JACA

The Journal of the Association for Communication Administration

Volume 33, Issue 1

Winter-Spring 2014

Journal of the Association for Communication Administration

Editor

Janie Harden Fritz
Director, Undergraduate & MA Programs
Communication & Rhetorical Studies
Duquesne University

Editorial Assistant

Matthew P. Mancino
Graduate Assistant
Communication & Rhetorical Studies
Duquesne University

Editorial Board

Jerry L. Allen
Associate Dean, College of Arts & Sciences
University of New Haven

Ronald C. Arnett
Chair, Communication & Rhetorical Studies
Henry Koren, C.S.Sp., Endowed Chair for Scholarly Excellence
Duquesne University

Besty Wackneragel Bach
Chair, Communication Studies
University of Montana

James B. Benjamin
Senior Associate Dean for Social Sciences
College of Lang., Lit., & Social Sciences
University of Toledo

Shannon A. Bowen
Associate Professor, College of Mass Communication
University of South Carolina

Carl M. Cates
Chair, Communication Arts
Valdosta State University

Melissa Chastain
Chair, School of Communication
Spalding University

Paul D. Driscoll
Vice-Dean Academic Affairs
School of Communication
University of Miami

William Harpine
Chair, Communications
University of South Carolina Aiken

Roderick P. Hart
Dean, College of Communication
University of Texas

Mark Hickson, III
Faculty Fellow, Office of the Vice Provost
University of Alabama-Birmingham

Thomas J. Hynes
President
Clayton State University

Danette Ifert Johnson
Director of the Integrative Core Curriculum
Office of the Provost & VPAA
Ithaca College

Nancy Kidd
Executive Director
National Communication Association

Kathleen Long
Dean of Graduate Studies & Extended Learning
West Virginia Wesleyan

Chris Lynch
Chair, Communication
Kean University

Brian R. McGee
Chief of Staff & Senior Policy Advisor
Office of the President
College of Charleston

Michael D. Miller
Chair, Communication & Senior Policy Advisor
Office of the President
College of Charleston

Timothy P. Mottet
Chair, Communication & Theater Arts
Henderson State University

Alfred Mueller, II
Chair, Communication Studies
St. Mary's College

H. Dan O'Hair
Dean, College of Communications & Information Studies
(Interim) Senior Vice Provost for Student Success
University of Kentucky

David Roach
Associate Dean, College of Arts & Sciences
Texas Tech University

Kelly Rocca-DelGaizo
Associate Dean, College of Liberal Arts & Sciences
St. John's University

Sally Vogl-Bauer, Ph.D.
Dean, General Education and Academic Support Division
Blackhawk Technical College

Journal of the Association for Communication Administration

Volume 33 Number 1 Winter-Spring 2014

Editor's Note
Janie Harden Fritz 1

Strategies for Easing Faculty-Management Tensions at Institutions of Higher Education
Sarah H. VanSlette, Zachary A. Schaefer, and Kathy Hagedorn 2

Symposium: The Undergraduate Teaching Assistant

Informing the Undergraduate Teaching Assistant (UTA) Debate
Deanna Sellnow 15

Exploring the Education Value of the Undergraduate Teaching Apprentice (UTA) Experience
Molly Reynolds, Deanna Sellnow, Katharine Head, and Kathryn E. Anthony 17

The Undergraduate Teaching Assistant: Scholarship in the Classroom
Sarah M. Flinko and Ronald C. Arnett 35

Undergraduate Instructor Assistants (UIAs): Friend or Foe
William J. Seiler and Jenna Stephenson Abetz 47

Book Review
Servant Leadership for Higher Education: Principles and Practices
John Howard III 57

Briefly Noted
Mentoring Faculty Members into (and away from) Serving as Department Chair
Sue Pendell 60

Journal of the Association for Communication Administration
Volume 33, #1, Winter-Spring 2014, p. 1

Editor's Note

I'm pleased to present the first issue of Volume 33 of the *Journal of the Association for Communication Administration*. Former editor Don Stacks led the revitalization of the journal, and my hope is to maintain the excellence with which he carried out this worthy task. I am fortunate to have had the support of a wonderful editorial board and the entire ACA leadership, so I offer them all thanks. Special thanks, as well, to Matt Mancino, my editorial assistant, who has worked tirelessly to assist with formatting the contents of the journal.

This issue includes several sections. First is an article by Sarah H. VanSlette, Zachary A. Schaefer, and Kathy Hagedorn that offers theoretical and applied insights for improving communication between university faculty and administrators. In an era of rapid change in higher education, healthy internal communication practices offer hope for institutional flourishing under conditions of uncertainty.

Conditions of resource scarcity and demand for engaged learning make the time-honored (but often contested) practice of engaging undergraduate teaching assistants newly salient for communication administrators in today's historical moment. Therefore, this issue presents a symposium on the undergraduate teaching assistant organized by Deanna Sellnow, Gifford Blyton Endowed Professor of Communication and Assistant Provost for Transformative Learning at the University of Kentucky. She introduces a set of three articles exploring various facets of the undergraduate teaching assistant experience that offer insights and evidence for faculty and administrators considering adoption (or continuation of) this importance pedagogical experience.

A review of *Servant Leadership for Higher Education: Principles and Practices* and recommendations from a seasoned departmental chair round out this first issue of 2014. The second issue is currently in process and should be available shortly, and, with several submissions under review, the outlook for volume 34 is promising. In the words of my esteemed predecessor, "Stay tuned!"

Journal of the Association for Communication Administration
Volume 33, #1, Winter-Spring 2014, pp. 2-14.

Strategies for Easing Faculty-Management at Institutions of Higher Education

Sarah H. VanSlette[1]
Zachary A. Schaefer[2]
Kathy Hagedorn[3]

With calls across the discipline of communication to use our research to enhance the lived experience of organizational members and employees of all industries, this essay focuses on the often tense communication between university faculty and university leaders. Using communication and business scholarship as our foundation, we recommend communication strategies that should facilitate better communication between university faculty and management. These strategies will not only help faculty and staff overcome disagreements and avoid uncivil discourse, but the strategies can also be applied to uncivil non-academic workplace environments. The authors will also outline how these incivilities and recommended communication strategies play out in actual cases.

With calls across the discipline of communication to use our research to enhance the lived experience of organizational members and employees of all industries, this paper turns the focus inward to the communication between university faculty and university leaders. We introduce a case study as well as personal experiences of the authors (two faculty members and one retired university administrator) to demonstrate some common conflicts at institutions of higher education that can be solved with better communication practices. Using communication scholarship as our foundation, we recommend communication strategies that should facilitate better communication between university faculty and management (deans, provosts, presidents, chancellors).

