data that may misdirect data analysis and validity of results.

In an effort to eliminate as much human error as possible, I employed a number of methods that include utilizing technology software where applicable in the recording, transcribing, analysis and maintenance of data. This lessens the chances of improper handling of field notes, misrepresentation of participant responses, etc. I also triangulated the data received in interviews against documents and archived records to account for criterion validity. Lastly, I shared research analysis findings with others on dissertation committee to ward against committing a type 1 or type 2 error.

Assumptions and Limitations

A qualitative study relies heavily on the assumption that participants refrained from knowingly falsifying answers to questions asked. It is assumed that participants provided information that is truthful regarding their perspective of the case being discussed. It was also

assumed that participants would display reluctance in openly discussing and/or acknowledging any negative occurrences involved with the case. Though participants were assured that measures would be taken to provide the utmost confidentiality, participant concern and/or fear of retribution may have impacted the quality and breadth of information provided.

An additional limitation of this study is that the case being studied took place in 2003. This eleven-year gap in time can elicit questions on the soundness of case selection and why a more current case was not selected for this study. Despite the time gap, this case was selected as it is one of the few examples available where I am able to examine several university units collaborating to accomplish one discerning goal that was time sensitive (as opposed to being an ongoing university initiative). Additionally, initial data collected on the case alluded to barriers that were present during the grant acquisition process, which provided a richer context to study the phenomenon. However, it is important to note that the time gap allowed for participant memories about the details of the case to fade, which could possibly skew the data collected if participant recollections are not accurate. However, I utilized other sources, such as documents and archived records that served as accurate historical markers of the incidents as they occurred and fill any gaps that imperfect memories may create.

CHAPTER 4: FINDINGS

The focus of this study is to examine what happens when loosely coupled institutional components work collaboratively to achieve university-wide goals. Though there is little research into this line of inquiry, this qualitative case study yields findings that could serve as an aid to universities during goal achievement endeavors which require institutional collaboration. This chapter provides a description of the case setting as a contextual background for the study's findings and concludes with a presentation of the findings that were identified from the data collected.

Case Context

According to archived documents, Palm State University (PSU) was one of eight institutions awarded the Sebastian Education Foundation Entrepreneurship grant, which provided schools $5 million each to make entrepreneurship education available across their campuses. The Request for Proposals (RFP) was mailed to thirty higher education institutions on April 29, 2003 by the Sebastian Education Foundation CEO. At PSU, the RFP was sent to the President who then forwarded the notification to various individuals within the university. The RFP invited institutions to "participate in a new initiative intended to enrich and extend the American tradition of entrepreneurship." This invitation outlined that the intent was to "expand entrepreneurship training beyond the business school" with the aim of reaching "... all college students from all disciplines…" to make entrepreneurship "...part of the campus-wide culture."

The Sebastian RFP reveals that the grant awarding process was broken down into two phases. Phase one included submission of a ten page initial proposal that addressed how the campus proposed to make entrepreneurship an accessible experience for all students, the leadership commitment of the University President to promote entrepreneurship on campus, the

ability to generate matching funds up to two times the grant award to sustain the initiative, and the institution's ability to serve as a model for other universities. This submission was due on June 13, 2003. Of those institutions that responded to the RFP, fifteen were selected to proceed to phase two of the process on June 17, 2003.

Phase two of the process included awarding the fifteen schools a $50,000 planning grant to help fund the development of the final proposal to be presented to the Sebastian Foundation. Schools then proceeded to make their initial proposals more detailed, change various aspects of the initial proposal (or change the entire proposal altogether), and/or identify innovative ways to present their proposals. The final proposal was to be no more than 20 pages and include details on the university's vision for "creating leaps in how entrepreneurship is currently offered at your institution" as well as provide an in-depth implementation strategy. On or around June 30th, the fifteen finalists were to present their final proposals to the Sebastian Education Foundation committee at their headquarters in Washington, DC. Interview data revealed that the university presidents and their teams were flown by private charter to the presentation location. The grant winners would be announced by early December 2003. However, documents reveal that the dates for phase two of the process were adjusted. Final proposals were actually submitted on November 21, 2003, final presentations were conducted Dec. 9th-11th, and the winning proposals were announced on or around January 15, 2004. I was unable to find any documentation or data that detailed the reasons for the changes in these dates.

In early January 2004, eight institutions, which included PSU, were awarded the Sebastian Entrepreneurial Campus Grant. In addition, PSU was identified by Sebastian as exemplary of what institutions aspiring to secure a Sebastian Entrepreneurship Campus Grant should be with regard to proposal application and the implementation of the initiative on campus.

This identification did not take place all at once, but rather was realized during the grant acquisition process, which included Sebastian officials meeting with PSU officials, conversations with PSU senior administration, reviews of the PSU proposal, and the final presentation. In December 2006, after completion of the second round of RFP announcements, proposals, and presentations, the Sebastian Education Foundation identified six new institutions to receive the Sebastian Entrepreneurial Campus Grant. During the second round grant application process, Sebastian presented PSU with the opportunity to serve as a mentor to institutions applying for the grant. Sebastian would regularly send representatives from mentee institutions to PSU to learn methods that would aid in successful grant acquisition.

Findings

This study found that the concerted action employed by loosely coupled university units can sometimes reflect a silo working style. Kezar and Lester (2009) are among those who highlight that to achieve joint goals, a collaborative process should be one where units take a collective approach to working relationships, require joint planning and utilize a structure that yields reliance on each other. However, this study found that university units can achieve institutional goals even if the collaborative process does not reflect a comprehensive collective approach. Rather, a process segmented into periods of inclusion and seclusion can also be effective in achieving cross-campus collaborative goals. Chinn (2013) found that authentic collaboration results from units sharing in the decision -making process and having equal accountability for the final product. Initially, PSU employed this style of collaboration that centered on inclusion, collective decision making, and shared accountability. However, failing to generate a compelling proposal after approximately five months of concerted collaborative effort revealed that the inclusion of many can sometimes undermine efficiency. Following this school

of thought, the PSU President decided on a silo strategy that ultimately facilitated the creation of a competitive grant proposal and successful grant acquisition.

This silo strategy removed the responsibility of composing the grant proposal from the collective group and placed it under the authority of one individual, the Director of the Ibis Institute. This seclusion tactic allowed the Director, along with his chosen team including the Executive Director of the Ibis Institute, and a College of Business administrator, to take all of the rich information discussed in the collective group and utilize it to compose a winning proposal within two weeks. The collaborative process then became inclusive again as the final product was presented to the collective group for approval prior to submission to the Sebastian Foundation. This unconventional strategy to collaboration utilized by PSU indicates that collaboration among loosely coupled university units does not have a one size fits all quality. Nor does it necessitate having broad scale participation at every step of the process. Rather, collaboration and the collaborative process can take many forms based on the demands of the initiative, the phase(s) of the initiative, the goals of the institution, and the needs of those involved.

This study also found that the commitment of senior level administrators, to include the university president and vice president, is necessary for cross-campus collaborative efforts to be successful. Research suggests that university presidents must demonstrate commitment to an initiative with passion, intensity, and persistence, which will provide the necessary momentum to motivate others toward goal achievement (Basam, 2010). In congruence with research, I found that the active participation of the President was significant in the success of PSU's acquisition of the Sebastian grant. This was attributed to the fact that all efforts for the initiative were spearheaded by the President's Office and/or his appointees, which aided in garnering university

administrators and faculty participation. PSU's President demonstrated his commitment to the initiative via verbal and written support, the allocation of necessary resources, as well as attending and participating in several meetings and events pertaining to the initiative. In addition, the involvement of senior leadership can impact the acquisition of external funding.

Data collected for this study indicates that the Sebastian Education Foundation utilized the commitment of the president as a criterion when deciding upon grant award recipients. This commitment was gauged by the president's presence at various grant acquisition activities such as Sebastian campus visits and the final presentation that was made at the Sebastian home office. Sebastian believed that the entrepreneurship campus initiative would not be successful at an institution if the president was not committed, as others on campus would be reluctant to rally behind an initiative that the president did not support. Institutions that applied for the Sebastian grant that lacked the support of the university president were not successful at receiving grant funds largely because they failed to reflect a succinct cross-campus approach to the initiative that was propelled not by one department, but rather by university leadership. PSU President's commitment to and demonstration of authority over the initiative was critical to the acquisition of the Sebastian grant.

This study also found that when faced with conflict, the university quelled any brewing tensions that would cause the conflict to escalate and thwart goal attainment. The data revealed instances where both intragroup and intergroup conflict presented during the grant acquisition process. Intragroup conflict took place between the university unit representatives regarding the content of the grant proposal. Some members supported erecting a new building on an unused parcel of land, some supported a more curriculum-based approach while others argued the verbiage of Sebastian's Request For Proposal (RFP) in whether or not the College of Business

should be included in the process or its implementation. Data into the intergroup conflict between two departments, Office of Technology Development and College of Business, is limited as participants were reluctant to provide specific details. However, I was able to gather that this conflict was rooted in previous interactions on group projects where the departments encountered intense disagreements. These previous interactions produced friction that made it difficult for these two departments to work together on the Sebastian initiative. Intergroup conflict also stemmed from competition for ownership and resources. This supports Forsyth's (1983) finding that intergroup conflict commonly stems from competitive attitudes. University units were very interested in obtaining a vast majority of the grant funds while also obtaining a position of prominence for their particular unit, the prevailing thought being that the principal unit would receive a lion's share of the funding. Despite the presence of both intragroup and intergroup conflict, PSU was able to apply strategies that minimized the negative effects of conflict on collaborative goal attainment.

Blanchard's (2013) research into intragroup conflict indicates that this form of relationship conflict is the most detrimental to goal attainment. However, I found that one strategy PSU utilized was that group members maintained a level of respect for each other. Maintaining respect helped mitigate the detrimental effects of intragroup conflict; this is because the difference of opinion that leads to conflict remains focused on the topic being discussed and did not cross into developing an unsavory view of an individual. Participant interviews revealed that individuals who participated in the PSU grant acquisition process respected the level of expertise and wealth of knowledge that each member brought to the initiative; therefore, disagreements were philosophical and professional in nature rather than personal. For example, discussions regarding implementation of a cross-campus initiative were focused on topics such

as identifying options that would best serve students, supporting the matching requirement of the initiative, and the financial implications of the grant for the departments and the university. These discussions did not include dialogue about individual administrators and/or their ability or willingness to participate in the initiative. This aided in preventing the conflict from escalating to detrimental levels.

PSU also utilized a third party strategy to aid in conflict resolution. The Vice President for Research identified that the group was having difficulty resolving the conflict of isolating a unified course of action for the initiative. This inability to reach a consensus was negatively impacting the overall progress of the initiative. The Vice President for Research presented the University President with the idea of utilizing a third party to manage the grant proposal writing process. The Ibis Institute's ability to serve in this third party capacity as a mediator for the group process and their ability to compile all of the ideas of the group into one cohesive proposal that ultimately won the Sebastian grant for PSU supports research that highlights the effectiveness of utilizing a third party to aid in conflict resolution (Forsyth, 1983). Participant interviews reveal that, while everyone was not initially pleased with the appointment of the Ibis Institute, everyone respected the President's decision and followed Ibis' lead. Forsyth (1983) highlights that the introduction of a third party must be done cautiously as it can be viewed as an unwelcomed intrusion. In congruence, this study found that a large portion of the group was not pleased with the decision of the Ibis Institute serving in a third party capacity. This discontent rested primarily on their lack of trust in Ibis.

The Ibis Institute is an affiliate of the PSU College of Business. The College of Business was a key department involved in the Sebastian grant initiative and discussions regarding cross-campus entrepreneurship implementation. Given this, Ibis' appointment as the third party

mediator was received with a bit of trepidation because group members were not convinced of Ibis' ability to remain neutral. Additionally, group members felt that their work to create a pan-university initiative prior to Ibis was in vain, as all efforts would be relegated to the College of Business. However, over time, the Ibis Institute was able to gain the trust of the group by employing methods such as transparency in the proposal writing process and the inclusion of ideas discussed in earlier group proceedings. Once trust was established and the direction of the initiative clearly articulated, the previously displeased individuals later determined that Ibis' appointment was the best course of action.

Lastly, this study found that loosely coupled university units that successfully achieve institution-wide goals have a shared ethos that transcends individual unit goals and preferences. An ethos, the fundamental spirit of a culture that informs the beliefs and practices of a group, served to rally PSU around the Sebastian initiative in that it provided the units and individuals involved with a motto behind which everyone could align. PSU's shared ethos was rooted in its campus culture of collaboration.

Coleman and Bavdyopadhyay (2011) highlighted that the performance of a group is heavily dependent upon the presence of a cooperative environment. PSU's campus culture of collaboration was cited by participants as an environment on campus that promoted working together with colleagues on various initiatives such as presentations and grant opportunities. Collaborating with someone in a different division or department did not require permission from senior administrators, nor was this collaboration questioned. In fact, participants highlighted that cross-unit collaboration was encouraged. The university motto of "low stone walls" sent the message that the dividing lines between departments and/or divisions were low enough to provide structure without impeding collaboration. The walls are so low that they can

be walked across in the name of collaboration. Data also highlighted that having the shared ethos of "low stone walls" infused the university units with the understanding that collaboration was the norm at PSU and the Sebastian initiative was an extension of their daily operation. While it is not possible to examine PSU's campus and/or website from 2003 to look for evidence of this, information found on the current website serves as evidence of PSU's collaborative campus culture. For example, PSU has a Collaboration Center that serves as a versatile meeting space, which boasts the latest technology and movable furniture, for faculty and research teams to engage in collaborative working groups. Additionally, a white paper on creating a collaborative organizational culture, written by the Director of PSU Executive Development in conjunction with a private firm whose focus is helping individuals, teams, and organizations understand the impact of collaboration, is published on the PSU website. This white paper highlights the benefits of collaboration and PSU's commitment to utilizing a highly collaborative process. PSU's culture of collaboration impacted the trajectory of PSU's grant acquisition efforts and aided in traversing barriers that presented during the course of the initiative.

The aforementioned intragroup conflict and intergroup conflict evident in this case was the primary barrier to collaboration. However, PSU's shared ethos of a collaborative culture aided group members to continue working together in spite of conflict barriers. Part of this was due to the presence of a strong emotional conviction regarding PSU's responsibility to both the academic and local community. Participants highlighted PSU's position of prominence and a sense of pride felt by being connected to PSU. This pride is evident in PSU's public narrative which touts its long-standing place among leaders in higher education, its diverse student body, and its reputation as one of the best universities in the world. This emotional connection and PSU pride propelled individuals to continue working together despite a sometimes difficult

process. While failing to secure the Sebastian grant was indeed possible, as no institution was guaranteed to be awarded, for PSU group members failure was not an option. Failing to win the Sebastian grant award was seen as a possible embarrassment to PSU's reputation of excellence. While the presence of a shared ethos did not prevent barriers from presenting during the course of the initiative, they did serve to mitigate the impact of the barriers, thus enabling the university units to proceed to goal completion.

The data collected for this study revealed that when considering how loosely coupled university units employ concerted action, five elements proved significant in the achievement of institutional goals. The processes and performance of the units, the collaborative processes of the group, the commitment of the units to the institutional goal, the presence and management of conflict, and the presence of a superordinate goal delineate what constitutes collaborative goal attainment at this large, loosely coupled research university. The significance of these themes was determined by their congruence to the evidence gathered from reviews of the literature outlining group dynamics and collaboration in higher education. Significance was also determined according to the number of references, words, and paragraphs coded in NVivo Pro for each a priori and emergent code across all data sources. The themes will be presented in accordance with the number of references found in the data, with the first theme having the most references and the last theme having the least. These themes will serve as the main foundation for presenting my findings; however, I will also periodically delineate findings according to data source for richer context.

Group Process and Performance

Group process and performance outlines data that details how PSU coordinated its efforts in the achievement of the Sebastian grant. This includes but is not limited to identifying plans to

conduct the work, identifying who would be involved in the process, agreeing upon the leadership of the process, and the delineation of responsibilities among those involved in the process. This theme was revealed to be the most vital in determining goal attainment among loosely coupled university units.

A key element evident in this case was the university's ability to quickly rally around the initiative. At the onset, the university immediately began to organize its processes to ensure the creation of a strong proposal and increase its chances at winning the Sebastian grant. Upon receiving the invitation from the Sebastian Education Foundation to submit a Request For Proposal (RFP), Palm State University pulled together a cross section of individuals that included representatives from the Center for Public Assistance, the School of Media and Journalism, Office of Technology Development, the Medical School, the Department of City and Regional Planning, the College of Business, the Department of Statistics and Operations, the School of Information and Library Science, the Department of Physics and Astronomy, the Department of Computer Science, the School of Government, the School of Pharmacy, and the Department of Chemistry. These individuals were selected because, according to Participant D, they "might have something to say" about the invitation. These individuals had demonstrated, either through research or teaching, an interest in entrepreneurship and/or expressed an interest in implementing the initiative in their respective units. A steering committee, appointed by the President, comprised representatives from the Center for Public Assistance, the College of Business, the Medical School, Office of Technology Development, Foundation Relations, the College of Arts and Sciences, and Central Administration, was commissioned at the onset. According to Participant J, the group started out relatively small. Participant J explained how "someone in central administration took the first try at composing what Sebastian required" for

the phase one proposal. Eventually, the group grew into a larger entity as phase two "became a much bigger deal where groups of people from across campus were present that engaged in any kind of entrepreneurial activity" on campus. However, the initiative was still "led primarily by central administration." This deliberate organization strategy continued throughout the initial steps and discussions about the initiative.

Initial steps, prior to applying for the grant, included discussion among senior administrators, including the President and Vice President for Research, regarding where the resulting product would be housed, who was going to be the point person for the initiative and, if acquired, how the university was to successfully meet the Sebastian Foundation's matching funds requirement for the five million dollar grant. Participant C indicated that at the very onset, the initiative took "a lot of careful thought" about how the university would proceed in acquiring the grant. Participant D stated that "…. first we had to decide what we wanted to do and how we wanted to approach it…" Part of this approach included the division of labor and responsibilities. Documents indicate that various campus representatives, such as the Director for Office of Technology Development, the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences, and faculty in the College of Business, were assigned to a number of tasks that included examining the endowment as a possible source to meet the matching fund requirement, creating an intellectual property policy for the proposal, and drafting the grant proposal. There were also conversations regarding how funds would be utilized and drafts of initial budgets. Archived e-mails and budget documents highlight that as funds were identified, several drafts of the budget were disseminated among committee members for review and approval. Participant A highlights that "the process of just getting the document put together was actually a lot of work done by some great accounting people. To figure out a really good budget that matched Sebastian's demands with the university

accounting processes and determining which programs were going to cost which amount of money was a very detailed process and a real challenge that had a lot of back and forth." In addition to determining the financial implications, this back and forth process consisted of negotiations regarding the content of the proposal, which university unit would own the initiative, and the implementation of the initiative on campus. Participant A highlighted that part of the discussion was a bit of "a philosophical question about what we should be proposing or what we should do with the money." Negotiations regarding how pan-university entrepreneurship would be implemented on campus elicited conversations that examined proposal options. Participant K indicated that these discussions centered on various topics such as the "likelihood of taking the commercialization program to the next level, expanding entrepreneurship to students across campus, expanding the Palm State Challenge across campus, creating a minor in the College of Arts and Sciences for entrepreneurship, and building a scholarly component where research and projects relating to entrepreneurship would be funded." Participant D highlighted that part of this back and forth process became "hairy" due to the discussions about who should be in charge and "should this initiative be based out of the Business School or should this be somewhere else." Interview data reveals that this challenging back and forth process soon became a stumbling block to the group process, which ultimately negatively impacted group performance as the consistent negotiations over the many topics resulted in a limited forward progression toward composing a competitive proposal.

What began as a very organized, well planned and intentional procedure quickly became an unorganized and unproductive process with respect to the constant negotiations and continual sharing of ideas about the possibilities of the initiative without much forward action toward the actual composition of a proposal. Participant F recounts the experience of one colleague who

refused to participate in the initiative due to thinking "it was a mess." Participant N openly acknowledged "checking out of the process" because it was "too disorganized." After approximately five months into the process, the group stalled and was unable to bring the initiative to fruition. The back and forth nature of the process prevented progression toward the goal because it arrested the group in a circling process where continuous dialogue about the initiative ensued and decisive advancement halted. When inquiring about the nature of the group process, a number of reasons for the stalling performance were revealed. Participant F indicated that the group process was "entropic, stuck and well-meaning. Everyone had their own ideas, so it makes the group process difficult. Some meetings had 10 people sharing their thoughts" which aided in making the process difficult. Participant J noted that "there was a point where we could not get total agreement on all the different elements across campus that should be included in the proposal." Participant D highlighted that another reason for the process becoming stuck was due to the fact that it came down to financial support of the initiative because "the Dean for the College of Liberal Arts didn't have the resources to support the initiative; when it came down to it we had this plan that was pretty broad and covered a lot of the University." The back and forth of continual negotiations, jockeying for ownership and discussions about the financial implications of the initiative without much forward momentum stalled the group process for approximately five months and placed the group under the duress of a looming deadline.

Approximately two weeks prior to the proposal deadline, the steering committee changed its tactics. The exact number of days prior to the grant deadline is not concrete as participants indicated a range of time from ten days, seven days, five days, two weeks, less than three weeks, and one month; however, comparing interviews against documents indicates that two weeks is the most accurate timeline for this tactical change. The primary reason for the change was that

the PSU President realized that the group was not progressing toward goal attainment and the metaphorical wheels were merely spinning. Additionally, members of the group began to realize that a group could not write a proposal. Participant F highlights that the initial group process tried "to be democratic and open and it simply doesn't work….. because democracy undermines efficiency. Not demeaning democracy; what I'm trying to say is when you have all these different ideas and approaches it's very hard to get an integrated set of tasks." It was at this point that the Dean of the College of Business, who was a member of the playfully dubbed "Breakfast Club" due to the early morning Tuesday meetings around breakfast, identified the need for a leader of the process. The Dean of the College of Business, along with the other Breakfast Club members, including the Vice President of Research, decided that someone had to take the point position and actually write the final proposal. Participant H recalled that the Dean of the College of Business had the idea to take the ideas and rough proposal drafts "back to the Business School's Ibis Institute of private enterprise". This idea was presented to the University President, who approved the strategy. The Vice President of Research then asked the Ibis Institute to "put together a proposal."

The data indicated that while the Ibis Institute was a participant in the grant acquisition process from the very beginning, it did not take the leadership reins until being invited to do so by the Vice President of Research. The Ibis Institute was chosen to help resuscitate the group's efforts because, as an affiliate of the College of Business, it was connected to PSU as well as the local and national entrepreneurial community. Also, it had a long successful history of securing competitive grants and working collaboratively with people within and outside of the institution. Participant E highlighted that the Ibis Institute had previously won "international awards from U.S. agencies for international development….successfully submitted multi-million-dollar

proposals for a whole range of things" so the assumption was that Ibis had experience in putting together a successful proposal." Additionally, and arguably most important, the Ibis Institute was a privately funded entity of the university and would not receive any of the Sebastian grant funds if awarded. Therefore, Ibis was able to serve in the leadership capacity without being viewed by other university units as being motivated by selfish interest. This was important to the other university unit representatives involved. For example, Participant G recalled that the Ibis Institute was the "staffer of this {initiative} and the organizer, but did not try to own it. They were trying to be facilitative of it." Dr. Smith was also well received and respected in the leadership role because of his extensive knowledge and experience. Participant J indicated that there was a "legitimacy that he brought to the effort because his training and background was in sociology, a discipline that was usually held within the college." According to Participant F, Dr. Smith:

> ….had no problem gaining the trust {of the group} because he was in the college of arts and sciences, the Chair of the sociology department for 10 years and was the Head of the faculty chairs….. this gave a little bit more confidence to people that this {initiative} was not just going to be a business school boondoggle to get resources for the business school but it was consistent with the Ibis Institute's objectives of utilizing the talents of the business school to improve the prospects of entrepreneurship for the college and other schools on campus.

Once the decision was finalized, Dr. Smith pulled together his team of three individuals that included himself, the Ibis Executive Director, and a professor in the College of Business, to compose what they hoped would be winning proposal.

Collaborative Processes

A conscious decision was made by the senior leaders at PSU early on to make collaboration a focal point during this initiative. The archived copy of the grant proposal highlights that PSU's first step was "to house the resource responsibility and coordination for the

PSU Entrepreneurial Initiative in the Office of the Vice Chancellor for Research and Economic Development…" to ensure that "…entrepreneurship initiatives and supporting resources are made available across the entire campus and distributed campus-wide... versus an individual subset of campus." By positioning the home for this initiative in an office that was central to the entire campus, PSU's senior leaders sent the message that collaboration would be key to their success. This commitment to collaboration was shared by many of the individuals on campus. Participant B indicated that "they did not have a hard time pulling together a cross-campus group" while Participant A notes that "from the beginning, people all wanted to do something; they wanted to put their best foot forward. Once it became clear what we were going for and that it would be this campus-wide program, a lot of people then said 'how can I help?'." Every participant indicated that collaboration was critical to successful grant acquisition at PSU. Some participants also highlighted that collaboration is inherent to the PSU campus culture.

Participants indicated just how common collaboration was at PSU. Participant D fondly recalled a love for PSU's "really low barriers to collaboration" by highlighting that "if you wanted to work with someone else then you just worked with them. There were no silos. There was an interdisciplinary nature to PSU that I still think is pretty unusual." Participant L highlighted that PSU has had "a very collegial and very collaborative culture….for decades." Participant I shared a campus metaphor of PSU having "low stone walls on campus" as a way to describe the fact "that our silos and departmental walls are constructed so that they are permeable and you can walk over them or climb over them." Additionally, collaborating is an expected mode of working, the focus is placed on getting the work done and not on whom the work is being done with. Participant D stated that when it came to the Sebastian grant process, "...it came down to getting the work done. It was like we can fight about who should run it, who

gets to have whatever piece of it, but the regulator on that discussion was we damn sure better not lose this grant……we always focused on how valuable the grant would be to the institution, not the Business School, or the College of Liberal Arts, Office of Technology Development or to the Provost, it was very institutionally focused." This culture of collaboration remained throughout the grant acquisition process and aided in goal attainment at PSU.

Collaboration at PSU was executed in different forms. One of the most easily identified forms of collaboration was meetings where "a lot of people were around the table". However, this form of collaboration was not perceived by participants as the most organized or efficient. Participant A characterized the early meetings as being less collaboration and "more of a mess than anything else." Participant N outlined initial meetings that were "too disorganized" because "everyone showed up…" as an attempt to "grab some of the money." This disorganized collaboration resulted in some individuals refraining from further participation in the initiative. However, as the larger group whittled down, the meetings became more productive because negotiations and jockeying decreased while the identification of points of agreement increased. Participant J noted that the later meetings were characterized by "bunches of traditionally siloed schools taking their school hat off and saying, 'okay, we are all sitting around the table trying to put this proposal together as Team PSU, not as Team Business School, not as Team College of Arts and Science, not as Team Law School'."