Strategic internal communication is critical to the success of any organization. Human resources and public relations should be "strategic partner[s] in leveraging the essential relationships between employees and top management" (Society of Human Resources Management, 2008). Although some universities have assigned a public relations specialist to oversee the task of managing the communication between university executives and faculty, many still rely upon human resource managers to communicate with these parties and be the mouthpiece for high level managers (i.e. the chancellor and vice-chancellor) in times of change and stress. As Freitag and Picherit-Duthler (2004) point out, HR managers may "lack extensive professional communication training," and, more specifically, may not be able to "craft messages suitable for segmented internal publics" (p. 476).

Since it is not economically feasible for every university to hire a communication specialist for the purposes of managing internal communication, we put forward some communication strategies to guide both communication specialists and HR managers through the difficult task of managing internal communication between university factions that are sometimes at odds. First, we will summarize some literature on successful internal

[1] Department of Applied Communication Studies Southern Illinois University Edwardsville
[2] Department of Applied Communication Studies Southern Illinois University Edwardsville
[3] The Hagedorn Institute, Ltd.

communication strategies from public relations and communication scholars. Next, we will describe some of the research that has been done on the communication issues that arise on college and university campuses between faculty and administrators. Finally, we will recommend communication strategies to enhance the relationship between faculty and management.

Employee Relations Strategies

While much research has been done on public relations and external publics, many public relations scholars acknowledge the gap in the PR literature in the area of employee relations (Asif and Sargeant, 2000; Freitag & Picherit-Duthler, 2004; Wright, 1995). Perhaps the lack of research on employee relations in the public relations literature is due to the fact that employee relations research is covered extensively by organizational communication and human resources scholars. Freitag and Picherit-Duthler (2004) found that the communication of employee benefits is still predominantly the responsibility of human resource officers, but "[their] survey data, which stress the recognised importance of benefits to employees, therefore, to organizational prosperity, dictates vastly increased involvement by the public relations department—the communication experts" (p. 481). Clearly, public relations scholars may be able to add to the employee relations body of knowledge that is currently dominated by organizational communication and human resources scholars.

Public Relations scholarship has highlighted ways in which organizations can successfully manage relationships with external publics. Some of the more developed lines of communication research on public relations are based on relationship theory and two-way symmetrical PR (Dozier, Grunig, & Grunig, 1995; Grunig & Hunt, 1984; Ledingham, 2001). According to relationship theory, organizations work to identify their publics and foster positive relationships with those publics through two-way communication. Grunig and Grunig (1992) describe the two-way symmetrical communication model as the "excellent model" for public relations, where the organization and its publics communicate openly and mutually adjust to the needs of the other. The best relationships are fostered between the organization and its publics (internal and external) when the organization both speaks freely and listens carefully, creating a feedback loop with its stakeholders where it takes their opinions into consideration when making decisions. In different situations, different publics will become more important to the success of the organization, and in these difficult and uncertain financial times, effective employee communication is perhaps more important than ever as employees are the public face of the organization and are the front line dealing with consumers and shareholders.

General public relations scholars have put forth some best practices that have been applied successfully to internal public relations situations, but we would like to apply these best practices to institutions of higher education. In McCown's (2007) study of internal public relations at a university, the practices of environmental scanning, two-way symmetrical communication (Grunig, L.A., Grunig, J.E., and Dozier, 2002), and "mixed motives" public relations practices (Murphy, 1991) all proved to be successful in building stronger employee-organization relationships, increased trust, openness, involvement, and increased satisfaction (p. 65). Environmental scanning refers to the organizational practice of collecting information from your publics in an effort to serve them and communicate with them better. Two-way symmetrical PR, as defined above, refers to the organizational process of communicating with your publics, collecting feedback from your public, and using that feedback to reorient your activities in order to build a stronger relationship with

your publics (Grunig, L.A., Grunig, J.E., & Dozier, 2002). Mixed motives PR practices involve each side of the stakeholder relationship prioritizing their own self-interests but cooperating in a limited fashion to resolve conflicts (Murphy, 1991). This article will expand upon the McCown (2007) study and apply these internal PR best practices to the unique communication context of colleges and universities. Specifically, we will use the previous literature to inform a list of internal public relations and management strategies that either the HR staff or PR staff in charge of employee relations can use to facilitate open and constructive communication between university faculty and management.

Since public relations is a part of an overall approach to the larger umbrella term organizational communication, it is necessary to highlight the organizational communication approach to internal communication strategies between hierarchically differentiated groups. Establishing an open and trusting communication environment between traditionally oppositional groups can be considered a change management process. There has been a substantial amount of research on the strategies that management uses to communicate during times of change and crisis (Cameron & Green, 2012). Clampitt, DeKoch, and Cashman (2000) identified five different strategies that upper management uses to communicate with employees during both unplanned and planned organizational changes. They found that the most effective change management communication strategy was "underscore and explore," which is when management highlights key topics related to a successful change program and then gives employees the creativity and flexibility to respond to and frame those issues. The authors also found that several communication strategies are ineffective at dealing with change management, including "spray and pray," where management inundates employees with information and then hopes the employees can properly prioritize it, and "withhold and uphold," where management keeps as much information as possible from employees and then holds the company line when confronted with gripes or questions. In short, the most successful change management programs emerge when management involves employees in the change process and truly values and explores their ideas (Clampitt, DeKoch, & Cameron & Green, 2012; Cashman, 2000; Miller, Johnson, & Grau, 1994).

Communication Issues between Management and Faculty in Higher Education Institutions: A Case Study

Collegiality and a sense of community have been found to be two primary sources of satisfaction in academic life (Barnes, Agago, & Coombs, 1998; Manger & Eikeland, 1990; Matier, 1990; Weiler, 1985). When these qualities are absent from the experience of faculty members, many will disengage from their academic departments and sometimes even disengage from the institution as a whole (Huston, Norman, & Ambrase, 2007). In addition to being the basis of job satisfaction, Tierney (2006) argues that collaboration, cooperation, and trust are the keys to the successful governance of a university. However, from the authors' personal experiences and from studies on the subject (Guckenheimer, Fenstermaker, Mohr, & Castro, 2008; Huston, Norman, & Ambrose, 2007; McCown, 2007), it seems that many faculty and administrators will face difficult communication challenges throughout their careers. While communication problems may exist between faculty and students, senior university administrators and lower level administrators, administrators and staff, or any other combination of a university's internal publics, we will focus on the communication issues that may persist between faculty and high level university management (deans, provost, chancellor, president).

Tyron (2005), a former faculty member who made the transition to administrator, labeled a traitor by faculty, describes the communication gap between faculty and administrators as "the Divide." He says, "The Divide is that almost unbridgeable, us-versus-them gulf between [faculty] members and those who would lead them" (para. 6). Guckenheimer et al.'s (2008) study of administrators' opinions about faculty demonstrated that the divide was painfully obvious in the nine colleges and universities they studied. The administrators studied said faculty were "myopic, and preoccupied with small, local concerns" (p. 9), "have a poor idea about financial realities" (p. 10), and are resistant to change. Overall, the administrators seemed to hold a contradictory view of [faculty]: "[Faculty] don't understand the workings of the institution (or the essential work of administrators), they care primarily about their own narrow, local concerns, and yet, they are also blissfully aware that they 'hold the key' to institutional transformation" (p. 13).