Collaboration also took the form of sharing the workload. Data found in meeting notes reflect the delineation of responsibility to the various university units involved. Representatives from the university units were given ownership by the Vice President of Research for various pieces of the process such as defining any overlap with this initiative and others on campus and developing a framework for an undergraduate minor. While earlier meetings were characterized

as being disorganized, data from meeting notes reflect that later meetings were more organized. For example, meeting notes dated November 7 (the year is not specified, but based on the content of the document, it is believed to be 2003) begin with the statement "period of performance" and proceeds to detail the five basic points of the proposal which outline that "10%" of activities will be "pre-college" focused, "80% on campus" and "10% post campus". These meeting notes also outline a plan to "organize according to social, traditional and faculty academic" parameters. University unit representatives were also included in the presentation of proposal ideas to the Sebastian Education Foundation during a visit to PSU's campus in September 2003. Data from meeting agendas reflect that segments of the presentation were completed by several unit representatives, including Arts and Science, College of Business, Medical School, University Advancement, and the Office of Technology Development. Another task included providing the University President with the necessary updates as well as information to aid in his preparation for Sebastian meetings and presentations. Archived documents from the Office of the President reflect that the President was provided with a "President's Briefing" document prior to the September 2003 meeting at PSU with Sebastian officials. This briefing included the meeting agenda, the participant list, information on the purpose of the meeting, background on the Sebastian Foundation, and a timeline for the Sebastian grant from the time of the RFP through PSU's progress to date. Additional data found in the archives include professional bios on the Sebastian officials, some of whom attended the September 2003 meeting. While it is unclear who compiled this information for the PSU President, it does indicate that part of the collaborative work done by members of the committee and/or administrative staff assisting with the initiative was to ensure that the President was well informed and well prepared for all Sebastian proceedings.

Collaboration also took the form of communication and verbal support. In a correspondence sent October 6, 2003, a draft of the proposal was shared to highlight the changes made that were "discussed in last Wednesday's meeting." The recipient(s) for this correspondence was an established e-mail group, entitled the Sebastian Group, to which these changes were distributed. The Sebastian Group included the PSU President, Dean of Arts and Sciences, Dean of College of Business, Ibis Institute Director, Executive Director for Entrepreneurship and the Director of Corporate Foundations. Additionally, e-mails from Dr. Smith to various individuals within the university, requesting thoughts and input on various aspects of the proposal, reflect a tone of desired collaborative consensus building. For example, the correspondence sent on October 6th to the Sebastian Group was shared by Dr. Smith with an external constituent indicating that "any comments or suggestions would be welcomed." The response to this invitation for feedback was one of appreciation, constructive feedback, well wishes for a successful grant acquisition, and a sharing of the external constituent's anticipated budget. E-mail correspondences regarding the budget and allocation of grant funds reflect this same collaborative tone. Internal conversations regarding resource allocation were constructed based on previous meetings and notes, which were shared in an effort to ensure the group "had an idea of all things that need to be considered…"

In an effort to display PSU's campus-wide collaboration to the Sebastian Foundation, letters of support were sent to the Sebastian Education Foundation leadership team from various college deans and university leadership. This included the School of Journalism, School of Education, the Ibis Institute, the Medical School, School of Government, School of Public Health, the Center for Public Health, Institute for the Arts and Humanities, College of Arts and Sciences, Biotechnology Center, and the Entrepreneurial Expansion Group. These letters

indicated the department's gratitude in being considered for the grant, willingness to meet the grant's matching fund requirement, and excitement to participate in an ambitions campus-wide plan.

Though the overall impression was of a very collaborative campus, there were instances where collaboration reflected a silo approach. Participant K highlighted that while the process was very collaborative and members were "willing to question old mores and old structures" with regard to how the entrepreneurial initiative would extend beyond the College of Business, he held some expressed concern "…that we were not terribly inclusive. There was a central group of people that wrote the proposal and they needed to execute the proposal…" This sentiment was validated by Participant F, who stated that "you can't have 15 people with 15 different ideas prepare a proposal. There has to be a top down {structure}; there has to be a leader in a structure that says 'this is what we're going to do and if you don't like it'….." as if to insinuate that individuals could excuse themselves from the process if they disagreed with this approach. Additional evidence of limited collaboration included the lack of presence of some campus entities. For instance, there was very little mention of the involvement of university units that were not connected to academic affairs. I did not find evidence of any student affairs or enrollment services division representatives in any of the data collected. Meeting notes, agendas, e-mail correspondences, etc. do not indicate that any of these university constituents were included or informed at any point to discuss the initiative.

Commitment

Commitment to the initiative was also an important factor in goal attainment. This theme presented in a few different ways. In addition to university commitment, data suggest that

individual commitment, departmental commitment, commitment to maintaining programs, and commitment of senior leadership were also evident.

In a letter from PSU's President to the Sebastian President accepting the invitation to seek the Sebastian grant, the PSU President states that "the students, faculty and staff of Palm, and I, are fully committed to partnering with you should this proposal be favorably received." Participant A noted that there was one particular meeting at the start of the initiative where "all the senior people around the table all talked about how they supported the program and the efforts and the proposal." This presence around the table was a demonstration of support that went a long way toward sending the message of commitment to campus. Participant H recalls there being "…an institutional commitment. The university had decided that they wanted to go for this. It wasn't like the idea came to the Business School and the Business School had to persuade the rest of campus that this was a good idea. The campus at large had already bought into this and was committed to it."

Participants also spoke of group members having a high level of individual commitment to this initiative. The commitment of the individuals to the initiative appeared to be rooted in their commitment to the financial wellbeing of the university. The reason for this was best described by Participant D, who indicated that group members "took the role of the flagship university really seriously. So it came down to getting the work done……. we stood a good chance to get up to 5 million for the institution….so it wasn't really hard to say 'all right how do we get this done'." Participant F indicated that "everyone agreed that it would be foolish not to respond" to the RFP while Participant D noted that individuals realized that they would be "fools to lose" the grant opportunity. This form of commitment was often executed via the work done by the individuals to help move the initiative forward. Participant J recalled that during the

group process, “people had to be willing to trust each other and stay at the table and keep talking even when the talking got hard. They} had to care enough about the initiative and what it needs to be.” When reflecting on the commitment to the project, Participant H stated that Dr. Smith “is one of the most committed to the institution people that I know…..we had a passion for what the possibilities were with this.” Conversely, not all individuals involved shared this passionate commitment to the initiative.

There were instances where participants indicated that various individuals elected to refrain from participation in the initiative. In most instances, the reluctance to participate was connected to the disorganized nature of the group process. Participant F highlights that a “very distinguished entrepreneurship professor would have nothing to do with the whole process” because he thought it “a mess.” In other instances, participants who were once at the table decided to discontinue participation. Participant N admitted to “checking out” of the process due to the chaotic nature of proceedings, while Participant D highlighted that, in addition to a representative from the Medical School discontinuing participation, “people dropped off because they said ‘no more for me’ and they left.” However, this decision to discontinue or decline participation was not frowned upon. The remaining individuals were not taken aback by the departures, and this departure did not reflect negatively on the departing individuals. Participant D indicated that the prevailing thought was “there’s not enough in it for them to continue to participate.” If the departing individual was highly sought after, personal relationships were sometimes used to convince and/or coax participation.

Departmental commitment was evident in the documents collected that outline the participation, and thereby commitment, of various departments throughout the various stages of the grant acquisition process. Interview data also spoke to commitment from the departmental

level. One component of the Sebastian grant was the requirement that the awarded school would match the grant funds in a 2 to 1 matching scheme. This equated to the five million dollar grant being matched by PSU at ten million dollars over the lifespan of the grant. This fact was not known by everyone at the onset of the grant announcement, which resulted in what Participant N described as several Deans and Department Chairs who "suddenly decided that their unit was part of entrepreneurship." What ensued was a sort of round robin where PSU Department Chairs made their bid for funding. However, once Deans and Department Chairs discovered that the funds would not be without obligation, that PSU's expectation was for departments who received funding to also match said funding received, a number of departments became less interested. Participant A highlights that this was the point that required departments to evaluate their commitment to the initiative because they had "to decide if this is really a priority. Is building an entrepreneurship program really something you want to invest in, not just something you're willing to do if somebody gives you the money for it?" Another component of the matching funds conversation was the expectation that programs established under the funded departments were to thrive after grant funds were no longer available. Therefore, departments had to show a commitment to maintaining these newly established and/or modified programs.

According to the grant announcement document, the premise of the grant was to encourage the creation of "new models that will spread widely beyond initial grantees." Participant K indicated that "this was not a startup program, it was an educational program." According to Participant L, the Sebastian grant "seeded a number of ideas and initiatives and behaviors" at PSU, like the fact that the "minor in entrepreneurship is taught in the general College of Arts and Science, not in the business school" and that PSU's new President appointed in 2008 was "an academic and an entrepreneur." The overall expectation was that programs

established with grant funds would continue to flourish at the awarded institution, who would continue to support the growth and development of entrepreneurship throughout the university and beyond. Participant B notes that the idea was for departments to commit "to continuing to fund support for those programs that the Sebastian grant helped get started." Some departments, such as the Medical School and the Economics Department, were able to utilize the Sebastian funds to create such long-lasting programs. However, not all programs thrived once the grant funds were exhausted. Participant K outlines that some departments became involved only for the money and that "the funding, once it dried up, the commitment to the research efforts died out." While the funding information caused some interested departments to become disinterested, the College of Business was one department that was disinterested at the start of the initiative but later became interested, even after the matching fund information was revealed. Several participants outlined that at the time of the announcement of the Sebastian grant, the College of Business was in the midst of a Dean transition. Upon the announcement of the grant, the college was one of the first notified about the grant. However, the interim Dean declined participation. Participant N recalled that the "Business School Dean was not all that excited about this in one direction or the other." Given the Dean's lack of interest, the early stages of the grant proposal process moved forward without involvement from the Business School. However, this changed upon the selection of the new Dean who, according to Participant A, "eventually helped the Business School be more involved in the initiative." This commitment from the College of Business Dean and other members of senior leadership was found to have an impact on the success of the initiative.

The senior leadership of PSU was intentional in its efforts to send a unified message to the Sebastian Education Foundation and the PSU community of commitment to the grant

initiative. A report on the first year of the initiative outlined that the planning process was to make upper-level administrators central to the management of the grant initiatives. This was made evident in the model selected to house the initiative. An archived document highlights that responsibility and coordination of the Palm Entrepreneurial Initiative would fall under "the Office of the Vice President for Research and Economic Development, with reports directly to the Provost" in an effort to ensure that the initiative was regarded "as a top university-wide priority." This document also explicitly states that the President of the university "has guaranteed the support of the University" for the initiative. These efforts went a long way to ensuring that the President, Vice President, Provost, and the entire university would be committed to the initiative throughout its duration. Several participants indicated that the commitment of senior leadership to the Sebastian initiative was a significant factor in its success. Participant J notes that a critical factor for success was the fact that senior leadership organized the processes under the Provost's Office. Participant L states that success should first be attributed to the fact that the President "was fully supportive of this so you have the top administrative official at the University saying this is important." Participant A notes that the initiative would not have happened if the university leadership had not made it happen.

In addition to making a written commitment to the initiative, senior leaders were also present at the initial meetings surrounding the initiative. It was noted that all of the senior leadership was present at the inaugural meeting to talk about how they supported the initiative and the efforts of the proposal. Though many of the senior leaders present were not actively involved beyond this initial show of support, there were other instances where senior leadership was active in the grant acquisition process. Participant A recalled that PSU was visited by representatives from the Sebastian Education Foundation in September 2003 "in the middle of

the process" during which time "every major leader of the university was there….everybody from the President, the Provost, every Vice President, the head of athletics department, the head of the fundraising office, etc." This account was supported by documents from this meeting with the Sebastian Representatives that lists an extensive participation list, including everyone mentioned by Participant A, as well as various college deans.

Participant F commented that PSU's President was very busy and incapable of attending every meeting and monitoring all of the details. However, PSU's President was kept well informed and remained abreast of the proceedings pertaining to the Sebastian grant initiative. Participant C indicates that being "the point person for the central administration office" he was one of the responsible parties for keeping the President "well informed." Data collected from the archives of the President's Office revealed that PSU's President had copies of all pertinent documents, including official and unofficial e-mails regarding the Sebastian Grant. The President was briefed on specific details and individuals prior to any meetings. The archives included bios on key members of the Sebastian Education Foundation put together by other members of the grant acquisition committee to prepare the President for meetings and presentations. The archives also included records of phone messages, which indicate that the President and members of the senior leadership at Sebastian were in communication during the grant process. There is also evidence that the President informed the PSU's Director of Corporate and Foundation Relations of these communications. Together, this information suggests that while the PSU President was not always an active participant in the details of the day to day grant process, he was definitely more than just a face on the process. The attentiveness of the President and senior leadership to the activities regarding the grant process is also believed to be integral to resuscitating the stalled grant proposal writing efforts.

The decision to place Dr. Smith and the Ibis Institute team at the forefront of the grant proposal drafting efforts was due to the Vice President recognizing that the group was finding it difficult to progress forward. Participant E stated that "there was awareness by senior administrators that we didn't have a compelling proposal and was requesting the Ibis Institute to step in." Dr. Smith confirmed this occurrence, stating that "the Provost, the Vice President for Research the Dean of Business School said 'Smith's going to write the proposal'". Senior leadership's involvement and commitment to this initiative was also seen as critical by the Sebastian Foundation.

The importance of senior leadership commitment to the grant initiative was also very critical to the Sebastian Foundation. Discussions with current Sebastian officials revealed their feelings that if the campus presidents were not supportive of the cross-campus initiative then it would not succeed. If the president would not actively participate in the grant acquisition process then the initiative would eventually fail. Participant G stated that the rationale for Sebastian requiring that all campus presidents present the final grant proposal at the Sebastian headquarters was that "if you bring your CEO into this, president, chancellor, etc. then you're going to be really serious." It also allowed Sebastian officials to delineate those campuses that may have wanted the grant funds but did not have institutional buy-in because the presence of the university president was a good indicator of institutional buy-in and the success of the initiative. The theory proved to be true, as data collected from discussions with current Sebastian officials, as well as a document outlining participant accounts, indicated that when the leadership of a university was in transition or was not supportive of the initiative, and the university continued forward despite this lack of commitment, the university ultimately was not successful at

composing a compelling proposal. Commitment from senior leadership was critical to the success of these cross-campus efforts.

Conflict

Despite the difficulties in getting participants to openly discuss instances of conflict, I was able to collect data that illustrates the conflict that was present during PSU's grant acquisition process. As previously mentioned, there was a period of time in the grant acquisition process where the initiative stalled. While this stall has been linked to group process and performance, it is also linked to the conflicts that the group encountered. One source of conflict was the difficulty of obtaining faculty buy-in for the initiative. A number of PSU faculty felt that pursuit of a grant with an entrepreneurial focus was not a judicious use of university time and resources. Participant B highlights that the faculty within various schools were "really not excited about entrepreneurship as a general direction" and that the university had to "convince faculty that this was an appropriate direction for a research university." Participant E stated that some faculty with the College of Arts and Science were "very, very resistant to this idea" due to their inability to see a connection between their field of study and entrepreneurship. Data collected from a document sent to the Sebastian Education Foundation acknowledges that some faculty believed that entrepreneurship had little relevance within academic settings. This document also states that among "large numbers of faculty" there was pessimism and skepticism held by some who did not see entrepreneurship as an academic discipline. Evidence of faculty reluctance was supported by data collected from an e-mail correspondence between various members of the Sebastian e-mail group that the proposal would be met with a "good deal of skepticism from college faculty." This was thought to stem from "misconceptions" and "lack of awareness" about the initiative.

The Sebastian grant announcement document indicates that the purpose of the grant was to "expand entrepreneurship training beyond the business school…so that all college students from all disciplines have the opportunity to develop an understanding of the entrepreneurial process." This statement was a source of conflict as some individuals interpreted this to mean that the College of Business was to be isolated from the initiative in its entirety. Participant A highlights that this phrasing by the Sebastian Education Foundation was a "key component" of some individuals at PSU interpreting the requirements "to mean that the Business School should not be involved at all." Conflict ensued as the discussions into whether or not the initiative should or could be housed in the College of Business progressed. This conversation was likened to a battle. Participant D indicated that "even though the RFP said that the initiative wasn't [supposed to be housed in the business school] ….you had to have that battle. We'll call it a battle. You had to have that battle with people to saying 'no you have to be involved but you can't be the center point of everything'." This participant proceeded to highlight that the battle continued approximately "2 to 3 weeks" before the group was able to agree on the commitment that the initiative would not be housed in the business school.

Such multiple interpretations of the Sebastian proposal led to mild animosity toward the College of Business. Participant D described this as being "identified pretty clearly as Business School versus not Business School." After insisting that no conflict existed at all during the process, Participant J acknowledged that there was "some misguidance … almost an animosity towards the Business School's participation on these across campus programs because the concern was that the College of Business is trying to own the process." This notion prevailed at PSU because the College of Business was already focused on entrepreneurship. So others assumed that any grant associated with entrepreneurship would have to be anchored in the

College of Business. The unfortunate result of this animosity, according to Participant K, was that the College of Business became "angry and somewhat demoralized" which caused some "walls to go up." The group reached the decision to house the initiative in the College of Liberal Arts; however, the collective group's inability to draft a compelling proposal led the senior leadership to name the Ibis Institute, a College of Business affiliate, as the manager of the process. When asking participants how committee members reacted to this, most participants stated universal amicableness with the decision. However, Participant D indicated that "big chunks of the group were not happy because the fear was we just did all of this collective collaborative work and it's going to wind up back in the [College of] Business. All of the resources were going to just wind up at the Business School and it's not going to make a difference. This turned out not to be the case but we were all very concerned that that's what would be the case." After taking two to three weeks to resolve the conflict stemming from the interpretation of the grant requirements, the group turned its attention to resolving the conflict of what to include in the grant proposal.

Upon receipt of the Sebastian grant announcement, PSU's initial reaction was to base the grant proposal on a previously discussed and desired initiative which entailed the building of new campus facilities on an unoccupied parcel of university land. In a document sent from PSU's President accepting Sebastian's RFP invitation, it was outlined that this plot of land and new building would be an extension of campus called Palm North. Conflict ensued when some committee members believed that this plan did not fit what Sebastian was looking for in its winning grants. Participant A indicated that "the friction was centered on what should be done with the money and how they aligned with both what Sebastian was looking for and what the university wanted to achieve." Participant D stated that there were "people that wanted to write

the grant that they wanted, based on what they wanted, not based on what the granting agency wanted." PSU's desire to force their previously established plan into the newly announced grant initiative resulted in conflict that was eventually resolved after, according to Participant A, "many months of effort and a lot of other people weighing in." The continual conversations among the university unit representatives, which included revisiting previously discussed options and funding priorities, were a component of the five-month process that ultimately contributed to the stalled efforts. However, it was this open sharing of ideas among group members that allowed the university units to eventually agree on the best course of action for the initiative and provide the Ibis Institute with the information necessary to compose the final proposal.

When considering the group process and the individuals within the group, one could reasonably assume that personalities and/or previous relationships became a part of the group interaction. While participants were willing to provide information on interactions where conflict was not present, few were willing to admit to relationship conflict between university units or individuals. Despite this, I was able to learn that relationship conflict was indeed present. One participant eventually disclosed that there was a major conflict between the Office of Technology Development Office and the College of Business regarding what the proposal should entail. According to the participant, this conflict was fueled by friction that was present from a previous initiative in which the two units collaborated. This conflict was validated by another participant who highlighted that the Office of Technology Development Office was viewed as being irrelevant to the initiative by the College of Business while the College of Business was viewed by Office of Technology Development as just wanting to be in charge. Conflict was also identified between Dr. Smith and a professor (called Mr. Spoon for the purpose of this study). The participant noted that this personality conflict was ongoing and resulted in Mr. Spoon

becoming a "rogue" as time went on. Another participant verified this conflict and added that Mr. Spoon's going rogue entailed his developing a separate advisory board for his program despite its being a part of the Sebastian funding umbrella. While no other specific personality conflicts were detailed, there was evidence of how egos were sometimes the driver of political conflicts.

Politics

"Everyone wants to be in charge" was a sentiment shared by Participant D that best summarizes the tone of the politics in evidence in this study. Several participants mentioned that there was a "lot of maneuvering" and "negotiating." This desire to be in charge became even more prevalent as the initiative continued with the predominant question being who would get the credit and who would really benefit. Participant A noted that "there was a lot of jockeying for ownership of the process." This was substantiated in a comment made by Participant N, who indicated that when universities compete for grants "there is [sic] a lot of politics about who gets to be in it." In addition to the politics of ownership, there were also politics associated with leadership of the process.

Once the Ibis Institute, and thereby Dr. Smith, was named the manager of the group process, the politics involved took on less of a jockeying for ownership and became more centered on how Dr. Smith utilized politics to effectively manage the process. Dr. Smith's acceptance by the group to serve in the leadership role was rooted in his political prowess. Participant H indicated that Dr. Smith had a skill for knowing "what incentives were required to really get people" to participate, because "no one ever said no to Harry." Participant H also indicated that Dr. Smith ensured the provision of "resources to support the work that he was asking them to do" and he would engage in a bit of "negotiation about what will it take" for

participation. These negotiations sometimes resulted in a giving of resources and administrative support. This ability of Dr. Smith's to negotiate appears to be frequently utilized as data collected from e-mail correspondences indicate that faculty members were "likely to be very unenthusiastic" about participating if "substantial, new and additional resources" were not provided. Participant G confirms that this quid pro quo technique was utilized by many individuals to secure various desires.

Competition

The primary source of competition associated with the case was between university units jockeying for grant funds. While some participants were not able to recall many details associated with the case, most were able to recall the exact amount of the grant award. The five million dollar award was significant in generating interest from university units and according to Participant A, caused "greed" to become evident as "people were looking at dollar signs." This greed was illustrated in a number of ways, including individuals having "sharp elbows" during group meetings, meaning that group members were exhibiting territorial behaviors in an effort to procure funding for their particular unit. Participant J explained that there was a concern about "who was going to get most of the money" and which university unit would have the lion's share. Most units asked "for all of the money" according to Participant D and were not overly concerned about working collaboratively in the financial aspect. This competition over funding was resolved once university units learned of the 2 to 1 matching requirement, which stipulated that all units receiving funding would be required to match said funds received.

Superordinate Goal

One theme that emerged from the interview data was the significance of a superordinate goal. A few participants mentioned the importance of a superordinate goal either while

answering interview questions or as additional information shared with me at the conclusion of the interview. Participants shared the belief that in order for institutions to be successful at achieving initiatives that require cross-campus collaboration, there must be a unifying goal under which everyone can rally. Participant A stated that sharing a "common goal, doing what's right for the institution…..is important." Participant D described the idea of having a "shared ethos" as the guiding principle that gets "everybody aligned." This shared ethos should be more than objectives of what will be done, but rather an in-depth understanding of "why you are doing it." Participant L called it a "roadmap" which serves as an overarching vision of "where you are headed and a strategy to get you there." This is said to be unifying because, in a loosely coupled organization with several moving parts and a variety of roles, the roadmap enables everyone to "see how I fit into this or what role I'm playing fits in with our overall objective as an organization" while also limiting the "chaos and confusion." The Sebastian grant was said to provide this for the university.

At PSU, the superordinate goal was to secure funds from the Sebastian grant to improve an already thriving university. Participant I indicated that securing the grant was "really important for us to do" and everyone "saw it as an opportunity to strengthen in" the area of entrepreneurship. Other participants also indicated that acquisition of the grant would help improve and/or strengthen the ecosystem of the university and the state. Participant J highlighted that the grant would "improve all three missions of the university: teaching, research, and public service." Archived documents reflected an interest in PSU partnering with sister institutions across the state to strengthen entrepreneurial principles.

Summary

The top five themes that were found to be significant in the study were Group Processes and Performance, Collaborative Processes, Commitment, Conflict and Superordinate Goal. The data also revealed the sub-themes of Leadership of the Group Process, Senior Leadership Commitment, Politics, and Competition. These findings provide a substantial basis upon which inferences and implications can be made.

CHAPTER 5: DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

This study sought to answer one primary question: how do higher education institutions, with their various colleges and departments, collaborate to achieve overarching university-wide goals? The challenge in supplying an answer to this question lies in the fact that it can be difficult to measure collaboration or, more specifically, to determine what variables are significant in understanding collaborative action among loosely coupled university units. This challenge is poignantly framed in the Palm State University Sebastian grant case, the center of analysis in this study.

Overview of Study

Given the fact that collaboration is largely enacted between the individuals that comprise an institution, group dynamics was chosen as the theoretical framework to aid in providing structure and a base upon which to develop the study. Group dynamics overlaps disciplines such as social psychology, sociology, and psychiatry. It also explicates the ways and means of group activity through several variables such as group formation, group cohesion, group think, group processes and performance, and group conflict. Literature indicates that groups are a common practice of everyday life and are evident in families, business, and educational settings (Johnson & Johnson, 1987). However, while the majority of human problem solving takes place in a group setting (Chizhik, Shelly, & Troyer, 2009), the group's ability to successfully solve problems and achieve specific goals is heavily dependent on how well the group members can work together and collaborate (Ruben 1995).

While groups are indeed present in the academy, Kezar and Lester (2009) highlight that collaboration is not a prevalent practice in the academy. This is largely because higher education institutions are complex systems with various interdependent components that have established

individual goals, initiatives, and missions. Additionally, departmental silos and bureaucratic and/or hierarchical structures can sometimes inhibit the flow of communication across the institution, thus making collaboration difficult (Ruben, 1995). Despite this reluctance to collaborate, literature highlights the various benefits of collaboration, including the pooling of waning resources and an improvement in knowledge creation, student learning, and organization functioning (Kezar & Lester, 2009). Additionally, government agencies, accreditation agencies, and various foundations are mandating that higher education institutions engage in collaborative efforts due to the many cited benefits of collaboration, including improved student learning and matriculation, enhanced economic development , and the ability to pool resources that may be waning (Eddy, 2010). Given this increasing necessity of collaboration in higher education today, it would behoove higher education institutions to understand how their many university units engage in collaborative action in the achievement of institutional goals.

While research that examines collaboration in the academy is limited, a few studies that investigate collaboration include Kim and Ju (2008), who found that collaborative knowledge sharing among full-time faculty at higher education institutions is influenced by faculty perceptions toward collaborative knowledge sharing and the reward structures in place for engaging in collaborative knowledge sharing. Chu (1995) highlights that successful collaboration among individuals from different subunits in a loosely coupled system requires a common understanding of the purpose for collaboration. Coleman and Bandyopadhyay (2011) found that faculty and student efforts to collaborate are increasing, as well as faculty openness to collaborating with others from different disciplines. In an effort to continue to supply data to this line of inquiry, this study utilized a qualitative case study methodology which examined the efforts of a large research university's acquisition of a competitive grant. The grant, which

stipulated that the university display a cross-campus approach to the initiative, provided an opportunity to examine how a research university employed collaborative action to successfully acquire this competitive grant. Data were collected via participant interviews, documents, archived records, and direct observation. Data were analyzed utilizing the constant comparative analysis, and a priori codes and emergent codes were utilized to help identify and organize the data collected.