The opinions of those administrators may not be unfounded. Sadly, studies have found that an alarmingly high percentage of junior faculty are unhappy with the level of collegiality at their universities (Ambrose, Huston, & Norman, 2005; Bilimoria, Perry, Liang, Stoller, Higgins, & Taylor, 2006) and many senior faculty are so dissatisfied with their workplace experience that they disengage from decision-making processes, avoid workplace social activities, and deliberately withdraw from university relationships and collaboration (Huston et al., 2007). Huston, Norman, and Ambrose (2007) found that faculty express their deep dissatisfaction with the university in four ways: voice, exit, silence/loyalty, or neglect/destruction (p. 512), which is similar to the findings reported in organizational theorist Albert Hirshman's (1970) seminal work, *Exit, Voice, and Loyalty*.

The most harmful responses to the management-faculty relationship would be the neglect/destruction response. The neglect response is exhibited by faculty who neglect or avoid responsibilities, and the destruction response "involves actively engaging in counterproductive, damaging behaviors," such as encouraging junior faculty members to leave or to disengage from the university (Huston et al., 2007, p. 512). The observations of the administrators studied by Guckenheimer et al. (2008) are not surprising, then, since this large proportion of disengaged faculty would obviously become much more focused on their own "local" concerns, would not be motivated to facilitate change in their university, and may even be consciously neglecting their duties or engaging in counterproductive behaviors.

Perkoski and Lutner (2005) write about the need for university administrators to manage employees at a university effectively and then communicate those management practices effectively to the entire university community (p. 9). They argue that in order to avoid conflicts between different employee constituencies and even the escalation of those conflicts to the point where faculty or non-academic staff fight to unionize, the university management needs to "[foster] honest dialogue, open communication, and an environment wherein employees treat one another with respect and dignity"(p. 9). If administrators do this, they could see "increased productivity; enthusiastic, positive, and motivated employees; loyalty; teamwork; regular attendance; the referral of qualified applicants by current employees; and support for new ideas"(p. 9).

June (2012) reported on a conflict between the president and provost and the faculty and students at Saint Louis University, a private Jesuit university. Over the period 2012–13, faculty took a vote of no confidence in the provost for actions they believed demonstrated a failure to consult effectively. One of the examples cited was a major change to tenure that was labelled "draf," but had an effective date only a few months after dissemination of the policy to faculty. According to a statement by a representative of the AAUP, the move "effectively eviscerates the university's existing tenure system" (Barker, 2013, para. 2). The

faculty blamed the provost and president for what felt like an attack on their job security, and called for the removal of the provost. When the president of the university refused to remove the provost, the faculty took a vote of no confidence in the provost (50-4) and the president (51-4) (para. 3–4). Students largely took the side of the faculty and also called for the president to step down (Townsend and Barker, 2013, para. 19). This was not the first time the president had been asked to remove the provost. In 2009, the faculty protested after being left out of a decision to begin dismantling the graduate school, another move spearheaded by the provost (Barker, 2013).

The president and the board of trustees pledged to ensure better communication between faculty, administrators and the board, but attempts by the administration to hire a public relations firm, as well as a firm to survey employees, were not positively perceived by faculty (Cambria, 2013). The PR firm advised the board of trustees not to communicate with faculty, students, or the media. At that time, the chairman of the Trustees said the board's goal was to communicate "full and unwavering support" of the president (Barker, 2013). This stance created more tension between university leadership and the faculty. Finally, the provost resigned from his position.

At a celebration of his twenty-fifth year in office, a month after cancelling a scheduled meeting with the faculty senate, the president announced that he would retire after a search for a successor had been completed. However, a few months later, faculty protested that the pay increases recommended by the deans were lowered by the president for those faculty members who were the most vocal opponents of the president. The perception of retaliation created even more contentiousness, and the president either decided or was asked to retire immediately (Townsend & Barker, 2013).

Even faculty who were vocal in their opposition to the president of Saint Louis University during 2012–13 were quoted as recognizing how much he had accomplished during his time in office (Townsend & Barker, 2013). Over those twenty-five years, the president had transformed the campus physically, with nearly one billion dollars in new construction, landscaping and equipment. He added a significant number of endowed chairs and student scholarships. He enhanced salaries and benefits, and grew the endowment almost ten-fold (Townsend & Barker, 2013). How could a president who was so effective by these measures have come to such an unlikely end to his presidency?

Judging from a distance, the answer seems to lie in the key areas of personality style, communication, and distinct conflict styles. Conflict styles are a person's orientation to and engagement of conflict (Folger, Poole, and Stutman, 2013). Blake and Mouton's (1964) influential work on conflict styles has been cited by every major writer on conflict, including family, workplace, and government conflicts (Nicotera & Dorsey, 2006). Their model hinges on two interdependent conflict components, assertiveness and cooperativeness, and these components interact to produce five different styles: accommodating, compromising, competitive, avoiding, and collaborative (Blake & Mouton, 1964). Conflicts often emerge when top management has a different conflict style than the majority of the employees, which might be the case in university settings.

In this case, the president was known to have a competitive conflict style, and the faculty at Saint Louis University were generally more compromising, collaborative, and accommodating. The president was able to accomplish so much, in part due to his competitive style and force of will. Over time, those traits that served a very positive role in the building of so many new initiatives became a weight that created a wedge between the faculty and the president.

It is the opinion of these authors that if there had been truly open communication channels, even the strong personality of the president would not have resulted in such upheaval. During earlier years, administrators, staff and faculty had effective dialogue and most felt that they were making positive progress. Faculty applauded the actions of the president and were proud of the success of the university. However, what was required was a provost and other administrators who could work collaboratively with faculty and staff to communicate and carry out the vision of the president. Without key administrators to communicate and effect change in a manner appropriate to an institution of higher education, where shared governance has symbolic resonance with faculty, the president becomes further distanced from the people and processes of the institution. He becomes isolated as a target, and criticisms that would normally have been filtered through appropriate shared governance channels had no way to surface, other than in public. Public humiliation is never a way to achieve positive outcomes without serious negative consequences.

Turning our focus back to the causes of the animosity between faculty and administration, it seems that collegiality and communication are the heart of a positive university employee experience. Since both faculty and administrators contribute to either a positive or negative university community, we offer communication strategies that relate to both groups. We understand these strategies may be read and used by a human resources director, a public relations specialist in charge of internal communication, department chairs, academic administrators, internal ombudsman, and faculty, alike, so we provide candid tips and use explicit language that hopefully will aid in their practical application.

Recommended Communication Strategies to Enhance Relationships Between Management and Faculty

I. ISSUE: Senior administrators become disconnected from the shared governance process and lose touch with the thoughts and ideas of the faculty.

POTENTIAL CONSEQUENCES: Although unilateral decisions at the highest levels may give the appearance of creating change more rapidly, in higher education it can actually slow down the process, as demonstrated in different ways by the Saint Louis University case.

STRATEGY: In addition to using traditional means of shared governance, we encourage open communication from university leaders, with the president or chancellor, vice-chancellors, and provost taking the lead. McCown (2007) found that the president's (or chancellor or vice-chancellor's) openness had a "trickle down" effect that prompted other university leaders to practice open communication and transparency. One suggestion would be to hold regular open discussion forums featuring university leaders, in which leaders can inform faculty and non-academic staff of important issues and answer any questions they may have. Upper level buy-in to openness is essential.

II. ISSUE: Internal bickering within academic departments may create a toxic environment that can undermine attempts at higher levels for an open and collaborative environment. One of the authors mediated a dispute between two faculty members that initially arose from one borrowing a book from the other. Over time, the two faculty members became so embattled that the entire school was suffering, and one of the faculty (a woman in an underrepresented area of engineering) was considering leaving the institution. All this

conflict ostensibly began over a book worth less than $150 but really involved underlying issues tied to emotions, reputation, and professional identity. Every difficult conversation is actually three conversations wrapped into one that include what happened, identity and impression management, and feelings (Stone, Patton, & Heen, 1999)

POTENTIAL CONSEQUENCES: Creating an environment that fosters civility and communication must be a priority at all hierarchical levels within an organization. .

STRATEGY: We encourage faculty members to take responsibility for creating academic departments that foster collegiality, open communication, and mentoring relationships between junior and senior faculty. In the individual academic departments, all the faculty should work together to make sure junior and senior faculty members are satisfied, feel a sense of community and collegiality, and are, therefore, more likely to remain positively engaged at both the departmental and university level. The department chairperson has a key role to play in creating this environment. Unfortunately, the vast majority of chairs either are not aware of this role or have not had professional training to create collaborative environments or engage in conflict management between faculty members. Therefore, we suggest that universities provide department chairs with experiential training in establishing collaborative communication channels, meeting facilitation, and conflict management strategies.

Specifically, trainers could apply the Harvard Negotiation project approach to having productive, albeit difficult, conversations (Stone, Patton, & Heen, 1999). We recommend that provosts and HR organizational development staff partner in developing the chairpersons in this role, and to internally recognize those chairs who do a good job of fostering collegiality and open communication within their departments. Universities could create a list of best practices based on how successful chairs structure the communication in their departments. Most academics can name several occasions when pettiness and bickering over insignificant issues created a toxic environment within the department. The chairperson needs to step up and deal with these issues before they become toxic. The deans, provost and HR offices need to provide tools and assistance to the chairs, as well as rewarding the chairs who are skilled and brave enough to take on this role. For instance, internal ombudsman programs need to be promoted and described to faculty more effectively.

III. ISSUE: Due to the nature of their work, faculty tend to remain isolated within their departments or research areas, losing sight of bigger picture issues facing the university. For example, many universities are attempting to remedy declining net tuition revenue by involving faculty in the recruitment of students. At some institutions, faculty resist taking part, saying that the recruitment of students is "not [their] problem."

POTENTIAL CONSEQUENCES: Declining net tuition revenue affects everyone at a university. If there are budget deficits, salaries, benefits and staffing levels must be reduced. In addition, studies (e.g. Astone & Nunez-Womack, 1990; Baldridge, Kemerer, & Green, 1982) indicate that speaking with faculty has a strong impact on potential students and their parents.

STRATEGY: We encourage faculty to emerge from their "silos" and cross "the divide" to take initiative in engaging others. Participation in university events is a start, but the

university should incentivize faculty to seek regular and substantive interaction with faculty from other departments, with administrators, and with staff. The ultimate goals are to have faculty members learn about the responsibilities of the administrators, the economic needs of the university, and the ways in which they can, personally and as a group, contribute to positive change at the university. One of the authors was involved in faculty development programs targeted to interdepartmental development and initiatives. These initiatives had positive results not just in developing a broader perspective of the university, but also in the design and implementation of interdepartmental academic programs and courses, which benefited the students and enhanced student recruitment and job placement.

IV. ISSUE: Information that could serve to educate faculty on the ongoing issues of the university does not "trickle down" from senior administrators. In addition, when administrators do communicate with faculty, they often adopt inappropriate communication strategies or channels that lead to information overload and an assumption that faculty can properly prioritize large amounts of information.

POTENTIAL CONSEQUENCES: When administration is seeking faculty support on issues, they learn that faculty do not understand the current financial or organizational challenges and, therefore, are reluctant to collaborate on solutions.

STRATEGY: We encourage the president, chancellor, vice-chancellor, provost, and other university leaders to use electronic tools to communicate with employees and students, but to do so in a strategic manner that prevents information overload and a "spray and pray" mentality (Clampitt, DeKock, & Cashman, 2000). Campus-wide emails on issues of importance (achievements, issues of health and safety, holidays, etc.) could go out to students and employees, and more tailored emails could go out to all employees on topics of special interest to them (the hiring and departure of employees, births and deaths, achievements, benefits, compensation issues, etc.). In addition, we recommend that the chancellor or vice-chancellor personally respond to any emails he or she may receive from concerned employees in a timely fashion, with at least a message stating who will be charged with responding to their issue.

Finally, the university intranet or internal social media could be a place where the dialogue between administrators and faculty is encouraged and enhanced. This approach should not be limited to frequent updating of human resources and management web pages. We believe blogs could be a tool for those university leaders willing to invest time in the activity, allowing comments to be posted by faculty and non-academic staff in response to each blog post. This feedback loop could be a particularly helpful feature of blogs. Robert M. Groves, Provost at Georgetown University, has a blog where his posts discuss his dinner with new faculty, his thoughts on preparing undergraduates for the 21st century, and his end-of-summer preparations for the new school year (blog.provost.georgetown.edu). Certainly this blog makes him appear to be more transparent and open, provides a way for Georgetown faculty and staff to get to know him at a more personal level, and also provides instant feedback opportunities for any readers who wish to comment on a post.

V. ISSUE: A physical distance exists between high level administrators and employees and students. Many faculty and students bemoan the fact they never see the chancellor or president on campus.

POTENTIAL CONSEQUENCES: The president is typically engaged in fund-raising, meeting with legislators, and other essential activities off campus. However, without some kind of contact, faculty and students do not feel a connection with the senior administrator and, in fact, may ridicule the amount of time he/she is off campus.

STRATEGY: We encourage the president or chancellor to engage in frequent face-to-face interaction with employees and students. One study found that designated "open door days," where all university employees and students were invited to visit the president (i.e., chancellor) in her office, were very successful (McCown, 2007). On the other hand, these face-to-face interactions don't have to be scheduled. Simply taking the time and effort to stop and talk with a few people (students, non-academic staff, faculty) whenever the president, chancellor or other university leader is walking on campus could go a long way towards improving relationships. This informal, mundane communication builds trust and creates the perception of openness, which is an essential first step that leaders should take to build a collaborative environment (Alvesson & Sveningsson, 2003). With enough interpersonal contact, employees will begin to trust administrators, feel personally appreciated, and may also experience more job satisfaction, as a result.