I found that the top five themes significant to pan-university goal attainment are group performance and process, collaborative processes, commitment, conflict, and having a superordinate goal. Group performance and process describes the day to day actions taken by the group to move the project forward to completion. This theme seemed most significant to successful goal attainment because of its congruence with previous literature on group dynamics and collaboration in higher education, as well as the fact that more data were coded for this theme than any other. In addition, a sub-theme, leadership of the group process, also emerged from the data. Significant amounts of data highlighted that the decisions, style, and effectiveness of the group leader significantly impacted the overall success of the initiative. Collaborative processes were identified as the second factor significant to successful goal attainment. This theme included data that revealed how the group members, who represented the various units on campus, worked together to achieve the institution-wide goal. Data revealed that having a culture of collaboration on campus can make the attainment of pan-university goals more probable. Next, commitment was identified as significant to goal attainment. This theme presented in the data in several ways, including university commitment, individual commitment, departmental commitment, and commitment to maintaining programs. The commitment of senior leadership

was a sub-theme that emerged from the data which highlighted that having the commitment of senior leadership is vital to the success of an initiative.

Despite mild difficulties in getting participants to openly acknowledge instances of conflict, data revealed that conflict was indeed present in group processes, both between individuals of the group and between some departments represented in the group. Two sub-themes that presented in the data as being sources of conflict were politics and competition. I found that group members were able to effectively manage conflict so that it did not impede goal attainment. Lastly, the existence of a superordinate goal emerged from the data as being significant to the success of a cross-campus initiative. Having a superordinate goal was identified as being necessary for getting all of the varied university components aligned and eliminating any chaos and confusion, making goal achievement possible.

Discussion

This study is a starting point to providing data that explains how collaboration happens on a college campus. The findings of this study reveal that group performance and process, collaborative processes, commitment, conflict and a superordinate goal all influence pan-university collaboration in the loosely coupled academy.

Group Process

Group processes were found to impact group performance. When the processes of a group were insufficient or lacking in some way, the group struggled to achieve the intended goal. In this study, one major indicator of this was the inability of the group to move from discussing what should be done to actually doing what was discussed. The processes were likened to a hamster wheel that, while continually circulating around the topic, never moved the group forward in its performance. Literature indicates that this arrested momentum could be due to

insufficient communication (Wheelan, 1994), failure to contract the expectations of group members (Ephross & Vassil, 2005), and the task environment (Collins & Guetzkow, 1964). However, this study found that the group's communication was uninhibited, occurred frequently, and was conducted in a manner that exuded respect. Responsibilities were delineated early on at the start of the initiative, and the campus environment was described as one that promoted collaborative work. Nevertheless, group performance still suffered, and for reasons not initially discovered in the literature.

Part of the stalled group performance was due to some of the dissonance that was evident in the group discussions. One point of dissonance was due to the fact that PSU faculty and administrators were divided along the lines of whether or not a research institution should pursue an entrepreneurial grant. While many believed that the Sebastian Entrepreneurial grant would be a tremendous opportunity for PSU, many also believed that entrepreneurship as an academic pursuit was not an appropriate direction for PSU. This dissonance influenced the manner by which the group proceeded toward acquiring the grant. Some of the aforementioned circulating around the topic was due in part to various university unit representatives' discussion of how entrepreneurship applied to their college, majors, etc. and whether or not the initiative was something the unit was able to support. Among those who were not convinced of the appropriateness of the grant, the focus of the discussions was on whether or not the Sebastian grant would be applicable to their fields of study. Parallel to these discussions were conversations regarding what the proposal for the grant should include.

Among those who supported the grant, the focus of the discussions was on what to include in the grant proposal. Interview data reveal that many of the university unit representatives had their own ideas about what they wanted to do with the grant funds, despite

the fact that the Sebastian Education Foundation put forth some very specific directives as to the grant goals. In addition to outlining specific goals for the grant initiative, the Sebastian RFP also highlighted four very specific components of the proposal. Initial responses were to take a previous PSU goal, which was to expand the campus onto an unused parcel of land, and utilize the Sebastian grant funds to accomplish this goal. While some group members were in favor of this direction, others believed that a competitive proposal would be more comprehensive than erecting a new building on campus. Nonetheless, defining what this comprehensive proposal would look like with regard to implementation on campus required extensive discussion as well. One participant likened these points of dissonance to a battle, while another described it as a back and forth process. While these accounts depict a failed process, one could challenge whether or not the process failed as opposed to evolved.

Interview data categorize the group process, prior to the introduction of the Ibis Institute as the third party mediator, as a disorganized mess marked by a cacophony of voices around the table. Interview participants detailed instances of withdrawing from the process or refraining from the process altogether because of the perceived chaos. However, it could be that the perceived chaos was a necessary component of the process to achieve goal attainment. Furthermore, this process could have been perceived as chaotic merely because it was not as simple and quick as some would have preferred. I submit that while the data supports that the process prior to the introduction of the Ibis Institute was disorderly, this disorder created by the differing opinions was necessary for the success of the overall process. If the discord over whether or not to seek the grant, to build on the unused parcel of land, or to seek more comprehensive entrepreneurship implementation strategies would not have happened, some of the rich details that made the initiative successful may have been lost. While dissonance can

sometimes make for an uncomfortable or lengthy group process, the discussion that ensues from this dissonance can create the many ideas that serve to construct the overall final product. In this case, the final product was the successful acquisition of the Sebastian Entrepreneurial grant.

Another contributor to the group performance was the inclusion of a manager for the process. The PSU Sebastian grant steering committee was composed of individuals who represented various university units. Under the leadership of the President's Office, the group was to work collaboratively to generate a compelling grant proposal; however, no one was identified as the leader to pull together the ideas of the many group members into one comprehensive and succinct proposal. The group found it difficult to move the initiative forward and eventually stalled completely. With mere days left until the deadline, the Vice President for Research realized that the group performance suffered as they did not have a compelling proposal drafted. This led to a change in the group process via the introduction of the Ibis Institute as the third party mediator charged with writing the proposal.

Ellemers, De Gilder and Haslam (2004) highlighted the importance of identifying a leader for group process, with the thought being that leaders manage the process by energizing, directing, and sustaining the work related efforts that inspire others to act. In agreement with research, the findings of this study indicate group process leadership as being critical to successful collaborative group work. With the appointment of the Ibis Institute and its Director, Dr. Smith, the group was better able to put momentum behind the many options discussed to generate a competitive proposal. Dr. Smith was able to provide direction to the group's efforts while honoring many stakeholder's interests in the final proposal product. Interview data revealed that the Ibis Institute and Dr. Smith were viewed by constituents as a manager and leader of the process. Dr. Smith was also touted by his colleagues as being the ideal candidate for

the role due to his connection to faculty and previous leadership experience. Though Dr. Smith was celebrated by interview participants as the reason PSU was successful in its acquisition of the Sebastian grant, this creates contradictions with other facts in evidence. It also contradicts much of the leadership theory over the last century. While the role of the Ibis Institute and Dr. Smith were indeed important, attributing the success of the initiative in its entirety to one individual is reflective of the (now largely discredited) "great man theory" of leadership. The great man theory of leadership highlights that the most effective groups are those led by an all-around leader, with the implication being that organizational performance is determined by one individual (Borgatta, Bales, & Couch, 1954). Dr. Smith is viewed by participants as the great man who "saved" the disorganized and stalled Sebastian grant initiative. However, it appears from the evidence that Dr. Smith utilized his experience, skill, and knowledge to take the many suggestions of the larger group and weave them together into a comprehensive and competitive proposal that reflected the interested of all constituents. His actions, while indeed great in many respects, would not have been possible if not for the preceding actions of the group members.

Collaborative Processes

This study found the collaborative processes of PSU to be significant in successfully achieving cross-campus initiatives. Several participants lauded PSU's campus culture of collaboration. Collaboration was evident in many ways, including the wide scale inclusion of others, a sharing of the work load, and verbal and written support during the grant acquisition process. However, data also revealed that this collaboration was limited primarily to the academic affairs division on campus. The involvement of student affairs and enrollment services were not evident in the data. Additionally, interview data revealed a dissonance between this presentation of a very collaborative process where everyone worked together and a process that

was rife with “sharp elbows,” jockeying for ownership, and negotiating for the lion’s share of the grant funds. Participants often depicted a process that was highly collaborative, where every decision or point of discussion had PSU at its core. Contrary to this are the accounts of a few participants who openly admitted to some individuals who attended meetings with the aim of securing funds for their unit or posturing for ownership of the initiative. Lastly, data reflected that a motivation for collaboration for some may have been rooted in the anticipated return on investment. Interview data hinted at the notion that some individuals considered whether or not the investment of their time working on the initiative would be adequately rewarded. Some individuals determined that the ends outweighed the means and remained engaged with the project, while others withdrew from the initiative. While those involved in the Sebastian initiative absolutely engaged in collaborative action, it seems that participant accounts of this collaboration may have been presented with a slightly rosy hue. This shining account of collaboration may be due to a desire to present PSU and the initiative in the best possible light, or it may be due to the fact that the case is over ten years old and memories about the less savory aspects have faded, leaving only the pleasing moments in their wake. Nevertheless, the collaboration was not perfect, nor was it all- inclusive of everyone on campus; however, it was executed in a unique manner that was effective for PSU.

PSU’s methods of collaboration were found to include a silo working style. One does not typically pair silos with collaboration, as collaboration often evokes the perception of inclusion and equality. However, this study found that silo working styles can be beneficial to collaborative goal attainment. Prior to Dr. Smith and his team leading the proposal writing process, the group was unable to democratically put together one cohesive and competitive document that reflected the needs and wants of the entire group. It was necessary for Dr. Smith,

charged by the university's senior leaders, to take the proposal out of the democratic hands of the group and compose the final document with a select few. While the document reflected the collaborative ideas of the larger group, the final proposal was the product of a silo working group. This highlights that sometimes, collaborative processes can necessitate periods of inclusion as well as periods of seclusion. Collaboration does not necessarily require the inclusion of everyone at all times in order to render successful results. Conversely, collaborative efforts can fluidly move between the two contradicting methodologies of inclusion and seclusion to produce successful results.

When considering collaboration, attention was immediately given to the collaborative process of PSU university units; however, a form of collaboration was also evident between PSU and the Sebastian Foundation. In a letter from the PSU President to the Sebastian President accepting the RFP invitation, the PSU President indicated a commitment to "partnering" with Sebastian. This letter also provided Sebastian with an open invitation to "join" PSU in the "defining, launching and assessment" of the various initiatives developed should PSU win the grant. This highlights that while Sebastian was the granting agency, there was also a desire of PSU to collaborate with Sebastian that went beyond the awarding of funds. This brings to the forefront the notion of granting agencies as collaborators and how their mission, policies, and practices may or may not align with that of the institution seeking grant funds. For PSU, there was considerable discussion on whether or not the Sebastian Entrepreneurial grant was an appropriate direction for a research university. Ultimately, the grant thrived at PSU as well as a relationship between PSU and Sebastian that was evident via PSU's work with Sebastian as a mentor to other Sebastian grant-seeking institutions. However, this may not be the case between other institutions and granting agencies. One could question whether some institutions that were

not successful at acquiring the Sebastian grant encountered unresolvable dissonance between their mission and Sebastian's. The notion of granting agencies as collaborators is one that institutions should consider when seeking grant funding.

Commitment

Commitment was an emergent theme that was not originally identified during the review of the literature. While a review of the literature did reveal evidence of group cohesiveness and its impacts on group productivity (Shaw, 1976), commitment was found to be slightly different than cohesion. Commitment was identified in the study as being more than the glue that kept the group members engaged with one another. It was the binding force that kept the university as a whole in pursuit of the grant, despite the stagnating process. Commitment moved beyond how the various members felt about the group, the work and even the initiative being pursued. Rather, it propelled the university toward success despite mixed emotions, and in some instances a lack of cohesion. Commitment to the grant acquisition initiative was evident at all levels of the university, including faculty, staff, administrators, and individual departments. Data collected from participant interviews reflect a deep commitment to PSU that transcends the individual and the individual department and/or college. This commitment was the foundation for any cohesion that was present during the collaborative processes. This deeply rooted commitment to PSU may also aid in understanding the campus culture of collaboration and why faculty, staff, and administrators depart their silos with relative ease. Commitment at all levels of the university was significant to institutional success; however, the most critical level of commitment was that of the senior leadership.

Commitment of senior leadership to the grant initiative was a critical element that impacted PSU's successful acquisition of funds. The commitment of the President to the

initiative was a criterion upon which the Sebastian Education Foundation evaluated submitted proposals. The prevailing thought held by the Sebastian Education Foundation was that a cross-campus initiative would not succeed at a university if the senior leadership of said university did not deem the initiative a priority. This brings to bear the notion that when considering where to bequeath monies, external funding agencies may link an institution's viability to achieve agency goals with the demonstrated commitment of the university president and his/her demonstrated authority over the initiative's process. Data collected from documents and during participant interviews reveals that the PSU grant proposal impressed the Sebastian Education Foundation officials with its comprehensive cross-campus collaborative approach that was spearheaded by the university's senior leadership, including the President. Additionally, data collected from Sebastian indicated that institutions that lacked the support of their senior leadership were unsuccessful at submitting compelling proposals that won grand funds. The significance of the President's role may also be linked to the symbolism of the position.

Bolman and Deal (2003) indicate that symbolism, often communicated via an institution's stories, ceremonies, heroes, and heroines, operates under the core assumption that importance lies in what an action means and not in the action itself, while processes are more important for what is expressed than what is produced. University presidents can also be the personification of a symbol, serving as the personified symbol of the institution and/or a particular message (Tierney, 1989). According to Peters (1978), when "getting things done" the symbols utilized by senior management are the tools that influence change. The President was indeed important to the success of the Sebastian grant initiative as his leadership, and the leadership of his designees, aided in the identification of the group's difficulty in composing a competitive proposal and the appointing of the Ibis Institute to facilitate the groups progress.