In short, interaction is necessary for trust and trust is necessary for collaboration, dialogue, and effective communication. The key to success, however, lies in listening to people and using their views to inform decisions that are being made. As noted above, the more internal communication and shared governance are effective, the less need there will be for public airing of grievances and disputes. Not only can negative publicity damage a university's reputation, but it also may serve to dampen the enthusiasm of donors, and hurt the recruitment of students, faculty and staff to the institution. The result could be a downward spiral that may take years to recover from. For example, lack of donations or student tuition revenue due to negative publicity for even one year means there is less money available for pay raises and scholarships. As these diminish, it becomes harder to recruit high quality students, faculty and staff.

VI. ISSUE: No one is attending to internal communications, assuming that "someone else is doing it." Presidents, provosts, and vice chancellors are extremely busy individuals who do not have time to plan communication strategies and reach out to target audiences.

POTENTIAL CONSEQUENCES: Most of the negative examples listed above have a communication or public relations gap which began as an internal issue and moved to a public relations debacle as it intensified.

STRATEGY: We recommend that there be a staff assistant, communication specialist, or public relations director who will have the responsibility of tending not only to external university relationships, but who is also attentive to the relationship between the President, Vice-Chancellor and Provost, and university employees. We suggest that this person monitor the sometimes tenuous but always critical relationship between faculty and administrators, in an effort to maintain a constant two-way flow of information between the groups.

VII. ISSUE: Universities struggle with outdated organizational and communication channels that are not effective in today's rapidly changing landscape for higher education. Endless committees exist that deliberate for entire semesters (and years, in some cases), have no clear

line of sight to decision-makers, and are uncertain what type of decision rights their committees even have. Many universities have committees that are initiated by the faculty senate, but are not aligned with any channels where decisions are made.

POTENTIAL CONSEQUENCES: Faculty who devote time to these orphan committees feel that their views are ignored and that they are wasting their time. The university may feel that it has met its obligation for shared governance, when in fact there has not been meaningful participation.

STRATEGY: We recommend that the university work towards the goal of instituting participative management practices (McGregor, 1960; Stohl & Cheney, 2001), by starting with support for shared governance on campus and moving from there into broader participative management. Broadly defined, shared governance is the involvement of faculty at a university in making decisions regarding the curriculum and educational standards and their involvement in describing and implementing selection, promotion, and tenure policies for faculty (Hagedorn & VanSlette, 2008). Participative management takes those principles a step further. Faculty and non-academic staff are not merely consulted in decisions; they are the decision-makers and the agents of change. In other words, as Hagedorn and VanSlette (2008) note:

> True participative management is the antithesis of the "program of the month" mentality in which external consultants conduct focus groups (to "involve employees") and then pronounce solutions that are implemented by management. True participative management charges each person in the organization to seek out the best way to achieve the organization's mission and transfer that learning to others within the group. Managers become facilitators of learning and agents of change, but the employees are the ones ultimately charged with implementing the strategy and achieving the results needed for success. (p. 7)

While this sort of shift in management requires large scale organizational adjustments, there are many benefits associated with participative management, including increased job satisfaction among faculty and administrators, increased productivity and personal accountability, the cultivation of leadership skills at every level which aids succession planning, and more informed decision making at all levels of the university (Hagedorn & VanSlette, 2008). McCown (2007) found that university staff "expressed increased trust and participation satisfaction from being a part of the governance structure" (p. 60).

A collaborative approach to leadership from the self-governing body of the faculty (sometimes referred to as a senate or advisory committee) is a critical factor, and the leader of that governing body should be included on key university committees, such as the chancellor's meetings with senior executives. Management may be invited to convene with the senate of the faculty at its meetings, enhancing the two-way dialogue so necessary for successful shared governance. The president of the faculty senate (i.e. elected leader of the faculty) at many universities writes regular email messages to all faculty, which reinforces the faculty's trust that she or he is actively involved in management discussions and decisions. Professors and deans should be invited to chair key university management committees, involving them as partners in setting the direction of the institution. A clear process for committee appointments utilizing dialogue between University management and the professors will ensure that respected opinion leaders gain access to internal university

activities. A fair and effective means of resolving disputes should be described in the handbook of the faculty, so that when grievances arise, they are dealt with expeditiously and in a manner that is perceived to be fair by all parties. Successful dispute resolution increases the level of trust that faculty will have in management. Even better is when a dean or provost can resolve a conflict before it rises to the level of a formal grievance.

Deans, provosts, presidents, chancellors, and vice-chancellors have the burden of management combined with the need to maintain connections to the faculty. The truly successful ones have earned the respect of the faculty by communicating their understanding of the interests of professors, and balancing those interests with the overall needs of the institution. Participative leadership within departments and schools can be mirrored at the provost/vice-chancellor level so that faculty have a direct connection with decisions and outcomes at the highest levels. This practice also serves to educate faculty on key issues of academic, financial, and institutional importance.

Conclusion

The recent economic crisis highlights and intensifies the need for improved internal communication structures, channels, and opportunities between hierarchically differentiated groups. Sources of revenue have decreased, causing colleges and universities to look for short-term and long-term solutions to real financial concerns. Faculty members and administrators both are worried about the lack of resources to fund critical programs, and what the impact will be on students and colleagues. If these two groups do not partner in finding answers to these very significant concerns, the university will splinter into antagonistic groups and battlefields, certainly not a fertile ground for learning. The strength of internal communication channels and the use of proven employee relations principles will be critical to how effectively colleges and universities work through the financial crisis. Those universities without effective internal communication processes and who lack a climate of openness, trust, and civility, will struggle with the difficult decisions that need to be made. Those universities with established partnerships between management and faculty will have access to creative and strategic options to address the challenges, and will find the strength to implement these strategies in a way that will transform their institutions for the future.

References

Alvesson, M., & Sveningsson, S. (2003). Managers doing leadership: The extra-ordinarization of the mundane. *Human Relations, 56*, 1435–1459.

Ambrose, S.A., Huston, T., & Norman, M. (2005). A qualitative method for assessing faculty satisfaction. *Research in Higher Education, 46*(7), 803–830.

Asif, S., & Sargeant, A. (2000). Modelling internal communication in the financial services sector. *European Journal of Marketing, 34*(3/4), 299–318.

Astone, B. & Nunez-Wormack, E. (1991). *Pursuing diversity: Recruiting college minority students* . Association for the Study of Higher Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. 333856)

Baldridge, J. V., Kemerer, F. R., & Green, K. C. (1982). *The enrollment crisis: Factors, actors and impacts* (AAHE-ERIC/ Higher Education Research Report No. 3). Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education, ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. 222 158)

Barker, T. (2013, August 17). Timeline of Biondi's struggles with SLU faculty, students. *St. Louis Post-Dispatch (online).* Retrieved from http://www.stltoday.com/news/local/education/timeline-of-biondi-s-struggles-with-slu-faculty-students/article_d46c90a5-3ce0-5032-852f-76467be9d4ef.html

Barnes, L.L.B., Agago, M.O., & Coombs, W.T. (1998). Effects of job related stress on faculty intention to leave academia. *Research in Higher Education, 39*, 457–469.

Blake, R.R., & Mouton, J.S. (1964). *The managerial grid*. Houston: Gulf Publishing.

Cambria, N. (2013, April 12). St. Louis University board chair resigns. *Saint Louis Post-Dispatch (online)*. Retrieved from http://www.stltoday.com/news/local/education/st-louis-university-board-chair-resigns/article_945c3a92-1c19-502d-b985-daf5322f09aa.html

Cameron, E., & Green, M. (2012). *Making sense of change management a complete guide to the models, tools & techniques of organizational change* (3rd ed.). London: Kogan Page.

Clampitt, P.G., DeKoch, R.J., & Cashman, T. (2000). A strategy for communicating about uncertainty. *Academy of Management Executive, 14*, 41–57.

Dozier, D.M., Grunig, L.A., & Grunig, J.E. (1995). *Manager's guide to excellence in public relations and communication management*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Ferguson, M. A. (1984, August). *Building theory in public relations: Interorganizational relationships as a public relations paradigm*. Paper presented to the Public Relations Division, Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication Annual Convention, Gainesville, FL.

Folger, J.P., Poole, M.S., & Stutman, R.K. (2013). *Working through conflict: Strategies for relationships, groups, and organizations* (7th ed.). Boston: Pearson.

Freitag, A.R., & Picherit-Duthler, G. (2004). Employee benefits communication: Proposing a PR-HR cooperative approach. *Public Relations Review, 30*, 475–482.

Grunig, J. E., & Grunig, L. A. (1992). Models of public relations and communication. In J. E. Grunig (Ed.), *Excellence in public relations and communication management* (pp. 285–326). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Grunig, L.A., Grunig, J.E., & Dozier, D.M. (2002). *Excellent public relations and effective organizations: A study of communication management in three countries*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Guckenheimer, D.E., Fenstermaker, S., Mohr, J.W., & Castro, J. (2008). *Reproducing "The Divide": Administrators' views of faculty*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Sociological Association.

Hagedorn, K., & VanSlette, S.H. (2009). "Participative Management" vs. Shared Governance: How much should faculty be involved in management decisions? In J.C. Knapp, & D.J. Siegel (Eds.), *The Business of Higher Education*. Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers.

Hirschman, A.O. (1970). *Exit, voice, and loyalty: Responses to decline in firms, organizations, and states*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Huston, T., Norma, M., & Ambrose, S. (2007). Expanding the discussion of faculty vitality to include productive but disengaged senior faculty. *Journal of Higher Education, 78*(5), 493–522.

June, A.W. (2012, December 17). Provost who sought tenure changes at Saint Louis U. will step down. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*

Ledingham, J. A. (2001). Government-community relationships: extending the relational theory of public relations. *Public Relations Review*, 27, 285–295.

Manger, T., & Eikeland, O.J. (1990). Factors predicting staff's intentions to leave the university. *Higher Education, 19*, 281–291.

Matier, M.W. (1990). Retaining faculty: A tale of two campuses. *Research in Higher Education, 31*(1), 30–60.

McCown, N. (2007). The role of public relations with internal activists. *Journal of Public Relations Research, 19*(1), 47–68.

McGregor, D. (1960). *The human side of enterprise*. New York: McGraw Hill.

Miller, V.D., Johnson, J.R., & Grau, J. (1994). Antecedents to willingness to participate in a planned organizational change. *Journal of Applied Communication Research, 22*, 59–80.

Murphy, P. (1991). The limits of symmetry: A game theory approach to symmetric and asymmetric public relations. In J. E. Grunig & L. A. Grunig (Eds.), *Public Relations Research Annual* (pp. 115–131). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Nicotera, A.M., & Dorsey, L.K. (2006). Individual and interactive processes in organizational conflict. In *The Sage hHandbook of conflict communication* (pp. 293–326). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Perkoski, J.J., & Lutner, R.E. (2005). Are You a Target? Countering Union Organizing Activity in the Educational Workplace. *CUPA-HR Journal, 56*(2), 8–13.

SHRM Communication Basics. Workplace Communication Series, Part 1. Retrieved September 30, 2008 from http://www.shrm.org/research/briefly_published/

Stohl, C., & Cheney, G. (2001). Participatory processes/Paradoxical practices: Communication and the dilemmas of organizational democracy. *Management Communication Quarterly, 14*, 349–407.

Stone, D., Patton, B., & Heen, S. (1999). *Difficult conversations: How to talk about what matters most*. New York: Penguin Books.

Tierney, W. (2006). *Trust and the public good: Examining the cultural conditions of academic work*. New York: Peter Lang Publishing.

Townsend, T. and Barker, T. (2013, August 17) Biondi will step down Sept 1, ending 25-year reign as SLU president. *St. Louis Post-Dispatch (online)*. Retrieved from http://www.stltoday.com/news/local/metro/biondi-will-step-down-sept-ending--year-reign-as/article_8ecc6cff-0c32-5e45-8093-61439feb930b.html

Tyron, B. (2005). The Divide. *The Chronicle of Higher Education, 52*(9), 1.

Weiler, W.C. (1985). Why do faculty members leave a university? *Research in Higher Education, 23*(3), 270–278.

Wright, D. K. (1995). The role of corporate public relations executives in the future of employee communications. *Public Relations Review, 21*(3), 181–198.

Journal of the Association for Communication Administration
Volume 33, #1, Winter-Spring 2014, pp. 15-16.

Informing the Undergraduate Teaching Assistant (UTA) Debate

Deanna Sellnow[1]

Inherent in the job of communication administrators (e.g., basic course directors, chairs, directors, deans) is the never-ending challenge of finding the right balance between economic efficiency and instructional integrity in terms of course delivery. Therefore, the question we continually struggle to answer is where to find balance with regard to compromising educational quality for financial frugality. Although always an issue, this subject is spotlighted prominently today as funding support for higher education wanes. The proliferation of online courses now being offered (e.g., MOOCs/massive open online courses) serves as a prime example.

The dialectic regarding educational excellence and course delivery methods did not arise, however, with the emergence of online course delivery systems. The ongoing controversy about using graduate teaching assistants to deliver courses, for instance, remains alive and well. Even more contentious than the debate surrounding the use of graduate students to teach courses is that of employing undergraduate students as teaching assistants. What is troubling about such debates is not the fact that that they occur, but, rather, that the arguments are typically based on anecdotal evidence and opinions. In essence, there is a void in the literature in terms of data-driven empirical research to inform such debates. The three manuscripts presented here aim to begin filling that void.