However, a portion of his importance was undoubtedly rooted in the symbolism of having the President involved. His presence as the iconic leader of PSU sent the message of strength, commitment, and unity to the Sebastian Education Foundation and the PSU community. His involvement at the September 2003 meeting at PSU and the final proposal presentation at the Sebastian Education Foundation headquarters likely included a bit of ceremony and pageantry that punctuated the significance of those proceedings. This in no way minimizes the data which reveal that the President maintained a firm grip on the pulse of PSU's progress, which ultimately led the university in successfully winning the Sebastian grant. Actually, it serves to add another dimension to the President's involvement that goes beyond his actions and highlights the symbolic meaning of said actions.

Conflict

Conflict was identified during the literature review as impacting collaborative goal attainment (Jehn, 1995). Though conflict, stemming from tensions that emerge during group interactions (Forsyth, 1983), is common among groups, Amson, Thompson, Hochwarter and Harrison (1995) identified that effective groups know how to manage conflict. Given this, the presence of conflict in this study was neither surprising nor unexpected. It was also unsurprising that many participants were reluctant to speak about the presence of conflict. This reluctance appeared to be rooted in the perception that conflict is negative, whereas conflict-free interactions are positive. In most cases, participants chose to focus on what they deemed to be the positives of the initiative and answered questions about conflict with information about the collaborative efforts of the group. However, after several attempts to gather data from participants regarding the presence of conflict, attempts which included re-assuring participant anonymity, avoiding using the term "conflict", and asking conflict-centered questions several

times throughout the interview, data were eventually uncovered that detailed the conflict and its sources.

One source of conflict was found in the attempts to convince faculty to participate in the entrepreneurship grant initiative. The differences in opinion regarding the appropriateness of a research university engaging in activities that were outside the traditional scope of the academy resulted in conflict. This conflict, according to participant interviews, was displayed during discussions about the initiative's implementation on campus. The conflict was resolved via Dr. Smith building on his relationships with faculty to garner support for the initiative. He also utilized negotiation strategies such as quid pro quo to gain buy-in. However, prior to this resolution, the conflict may have also included a bit of pressuring of those for the initiative toward those that were against the initiative.

Winston Churchill is noted as saying that "history is written by the victors," while James Loewen challenged the history as conveyed by textbooks to be skewed in favor of the victor (Jetty & Loewen, 2006). The data for this study were partially collected from participant accounts, each of which indicated having a favorable view of the Sebastian initiative. It would be prudent to take into account the fact that the story as constructed by the participants may have left out details from the vantage point of those who were opposed to the Sebastian initiative. Additionally, when asking participants to provide the names of others who were involved in the initiative for the purpose of inviting these individuals to participate in this study, it would be prudent to consider that participants may have only provided the names of those that were on their same side of the argument. While document and archived records did not provide any indication of conflict between the two opposing thoughts, if additional time and researcher manpower were available for the identification of individuals that were against the initiative, and

the collection of data from these individuals, it would provide another vantage point of the case and the conflict that ensued.

Another source of conflict had nothing to do with the university itself but rather stemmed from the Sebastian Education Foundation RFP. The phrasing of the RFP speaking specifically to the role of the College of Business in the grant acquisition process caused sufficient confusion that resulted in a bit of animosity between the College of Business and the other participating departments. As one participant indicated, it created an environment that was very much College of Business vs. non-College of Business. Tajfel (1974) indicates that this intergroup behavior of an ingroup and outgroup is rooted in the ingroup members acquiring a sense of belonging to their "superior" group, which is distinctly different from the outgroup they perceive as a threat. Data also indicated that this was not unique to PSU as other institutions that sought the Sebastian grant also encountered similar conflict surrounding the interpretation of the RFP. This highlights again that the presence of conflict is not always predicated within the university or rooted in intergroup/intragroup factors. Nevertheless, there were instances when conflict was rooted in some of the classic factors such as competition and politics.

Review of the literature revealed that competition is a common source of conflict in groups (Verderber, 1982), as group members can become preoccupied with the notion of winning (Forsyth, 1983). Conflict often stemming from competition over scarce resources and a desire to obtain a lion's share of the limited resources is often evident in any number of group interactions. Data from this study supports this theory, as competition was the primary source of conflict evident. Greed, sharp elbows, and asking for all of the money were a few of the adjectives utilized by participants to describe the group interactions. One interesting point realized during data collection is that while many participants spoke of a memory lapse regarding

the details of the case, specifically where conflict was concerned, each of them remembered with perfect clarity the amount of the grant funds. To get exact dates, timeline data and composites of participation required the comparison of interview data against documents and archived records. However, the exact amount of the grant award was spot on for every participant and required no additional comparison to get exact amounts (though it was compared to grant award documents for verification). This suggests that the resources were indeed a point of contention that was the focus for a number of people, thus resulting in competitive conflict.

Politics were also identified as a source of conflict for PSU that stemmed mostly from competition because everyone wanted to be in charge of the initiative. Participants utilized adjectives such as jockeying, maneuvering, and negotiating to describe the interactions of group members when trying to determine who got to be a part of the initiative and who took ownership of the initiative (with ownership being directly linked to who received the bulk of the grant funds). Ironically, Dr. Smith, the individual selected to lead the initiative, was cited as having a political prowess that had nothing to do with a desire to own the initiative but rather a skill at utilizing political tactics such as quid pro quo to accomplish the intended goal. This form of politics did not result in conflict but rather resulted in successfully accomplishing the goal. This highlights that politics, when utilized in an overbearing manner with self-serving intentions, can be a source of conflict. However, if utilized as a tool to manage a group process and garner support among constituents, it can result in successful collaborative action to achieve a common goal.

Superordinate Goal

The final theme significant to successful collaboration is the presence of a superordinate goal. Review of the literature indicates that superordinate goals, goals that are only achievable

via teamwork, aid groups in putting aside previous disagreements to combine efforts in achievement of the stated goal (Forsyth, 1983). Data from the study support this theory, as the Sebastian grant was a superordinate goal that was only achievable via the multiple units of PSU working together. This goal aligned the various university units around one institutional initiative while also providing an in-depth understanding of how the roles of each unit fit into the overall bigger picture. Additionally, the superordinate goal aided two sparring departments to put aside previous disagreements to work together again.

Interview data revealed that the Office of Technology Development Department and the College of Business came to this initiative with a healthy wariness of each other that derived from previous interactions which resulted in each unit maintaining a preference to not work with the other on any future initiatives. While details into the previous disagreements were not provided, data revealed that the reluctance to collaborate extended to the Sebastian grant. Many of the interactions regarding the Sebastian grant were conducted through guarded conversations, skepticism regarding ulterior motives, and a remembrance of past interactions. However, while each was able to put aside their previous disagreements to work on the grant acquisition initiative, the suspicion did not dissipate until the grant proceedings were well underway. This highlights that the presence of a superordinate goal can aid in the dissolution of previous disagreements and serve as a unifying factor; however, it is not a quick fix, as its presence does not guarantee immediate results. In addition to a superordinate goal, time and a rebuilding of trust are key elements that aid units in traversing previous differences that impede collaborate.

Implications for Future Practice

Institutions of higher education are complex systems with several loosely coupled units that have their own missions, visions, and goals. Given this, cross-campus collaboration is not

always easily achieved on a college campus. One of the primary difficulties when attempting pan-university initiatives is the lack of knowledge regarding how collaboration is executed on a college campus and/or the components that comprise successful collaborative efforts. The findings of this study provide data that can aid institutions in engaging their loosely coupled units in collaborative action in the achievement of institution- wide goals.

Diamond and Rush (2012) found that intra-organizational collaboration is not a linear process but rather multi-layered and multi-faceted, with unclear starting and finishing points. Florczak and Bunting (2012) highlight that the frame of reference for each academic professional can differ greatly and has the potential to create boundaries in collaboration between these academic groups. Ruben (1995) indicated that the more integrated an institution's facilitation of cross-functional and/or cross-divisional collaboration, the better an institution will be at improving the alignment of individual units with the institutional mission and improving overall quality. These studies serve to highlight the fact that collaboration in the academy is a phenomenon that varies according to the conditions under which the collaboration is taking place. Given this, a one-size model to collaboration may be unsuccessful at capturing all of the many factors that higher education institutions encounter during collaborative processes.

The finding of this study which highlights the effectiveness of a silo approach to collaboration suggests that institutions should rethink their modes of collaboration. Faculty, staff and administrators should seek to understand what works for their particular campus and place more of the focus on identifying ways to motivate their campus constituency toward collaboration rather than adhering to a prescribed collaborative method. This also includes understanding that the mode of collaboration that was utilized during a previous initiative may not be appropriate for the current initiative. This study provides five themes that serve as the

bases for a tentative model of collaboration that can be tailored to a specific campus's needs. Institutions that are interested in pan-university collaboration may want to consider the five themes of this tentative tailorable model of collaboration. These areas, group process and performance, collaborative processes, commitment, conflict, and a superordinate goals should be specific to the institution and adjusted, monitored, and executed in a manner that aligns with the institutional mission and goal of the pan-university initiative.

This customized approach requires universities to consider the process and the performance of the group that is engaged in the collaborative initiative. Institutions should be deliberate in their decisions about the composition of the group, the leadership of the group, clearly defining the work that will be conducted by the group, and delineation of the roles/responsibilities of the group members/unit representatives. These are the foundational elements that will define much of the work that will be done, define how the work will be conducted, and determine how the group will perform. According to Mena, Humphries, and Wilding (2009), belonging to the same organization and having common ownership within said organization does not result in close collaboration. This supports the notion that effective collaboration does not always happen as an off-shoot, byproduct, or automated response to working together in groups. It is not brought to fruition without intentional actions and conscientious effort. Given this, universities should outline their expectation for cross-campus collaboration and consider these foundational elements to optimally position the group for successful collaboration.

Customizing collaboration also suggests that institutions consider whether or not there is a culture of collaboration on its campus. If the campus culture is one that encourages an individualized approach to problem solving, individualized resource acquisition, and/or a reward

structure that focuses heavily on the individual, implementing collaboration on campus may be difficult. This is not to suggest that institutions should discard all methods of functioning where the individual, individual college, department, and so on, is the primary focus. However, institutions should ensure there is a balance between focusing on the individual and maintaining a focus on the individual as a component of the larger university. This would aid in imbuing the campus with a culture of collaboration and make cross-campus collaborative efforts easier to accomplish.

A customized mode of collaboration also hinges on the role of senior leadership in collaborative efforts. For cross-campus collaboration to be successful, senior leadership, including the university president, should be committed to the initiative and any collaborative efforts taken to achieve said initiative. The findings of this study suggest that institutions would be hard pressed to achieve pan-university collaborative action if the heart of the impetus is rooted in an individual department. This is not to render it impossible; however, this study suggests that cross-campus collaborative efforts that stem from the central leadership office of the university may receive buy-in more readily than efforts stemming from individual units. This may be due to the message it sends to the campus and all constituents that collaboration is a priority for the university. Communication of this message should be more than a letter from the president stating his/her expectations, but include an active presence and involvement of the president, his or her designee, and other senior leaders of the university. The commitment of senior leadership is also critical to securing external funding for the university.

Institutions of higher education are increasingly becoming more reliant on external funding. Given this, it is important for institutions to heed this study's finding that the participation and commitment of senior leaders to an initiative can impact an institutions' ability

to acquire funds from external stakeholders. Hodson (2010) highlights that the university president is the "fundraiser-in-chief" because the ultimate responsibility for fundraising efforts, as well as the cultivation and solicitation of major gifts, is shouldered by the president. Miller (1991) indicates that the personal involvement of presidents in fundraising efforts is critical in bolstering the efforts of the university fundraising staff. Given this, it is believed that presidents should elevate the priority of fundraising to the same level of importance given to other presidential responsibilities (Hobson, 2010). Higher education funding agencies seek opportunities to invest in institutions that they feel would be the most successful at utilizing awarded funds to meet the intended goals. Finding the collaboration commitment of senior leadership significant to an institution's future funding aspiration elevates in priority the need to establish a mode of collaboration unique to the institution and its leadership.

While conflict may not be a desirable element of collaboration, it is a reality that should be anticipated. Remembering that conflict can result in positive outcomes, such as richer group discussions due to the varying vantage points, institutions should not attempt to squelch conflict in its collaborative processes. However, not preparing for and/or ignoring conflict will leave institutions vulnerable to its negative impacts. Strategies, such as containing the conflict only to the topic being discussed, maintaining respectful group interactions, and utilizing a third party mediator were found to be successful in diminishing conflict and aiding groups to proceed toward goal attainment. Institutions should develop customized strategies that best address conflict presented on their campus. By anticipating conflict and developing strategies for its management, institutions can mitigate any negative effects conflict may have on collaborative goal attainment.

Lastly, universities should have a superordinate goal that is clearly defined and communicated. A clearly defined and articulated superordinate goal requires university units to work together to achieve the goal and articulates how the university units, as well as the individuals, fit into the work being conducted. It also provides an outline of the work being conducted and the stages in the process, which reduces chaos and confusion. Given the fact that higher education institutions are one entity with several loosely coupled units, a superordinate goal that rallies all university units under one initiative is necessary to ensure concerted action.

University units often act as independent entities, each with separate pursuits and goals that may or may not link together. Given this, in addition to a superordinate goal, the group should also have a shared ethos. The shared ethos serves to rally the quasi-independent units under one common goal. This rallying effect could also happen in the reverse where the units, who have been given a common goal, come together and a shared ethos emerges as a result of the work being done to achieve the common goal. In either direction, a shared ethos aids in the achievement of a common goal among loosely coupled university units. The shared ethos ethically and emotionally connects the group to the university and each other, which can aid in reducing the focus on achieving unit goals in favor of achieving institutional goals.

Recommendations for Future Research

While this study aids in understanding how loosely coupled university units work collaboratively in the achievement of pan-university goals, it is one of the few studies to delve into this topic. Given this, additional research is necessary to further the understanding of cross-campus collaboration.

This study is a qualitative single case study that focused on an institution that was successful at employing cross-campus collaboration to acquire a competitive million dollar grant.

Future studies could employ a multi-case study design, which would allow data to be compared and contrasted across institutions. In the first iteration of the grant competition, thirty institutions, including PSU, were invited by the Sebastian Education Foundation to submit a RFP. This provides the opportunity to select additional institutions that can serve as case institutions. Additionally, eight universities were awarded the grant, but twenty-two universities were unsuccessful. In addition to including additional institutions for a multi-case study, there is also an opportunity to include institutions that were unsuccessful in grant acquisition. Twenty-two institutions were not successful in acquiring the million dollar grant; by including these institutions data could be collected that examines what differences exist between successful and unsuccessful institutions. Expansion of this study to include additional successful institutions and unsuccessful institutions would generate more comprehensive data that would inform institutions on what works as well as detrimental practices. This comprehensive information could aid institutions in ensuring successful results in cross-campus collaborative efforts.

Utilizing a mixed methods approach would also supply a richer context for the study. Particularly for the areas that participants were reluctant to discuss, such as conflict. By adding a survey component it may allow for additional data to be collected as participants may feel more comfortable providing certain types of data in an anonymous survey. For example, participants may be more willing to detail instances of conflict in a survey format than in an interview format. Even though interview participants are assured of their anonymity, being able to complete a survey that protects the participant's identity from the researcher may help in collecting data that participants may deem sensitive. This could result in the identification of additional factors related to collaborative goal attainment that was not found in this study.

This study put forth a customizable model that could aid institutions in collaborative endeavors. Future studies could investigate the effectiveness of this model via the examining institutions that have implemented this model on their campus. Additionally, each element of this model can be studied independently to determine if university faculty, staff and administrators respond to each element differently. This data would aid in identifying more methods by which this model can be customized to the institution.

Conclusion

This study sought to better understand collaboration in the loosely coupled academy, more specifically, how the various university units in a large research university work together to achieve an institutional wide goal. Institutions of higher education are traditionally decentralized organizations comprised of traditionally siloed colleges and departments, each with their own missions, visions, and goals. Nonetheless, the increased calls for accountability, the expectation for institutions to do more with less, and the inquiries into the rising cost of higher education in the U.S. now bring collaboration to the forefront as one solution to improving costs, quality and student achievement.

This study found that the five themes, group performance and process, collaborative processes, commitment, conflict, and having a superordinate goal, may aid institutions in customizing their approach to cross-campus collaboration in the achievement of pan-university goals. Additionally, this study found that collaboration can be enacted in a number of ways and can include periods of seclusion as well as inclusion. This highlights that the practice of collaboration on campus is not a one size fits all model but rather a dynamic process that involves an examination of the five themes, along with the institutional mission and goal of the pan-university initiative. Gaining a deeper understanding of this dynamic process can aid

institutions in the future achievement of pan-university goals as well as preparing for the future of higher education collaboration.

REFERENCES

Adams, H. (1973). *The academic tribes*. New York, NY: Liveright.

Almost, J., Doran, D. M., Hall, L. M., & Spence Laschinger, H.K. (2010). Antecedents and consequences of intra-group conflict among nurses. *Journal of Nursing Management, 18,* 981-992.

Amason, A. C., Thompson, K. R., Hockwarter, W. A., & Harrison, A. W. (1995). Conflict: An important dimension in successful management teams. *Organizational Dynamics, 24*(2), 20-35.

Auerbach, C. F., & Silverstein, L. B. (2003). *Qualitative data: An introduction to coding and analysis*. New York, NY: New York University Press.

Aurini, J. D. (2012). Patterns of tight and loose coupling in a competitive marketplace: The case of learning center franchises. *Sociology of Education, 85*(4), 373-387.

Barbieri, J. A. (2012). The structure of a team: The influence of goal setting type on intrinsic motivation, group cohesion and goal achievement orientation of division III female student-athletes at the Richard Stockton College of New Jersey. Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI 3543045)

Basham, L. M. (2010). Presidents as transformational or transactional leaders in higher education (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 3405819)

Bavelas, A. (1968). Communication patterns in task oriented groups. In Cartwright, D. & Zander, A. (Eds.), *Group dynamics: Research and theory* (3rd ed.). (pp. 192-198). New York, NY: Harper & Row Publishers.

Berent, S. (2004). Group cohesiveness. In Craighead, W. E. & Nemeroff, C.B. (Eds.), *The concise corsini encyclopedia of psychology and behavioral science* (3rd ed.). (pp. 412-413). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.

Bers, T. (2012). Surveys and benchmarks. *New Directions for Institutional Research, 153,* 33-48.

Bienen, H., & Boren, D. (2010). The financial crisis and the future of higher education. *Forum for the Future of Higher Education.* Retrieved from https://net.educause.edu/forum/ff10.asp

Birnbaum, R. (1988). *How colleges work: The cybernetics of academic organization and leadership.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.

Blake R. R., & Mouton, J. S. (1961). *Group dynamics: Key to decision making*. Houston, TX: Gulf Publishing Company.

Blanchard, L.S. (2013). Intragroup conflict: Its dimensions and effects on group effectiveness in science and engineering natural work groups (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 3558528)

Bleiklie, I. (2012). Collegiality and hierarchy: Coordinating principles in higher education. In Nelson, A. R. & Wei, I. P. (Eds.). *The global university: Past, present, and future perspectives.* (pp. 85-101). New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.

Boeije, H. (2002). A purposeful approach to the constant comparative method in the analysis of qualitative interviews. *Quality & Quality*, *36*, 391-409.

Bolman, L. G., & Deal, T. E. (2003). *Reframing organizations: Artistry, choice and leadership*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Bonner, H. (1959). *Group dynamics: Principles and applications*. New York, NY: The Ronald Press.

Borgatta, E. F., Bales, R. F., & Couch, A. S. (1954). Some findings relevant to the great man theory of leadership. *American Sociological Review, 19*(6), 755-759

Bradford, L. P. (1961). The case of the hidden agenda. In Bradford, L. P (Ed), *Group development.* (pp. 60-68). Washington, DC: National Training Laboratories National Education Association

Bradford, L. P., & Lippitt G. L. (1961). The individual counts in effective group relations. In Bradford, L. P (Ed.), *Group development*. (pp. 25-30). Washington, DC: National Training Laboratories National Education Association.

Brewer, M. B. (2007, November). The importance of being we: Human nature and intergroup relations. *American Psychologist, 62*(8), 728-735.

Buchko, R. D. (2013). Analyzing negotiated power relationships within a small software organization. (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 3610772)

Burton, Y. C. (2000). Understanding the significance of socially constructed conditions and business information exchanges in group task-goal dynamics (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI 9999039)

Cartwright, D. (1959) A field theoretical conception of power. In Cartwright, D. (Ed.) *Studies in social power*. (pp. 183-220). Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan.

Cartwright, D., & Zander, A. (1960). Group cohesiveness. In Cartwright, D., & Zander, A. (Eds.) *Group dynamics*. (pp 69-94). New York, NY: Harper & Row Publishers.

Chinn, M. N. (2013). Managing threats: Examining intra-organizational collaboration between academic and student affairs divisions (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI 3295507)

Chizhik, A. W., Shelly, R. K., & Troyer, L. (2009). Intragroup conflict and cooperation: An introduction. *Journal of Social Issues, 65*(2), 251-259.

Choi, J. N., & Kim, M. U. (1999). The organizational application of groupthink and its limitations in organizations. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 84*(2), 297-306.

Chu, F. T. (1995). Collaboration in a loosely coupled system: Librarian-faculty relations in collection development. *LISR, 17,* 135-150.

Cohen, N. & Arieli, T. (2011). Field research in conflict environments: methodological challenges and snowball sampling. *Journal of Peace Research, 48(4), 423-435*

Coleman, L. J., & Bandyopadhyay, J. (2011). Role of collaboration in higher education. *Competition Forum, 9*(2), 371-377.

Collins, B. E., & Guetzkow, H. (1964). *A social psychology of group processes for decision making.* New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (2003). *Strategies of qualitative inquiry*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Deutsch, M. (1960). The effects of cooperation and competition upon group process. In Cartwright, D., & Zander, A. (Eds.) *Group dynamics*. (pp 414-448). New York, NY: Harper & Row Publishers.

Diamond, J., & Rush, L. (2012). Intra-organizational collaboration in one UK university: Potential for change or missed opportunity. *International Journal of Public Sector Management, 25*(4), 287-300. http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/09513551211244115

Duderstadt, J. J. (2012). The future of the university: A perspective from the oort cloud. In Mack, A. (Ed.), The future of higher education. *Social research, 79*(3), 579-600.

Eddy, P. L. (2010). Partnerships and collaborations in higher education. *ASHE Higher Education Report, 36*(2), 1-11.

Ellemers, N., De Gilder, D., & Haslam, S. A. (2004). Motivating individuals and groups at work: A social identity perspective on leadership and group performance. *Academy of Management, 29*(3), 459-478

Ellis, D. G., & Fisher, B. A. (1994). *Small group decision making: Communication and the group process*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Ephross, P. H., & Vassil, T. V. (2005). *Groups that work* (2nd. ed.). New York, NY: Columbus University Press.

Falbo, T. (1977). Multidimensional scaling of power strategies. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 35*(8), 537-547.

Farrell, M. P. (2001). *Collaborative circles: Friendship dynamics and creative work*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.

Farrow III, R. B., & Kasarda, J. D. (2009). Developing a culture of entrepreneurship in the academy. In Knapp, J. C., & Siegel, D. J. (Eds.), *The business of higher education* (pp. 17-52). Santa Barbara, CA: Praeger Perspectives.

Fielder, F. E. (1967). *A theory of leadership effectiveness*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Florczak, K. L., & Buenting, J. A. (2012). Protecting the discipline: Loosely coupled systems. *Nursing Science Quarterly, 25*, DOI 10.1177/08943184124475636.

Forsyth, D. R. (1983). *An introduction to group dynamics*. Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole Publishing Company.

Fram, S. M. (2013). The constant comparative analysis method outside of grounded theory. *The Qualitative Report, 18*(1), 1-25.

French, J. R. P., & Raven, B. (1959). The bases of social power. In Cartwright, D. (Ed.) *Studies in social power*. (pp. 118-167). Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan.

Freud, S. (1922). *Group psychology and the analysis of the ego*. London: Hogarth.

Glaser, B. G. (1965). The constant comparative method of qualitative analysis. *Society for the Study of Social Problems, 12*(4), 436-445.

Glassman, R. B. (1973). Persistence and loose coupling in living systems. *Behavioral Science, 18*, 83-98.

Granada, K. L. (2003). The relationship of intragroup work group conflict to job satisfaction and perceived performance (Master's thesis). Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 1416497)

Gobo, G. (2004). Sampling, representativeness and generalizability. In Seale, C., Gobo, G., Gubrium, J. F., & Silverman, D. (Eds.), *Qualitative research practice* (pp. 435-456). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications Ltd.

Hallett, T., & Ventresca, M. J. (2006). How institutions form: Loose coupling as mechanism in Gouldner's patterns of industrial bureaucracy. *American Behavioral Scientist, 49*. DOI 10.1177/0002764205285171

Hamill, M. (2010, September). The long shadow of the recession. *National Association of College and University Business Officers.* Retrieved from http://www.nacubo.org/Business_Officer_Magazine/Magazine_Archives/September_2010/The_Long_Shadow_of_the_Recession.html

Heller, D. E. (2009). The context of higher education reform in the United States. *Higher Education Management and Policy, 21*(2).

Hewstone, M., Rubin, M., & Willis, H. (2002). Intergroup bias. *Annual Review of Psychology, 53*, 575-604.

Hodson, J. B. (2010). Leading the way: The role of presidents and academic deans in fundraising. *New Directions for Higher Education, 149,* 39-49

Horne, S. (1992). Organization and change within educational systems: Some implications for a loose coupling model. *Educational Management and Administration, 20*(2), 88-98.

Immerwahr, J., Johnson, J., & Gasbarra, P. (2008, October). The iron triangle: College presidents talk about cost, access and quality. Retrieved from http://highereducation.org/reports/iron_triangle/index.shtml

Janis, I. L. (1973). Groupthink and group dynamics: A social psychological analysis of defective policy decisions. *Policy Studies Journal, 2*(1), 19-25.

Jehn, K. A. (1995, June). A multimethod examination of the benefits and detriments of intragroup conflict. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 40*(2), 256-282.

Jenkins, D. H. (1961). What is group dynamics? In Bradford, L. P. (Ed.), *Group development*. (pp. 5-10). Washington, DC: National Training Laboratories National Education Association.

Jetty, M., & Loewen, J. (2006). History through red eyes: A conversation with James Loewen. *The Phi Delta Kappan, 88*(3), 218-222.

Johnson D. W., & Johnson F. P. (1987). *Joining together: Group theory and group skills* (3rd. ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall Inc.

Jones, E. E., & Lambertus, J. D. (2014, June 16). *Expecting less from groups: A new perspective on shortcoming in idea generation group. Group Dynamics: Theory, Research and Practice.* Advance online publication. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/gdn0000010

Kezar, A. J., & Lester, J. (2009). *Organizing higher education for collaboration: A guide for campus leaders.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Kim, S., & Ju, B. (2008). An analysis of faculty perceptions: Attitudes toward knowledge sharing and collaboration in an academic institution. *Library & Information Science Research*, *30*, 282-290.