Few would argue with the notion that undergraduate teaching assistants/apprentices (UTAs) may be a helpful financial resource for programs as they help faculty members with procedural tasks (e.g., taking attendance, managing group work) at a much lower cost than graduate teaching assistants (GTAs). What is much less clear, however, is the educational value for students enrolled in the courses in which UTAs serve, as well as the educational value afforded to the UTAs themselves in doing so.

If we agree with the philosophies of Socrates (e.g., Taylor, 1998) and his contemporaries, for example, that mentoring is the most productive pedagogical method for teaching and learning, then it follows that UTAs being mentored by a faculty member would be likely to learn more from the experience than they might in a traditional lecture-oriented classroom setting. Similarly, it might also follow that UTAs serve effectively as a mentoring bridge between faculty members and the students enrolled in the course. Moreover, if we agree with the experiential learning theories of John Dewey (1938) and his contemporaries, UTAs may also learn course content better as a result of teaching it to others (doing) and reflecting on it than they would as students in a traditional lecture-oriented classroom. The following three articles begin to shed light on the veracity of such ideas by examining the UTA experience via data-driven empirical research lenses.

In "Undergraduate Instructor Assistants (UIAs): Friend or Foe," for example, Seiler and Abetz examine the value of undergraduate instructor assistants (UIAs) used in courses employing the personalized system of instruction (PSI) method as first conceptualized by Keller (1968). Based on in depth interviews with six former UIAs, they conclude that UIAs report growth in terms of balancing multiple roles, understanding what teachers face in working with students, and developing leadership skills.

[1] University of Kentucky

Journal of the Association for Communication Administration
Volume 33, #1, Winter-Spring 2014, pp. 15-16.

In "The Undergraduate Teaching Assistant: Scholarship in the Classroom," Flinko and Arnett take a Kantanian perspective to focus on the value of the UTA experience as it unites teaching and scholarship. Based on the personal examples offered by a former UTA, the essay employs an auto-ethnographical approach to explain ways in which the UTA experience socializes a student to understand the comprehensive teacher-scholar vocation by "imagining the real" (Buber, 1988, p. 60).

In "Exploring the Educational Value of the Undergraduate Teaching Apprentice (UTA) Experience," Reynolds, Sellnow, Head, and Anthony conduct a qualitative thematic analysis of reflective essays completed by UTAs while engaged in their first semester serving in the role. Based on three primary emergent themes they describe as *teaching as challenging, teaching as rewording,* and *teaching as transformational,* they conclude that UTAs challenge tacit assumptions in ways that transform their world-view with regard to teaching and learning in college classrooms. As such, their conclusions extend the utility and implications of transformative learning theory as described by Mezirow and colleagues (2000).

Taken together, these articles begin to reinforce an argument for the educational value of employing undergraduate teaching assistants/apprentices (UTAs) based on data-driven empirical research. Although they provide a reasonable foundation, they also point to a need for additional research regarding (a) the learning outcomes achieved by apprentices as a result of their one-on-one mentoring experience with a faculty member, (b) the learning outcomes achieved by students mentored by apprentices, and (c) the learning outcomes achieved by apprentices based on the experiential learning opportunity to teach others.

References

Buber, M. (1988). *The knowledge of man: Selected essays.* Atlantic Highlands, NJ: Humanities Press International.

Dewey, J. (1938). *Experience and education.* New York: Kappa Delta Pi.

Keller, F. S. (1968). Goodbye teacher. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis, 1,* 79-89.

Mezirow, J., & Associates. (2000). *Learning as transformation: Critical perspectives on a theory in progress.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Taylor, C. C. W., Hare, R. M., & Barnes, J. (1998). *Greek philosophers: Socrates, Plato, and Aristotle.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Journal of the Association for Communication Administration
Volume 33, #1, Winter-Spring 2014, pp. 17-34.

Exploring the Educational Value of the Undergraduate Teaching Apprentice (UTA) Experience

Molly Reynolds[1]
Deanna Sellnow[2]
Katharine Head[3]
Kathryn E. Anthony[4]

Employing graduate students as teaching assistants (GTAs) is a common practice in universities across the United States. Using undergraduate students as teaching assistants/apprentices (UTAs), however, is not only less common but also often sparks debate among various stakeholder groups (e.g., teachers, administrators, community members). Moreover, relatively little empirical research has been published to support arguments on either side of the issue. The present study extends research by providing evidence to support the educational value of employing UTAs as teaching apprentices. More specifically, researchers conducted a grounded theory qualitative analysis of free-write essay responses collected from 33 UTAs throughout the course of their first semester serving as teaching apprentices. Three learning outcome themes emerged from the analysis: teaching as challenging, teaching as rewarding, *and* teaching as transformational. *Conclusions support the educational value of UTAs as a transformative learning experience.*

Key words: *undergraduate teaching assistants/apprentices (UTAs), experiential learning, transformative learning*

Most teachers agree with the Latin proverb that claims that "by learning you will teach, and by teaching you will understand." In fact, the wisdom in it is borne out every time an instructor is faced with teaching a new course for the first time. Clearly, the learning curve is steep when one moves from the role of student to teacher. Given this fact, it stands to reason that students may also learn more when offered opportunities to teach others. Consequently, pedagogical practice in higher education is shifting from teacher-centered toward learner-centered where both students and instructors engage in and inform classroom discussions (e.g., Fingerson & Culley, Taylor, 2010). In doing so, learning becomes what Fingerson and Culley (2010) call "a more collaborative and participatory process" (p. 299). This pedagogical shift may have come in response to expectations of undergraduate students today who want to engage with both course material and classmates via technology and teamwork (e.g., Keup & Kinzie, 2007; Laanan, 2006). Regardless of the reason for this paradigmatic shift, the fact remains that when students are provided opportunities to teach, they learn more.

To clarify, teaching and learning theories are grounded in one of several general schools of thought. Behaviorist philosophies suggest that students learn through

[1] University of Kentucky
[2] University of Kentucky
[3] Indiana University Purdue University Indiana
[4] University of Southern Mississippi

conditioning and, consequently, advocate rote repetition and a system of stimulus/response rewards (e.g., Watson, 1930). Cognitive philosophies tend focus on mental processes as the means to learn material (e.g., Bruner, 1966; Piaget, 1926; Vygotsky, 1962). Such philosophies tend to privilege a student's ability to recognize, recall, understand, analyze, and evaluate material. Humanist philosophies emphasize self-directed and intrinsically motivated learning with an ultimate goal of becoming self-actualized (e.g., Freire, 1970; Glasser, 1996; Maslow, 1954; Rogers, 1969). Constructivist philosophies (e.g., experiential learning theories) emphasize active involvement of learners in constructing knowledge and building new ideas based on current knowledge and past experiences (e.g., Dewey, 1938; Kolb, 1984). Transformative theories of adult learning actually draw from many of these philosophical perspectives to suggest that learners engage in a combination of psychological, cognitive, and behavioral processes in ways that challenge and ultimately change their preconceived assumptions, beliefs, interpretations, and perspectives of (as well as actions and interactions in) the world around them (e.g., Cranton, 2006; Mezirow, 1991, 2000; Taylor, 1998). Thus, individuals *may learn more when they teach* because doing so affords opportunities to engage with material in these overlapping ways.