Klein, D. B., & Stern, C. (2009). Groupthink in academia: Majoritarian departmental politics and the professional pyramid. *The Independent Review*, *13*(4), 585-600.

Lena, C. R. (1985). A partial test of Janis' groupthink model: Effects of group cohesiveness and leader behavior on defective decision making. *Journal of Management, 11*(1), 5-17.

Lewin, K. (1997). *Resolving social conflicts: Field theory in social science*. Washington, DC: American Psychology Association.

Libo, L. M. (1953, December). *Measuring group cohesiveness.* Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan.

Luft, J. (1970). *Group processes an introduction to group dynamics*. (2nd ed). Palo Alto, CA: National Press Books.

Lutz, F. W. (1982, December). Tightening up loose coupling in organizations of higher education. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 27*(4), 653-669

Mack, A. (Ed.). (2012). The future of higher education. *Social Research, 79*(3).

Mankovskii, S. (2009). Loose coupling. Encyclopedia of Database Systems, 1661-1662.

March, J. G. (1982). Emerging developments in study of organizations. *The Review of Higher Education*, *6*, 1-18.

Mena, C., Humphries, A., & Wilding, R. (2009). A comparison of inter-and intra-organizational relationships. *International Journal of Physical Distribution & Logistics Management, 39*(9), 762-784. http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/09600030911008193

Meyer, H. D. (2002). Introduction: From "loose coupling" to "tight management"? Making sense of the changing landscape in management and organization theory. *Journal of Education Administration, 40*(6), 515-520.

Meyer, H. D., & Rowan, B. (2006). *The new institutionalism in education*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Mierlo, H. V., & Kleingeld, A. (2010). Goals, strategies and group performance: Some limits of goal setting in groups. *Small Group Research, 41*(5), 524-555.

Miller, M. T. (1991). *The college president's role in fund raising*. Retrieved from http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED337099.pdf

Morgan, G. (2006). *Images of organization*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Napier, R. W., & Gershenfeld, M. K. (1987). *Groups theory and experience* (4th ed). Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin Company.

Newman, F., Couturier, L., & Scurry, J. (2004). *The future of higher education: Rhetoric, reality and the risks of the market*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Newton, J. D., Ewing, M. T., & Collier, P. M. (2014). Resolving contradictions in institutional demands through loose coupling. *Industrial Marketing Management, 43,* 747-753.

Norris, N. (1997). Error, bias and validity in qualitative research. *Education Action Research, 5*(1), 172-176.

Oliff, P., Palacios, V., Johnson, I., & Leachman, M. (2013, March). *Recent deep state higher education cuts may harm students and the economy for years to come*. Retrieved from http://www.cbpp.org/cms/?fa=view&id=3927

Orton, J. D., & Weick, K. E. (1990). Loosely coupled systems: A reconceptualization. *The Academy of Management Review, 15,* 203-223.

Patton, M. Q. (1990). *Qualitative evaluation and research methods*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Peters, T. J. (1978). Symbols, patters, and settings: an optimistic case for getting things done. *Organizational Dynamics, 7*(2), 3-23.

Pfeffer, J. (1992). *Managing with power: Politics and influence in organizations*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.

Richman, B. M., & Farmer, R. N. (1974). *Leadership, goals, and power in higher education*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Riege, A. M. (2003). Validity and reliability tests in case study research: A literature review with hands on applications for each research phase. *Qualitative Market Research: An International Journal, 6*(2), 75-86.

Ritchie, J., & Lewis, J. (2003) Generalizing from qualitative research. In Ritchie, J., & Lewis, J. (Eds.), *Qualitative research practice: A guide for social science students and researchers* (pp. 263-286). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications Ltd.

Robinson, S. L. (2002). Where do we go from here? An interpretivist perspective on dynamics of an executive group (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 3055114)

Ruben, B. D. (1995). The quality approach in higher education: Context and concepts for change. In Ruben, B. D. (Ed.), *Quality in higher education* (pp 1-36). New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.

Sabo, S. R. (2010, February). *All for one, one for all*. National Association of College and University Business Officers. Retrieved from http://www.nacubo.org/Business_Officer_Magazine/Magazine_Archives/February_2010/All_for_One_One_for_All.html

Schachter, S., Ellertson, N., McBride, D., & Gregory, D. (1968). An experimental study of cohesiveness and productivity. In Cartwright, D. & Zander, A. (Eds.), *Group dynamics: Research and theory* (3rd ed.). (pp. 192-198). New York, NY: Harper & Row Publishers.

Schlackman, J. M. (2002). The role of goal orientation in small-group behavior, productivity and student achievement (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI 3076583)

Schofield, J. W. (2002). Increasing the generalizability of qualitative research. In Huberman, A. M., & Miles, M. B. (Eds.), *The qualitative research companion* (pp. 171-203). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications Ltd.

Scott, K. W. (2004, March). Relating categories in grounded theory analysis: Using a conditional relationship guide and reflective coding matrix. *The Quality Report, 9*(1), 113-126.

Shaw, M. E. (1961). Group dynamics. *Annual Review of Psychology, 12*, 129-156.

Shaw, M. E. (1976). *Group dynamics: The psychology of small group behavior*. (2nd ed). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill Book Company.

Tajfel, H. (1974). Social identify and intergroup behavior. *Social Science Information, 13*(2), 65-93.

The National Center for Public Policy and Higher Education. (2009, March). Retrieved from http://www.highereducation.org/crosstalk/ct0309/Challenge_to_the_states.pdf

The National Center for Public Policy and Higher Education. (2010, February). Squeeze play 2010: Continued public anxiety on cost, harsher judgments on how colleges are run. Retrieved from http://www.highereducation.org/reports/squeeze_play_10/

The White House. (2015). *Education: Knowledge and skills for the jobs of the future*. Retrieved from http://www.whitehouse.gov/issues/education/higher-education

Tierney, W. G. (1989). Symbolism and presidential perceptions of leadership. *The Review of Higher Education, 12*(2), 153-166.

Turner, D. W. (2010). Qualitative interview design: A practical guide for novice investigators. *The qualitative report, 15*(3), 754-760.

University of Michigan. (2012). *Sharing space: Proximity breeds collaboration*. Retrieved from http://home.isr.umich.edu/releases/sharing-space-proximity-breeds-collaboration/

U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. (2012, July). Retrieved from http://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d12/tables/dt12_307.asp

Verderber, R. F. (1982). *Working together: Fundamentals of group decision making*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Company.

Weick, K. E. (1976). Educational organizations as loosely coupled systems. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 21*(1), 1-19.

Weick, K. E. (1982a). Administering education in loosely coupled schools. *The Phi Delta Kappan, 63*(10), 673-676

Weick, K. E. (1982b). Management of organizational change among loosely coupled elements. In Goodman, P. S. (Ed.) *Change in organizations*. (pp 375-407). San Francisco, CA; Jossey Bass.

Weick, K. E. (1983). Contradictions in a community of scholars: The cohesion-accuracy tradeoff. *The Review of Higher Education, 6*(4), 253-267

Wheelan, S. A. (1994). *Group processes: A development perspective*. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Whitney, K. (1994). Improving group task performance: The role of group goals and group efficacy. *Human Performance, 7*(1), 55-78.

Wilder, D., & Simon, A. F. (1998). Categorical and dynamic groups: Implications for social perception and intergroup behavior. In Sedikides, C., Schopler, J., & Insko, C.A. (Eds.) *Intergroup cognition and intergroup behavior*. (pp-27-44). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.

Woodruff, M. J. (1991). Understanding and combatting groupthink. *Supervisory Management, 36*(10), 8.

Worchel, S., Ferris, F., Samaha, G., Axsom, D., & Schweizer, S. (1978). Determinants of the effects of intergroup cooperation on intergroup attraction. *Journal of Conflict Resolution, 22*(3), 429-439.

Yin, R. K. (2003). *Applications of case study research* (Vol 34). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Yin, R. K. (2012). *Applications of case study research*. Los Angeles, CA: Sage Publications.

Yukl, G. A. (1981). *Leadership in organizations*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Zander, A. (1985). *The purpose of group and organizations*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Zander, A., Cohen, A. R., & Stotland, E. (1959). Power and the relations among professions. In Cartwright, D. (Ed.) *Studies in social power*. (pp-15-34). Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan.

Zumeta, W., Breneman, D. W., Callan, P. M., & Finney, J. E. (2012). *Financing American higher education in the era of globalization.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Press.

APPENDIX A: INTERVIEW PROTOCOL

1. How did the Sebastian grant arrive at Palm State University (PSU)?
    a. Was there a public announcement about the new grant, did someone from Sebastian contact PSU to notify about the new grant, or did someone from PSU contact Sebastian about the grant?
    b. Who was the person(s) that brought this grant to the university's attention?
    c. Whose idea was it to seek this grant? / How did the university decide to pursue this grant? (was it a one person decision, committee decision, voting, etc.)
    d. Aside from the economic/financial impetus, what motivated PSU to pursue this grant?

2. After the university decided to apply for the Sebastian grant, what were the initial next steps taken?
    a. How was it determined who would be on the steering committee/task force for the grant acquisition process?
    b. How did you become involved with this initiative and what was your role on the committee?
    c. Who were others on the committee?
    d. What were their roles at the university and on the committee?
    e. Not including members who worked in the same department, to the best of your knowledge had any of the members worked together on any other initiatives prior this one? If so, when/on what initiative?
    f. What about after this initiative? If so, when/on what initiative?
    g. What is your opinion of the committee composition with regard to cross campus representation?

3. Describe the nature of interactions between unit representatives/ committee members during the grant acquisition process.
    a. Explain how interactions looked in this group over time as member interaction(s) progressed.
    b. What descriptive word(s) would you use to define these interactions?
    c. Would you suggest a different combination of descriptive words to define early interactions verses later interactions? Why? (if applicable, what are the early interaction descriptors, what are the later interaction descriptors?).
    d. What role did collaboration/collaborative action play in the grant acquisition process?
    e. How did committee members/unit representatives contribute to collaborative efforts?
    f. How did committee members/unit representatives subtract from collaborative efforts?
    g. How did this contribution and/or subtraction effect the group achieving the stated goal(s)
    h. What role did upper administrators play in the state of collaboration/collaborative action of the group?

4. What barrier(s) presented during the group process?
    a. Where there barriers that presented between group members? If yes, describe what the barriers were between group members. If No, please describe why you think there were no barriers between members.

b. When were the barriers identified? At what point in the group process?
c. Who and/or what was central to identifying the barrier(s)? (i.e. one person, multiple people, catalyst that brought barrier into focus).
d. Once identified, how did the group move to address the barrier(s)?
e. If there was more than one barrier, were there different techniques utilized for each barrier; or was the same response utilized for all barriers? Why?
f. Please share what the resolution(s) to the barrier(s) were and how members reacted to said resolutions.

5. With regard to both time and stage in the grant acquisition process, at what point was the Ibis Institute brought into the process?
    a. Who suggested Ibis be included? Why?
    b. Who made the initial contact with Ibis to extend the invitation? How and why was this person selected?
    c. Was everyone in agreement with this decision? Why or Why Not?
    d. What did Ibis do once involved?
    e. Was their approach different or similar to what the group was already doing to meet the desired goal?
    f. Did Ibis help or hinder the group goal attainment process?

6. In thinking about the process in its totality, please share the key factors and/or characteristics of the group that made goal attainment possible.
    a. Of these key factors and/or group characteristics, which, if any, are most important to group goal attainment?
    b. What advice would you give groups comprised of loosely coupled university units working toward achieving larger institutional goals?

7. Do you have any documents from your involvement with this initiative?
    a. Meeting notes, agendas, grant application, e-mails, etc.
    b. Do you know of where any of these documents may be stored within the university's archived records and/or who I can contact to receive copies of this information?

8. Would you be able to provide me with the name(s) of others who were engaged in this process that may be willing to serve as a participant for this study?

9. Once I have transcribed your interview data, would you be interested in me sharing this information with you?
    a. At that time, would you be willing to answer any follow up questions should I have any?

10. Is there anything I did not ask that is important to this case and/or that you would like to share?

APPENDIX B: INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD APPROVAL

EAST CAROLINA UNIVERSITY
University & Medical Center Institutional Review Board Office
4N-70 Brody Medical Sciences Building· Mail Stop 682
600 Moye Boulevard · Greenville, NC 27834
Office **252-744-2914** · Fax **252-744-2284** · **www.ecu.edu/irb**

Notification of Initial Approval: Expedited

From: Social/Behavioral IRB
To: Tierini Hodges
CC: David Siegel
Date: 6/9/2015
Re: UMCIRB 15-000818
Loose Coupling and the Way We Work Together

I am pleased to inform you that your Expedited Application was approved. Approval of the study and any consent form(s) is for the period of 6/9/2015 to 6/8/2016. The research study is eligible for review under expedited category # 6, 7. The Chairperson (or designee) deemed this study no more than minimal risk.

Changes to this approved research may not be initiated without UMCIRB review except when necessary to eliminate an apparent immediate hazard to the participant. All unanticipated problems involving risks to participants and others must be promptly reported to the UMCIRB. The investigator must submit a continuing review/closure application to the UMCIRB prior to the date of study expiration. The Investigator must adhere to all reporting requirements for this study.

Approved consent documents with the IRB approval date stamped on the document should be used to consent participants (consent documents with the IRB approval date stamp are found under the Documents tab in the study workspace).

The approval includes the following items:

Name	Description
Consent Form	Consent Forms
Dissertation Proposal	Study Protocol or Grant Application
Interview Protocol	Interview/Focus Group Scripts/Questions
Participant Invite Script	Recruitment Documents/Scripts

The Chairperson (or designee) does not have a potential for conflict of interest on this study.