Teaching as a means by which to foster learning is well understood in graduate programs throughout the professoriate. Hence, graduate teaching assistants (GTAs) are commonly employed not only as cost effective human resources by which to educate undergraduate students, but also to enhance their own mastery of course content (e.g., Henning, 2009; Levingson-Rose & Menges, 1981; Park, 2004). For these reasons, the GTA experience is a central component in preparing future faculty (PFF) programs (Darling, 1999). If teaching promotes learning and the graduate teaching assistant (GTA) model is an effective means by which to do so, then it stands to reason that employing undergraduate students as teaching assistants/apprentices (UTAs) could be an equally beneficial pedagogical strategy.

Employing undergraduate students as instructional assistants actually dates back to the 1960s (Goldschmid & Goldschmid, 1976). More than fifty years later, however, undergraduate teaching assistants (UTAs) continue to be used far less commonly than graduate teaching assistants (GTAs). This may be due in part to the fact that relatively little empirical research exists to support the educational benefits of doing so. Whereas a good deal of research supports the exponential learning outcomes achieved in GTAs, much less has been done support the practice with UTAs. Unfortunately, this void in research only serves to strengthen the arguments of those opposing the use of UTAs in college classrooms.

One oft-cited claim is that UTAs merely help save money as class sizes grow and economic resources wane. Although this cost saving practice could be touted as a benefit, it is most often framed in a negative light as a claim that UTAs are nothing more than a form of cheap labor (Fremouw, Millard, and Donahue, 1979). Firmin (2008) contends, for instance, that "it is simple math that paying multiple professors to teach smaller sized classes is far more expensive than hiring one professor to teach students en masse" with the help of an instructional assistant or two (p. 1). Moreover, UTAs cost even less than GTAs (Roberts, Lilly, & Rollins, 1995).

Some research does exist to support the value of the UTA experience beyond that of cost savings. Foremost is the benefit to the UTA of learning through teaching. In addition to developing their own teaching skills, Owen (2011) explains that UTAs are "exposed to discussions about the developmental nature of learning, which can result in increased agency and efficacy for their own learning" (p. 57). Similarly, Mendenhall and Burr (1983) report

that UTAs develop leadership skills for facilitating discussions and mentoring among students (p. 185). Moreover, the one-on-one faculty mentoring afforded to UTAs from the professors they assist may lead to "a greater appreciation of what it means to be a teacher, "thereby making them "better students . . . and strong candidates for receiving graduate teaching assistantships" (Pruett, 1979, p. 32). In essence, the UTA experience can lead to "better understanding of the teaching and learning process, deeper appreciation of the subject matter, pre-professional training, improvement of writing and presentation skills, development of leadership and self-confidence, and better time management skills" (SUNY Faculty Senate, 2012, p. 2).

Some research also suggests that UTAs may positively influence the students they serve by acting as liaisons or "bridge[s] between faculty and students, while working to understand the implicit rules and expectations associated with their context" (Dotger, 2011, p. 158). UTAs may also function as "top-rated students" serving as "role models" other students might aspire to emulate (Socha, 1998, p. 77). As such, UTAs may help promote a classroom climate that "stimulates peer interest in the transformative possibilities of education" (Owen, 2011, p. 56). Ultimately, students learn from UTAs because they act as liaisons between students and the professor, understand intimately the pressures and needs of undergraduate students, and provide examples that relate more directly to students' lived experiences (Roberts et al., 1995).

To achieve these educational benefits both for the UTAs as learners and for the students they work with as teaching apprentices, several potential obstacles must also be overcome. For example, UTAs may experience anxiety about grading, about establishing and maintaining both credibility and rapport with students, and about balancing relationships with peers inside and outside the classroom. Owen (2011) clarifies, for example, that "the processes of organizing and evaluating peers and near-peers can be anxiety-producing for many students, especially if they have relationships with class members that extend outside the classroom" (p. 57). Moreover, students may perceive information from UTAs as "less valid" than that offered by the faculty member (p. 58). Such potential obstacles can be addressed and overcome through appropriate UTA training in instructional and assessment best practices and ongoing mentoring from the faculty member throughout the process (SUNY Faculty Senate, 2012). Thus, although few empirical studies have been conducted to support the educational value of UTAs, some published essays suggest that UTAs may reap similar rewards from their teaching apprenticeship experiences as their GTA counterparts.

Transformative Learning

Perhaps one of the most important benefits in serving as a UTA is that of learning more than what one would as a traditional classroom student. In terms of educational theory, then, the act of teaching may provide UTAs with opportunities for experiential learning (e.g., Dewey, 1938) as they process cognitively the meaning of concepts (e.g., Bruner, 1962; Piaget, 1926) and attempt to teach them to others. As Roberts et al. (1995) suggest, UTAs may cognitively retain more class concepts when they must translate the information to others. Owen (2011) further contends that through the act of teaching, UTAs "may be exposed to discussions about the developmental nature of learning, which can result in increased agency and efficacy for their own learning" (p. 57). Because the act of teaching may employ these and other aspects of behaviorist, cognitive, humanistic, and constructivist philosophical perspectives, it may be most appropriate to ground our examination of UTA experiences in transformative learning theory. In essence,

transformative learning may draw from and extend any of these philosophical approaches as they ultimately transform learners' preconceived notions about the world around them—in this case, the world of college teaching and learning.

Transformative learning theory examines not just content or process learning as conceived in traditional classrooms, but also how adult learners understand, evaluate, and apply information in ways that ultimately may reframe their world-view (Mezirow & Associates, 2000). To clarify, transformative learning both supports and extends the core principles of conceptual understanding as described in cognitive theories to include a conscious awareness and critical examination of the tacit assumptions of self and others. Similarly, transformative learning both supports and extends the notions of active experience and reflection espoused in humanist and constructivist theories to include the trying on of entirely new roles and behaviors as a result of the subjective reframing that transpires after tacit assumptions have been challenged (p. 4). For UTAs as adult learners, then, educational value might exceed what is gained as a student by challenging their assumptions about not only the course material, but also about the roles of both teachers and students in the process.

To extend what is known about the educational value of employing undergraduate teaching assistants (UTAs) in college classrooms, the following research question was posed:

> RQ: How do undergraduate teaching assistants perceive their experiences inside and outside of the classroom over the course of a semester?

As described in the preceding paragraphs, a number of articles have been published that espouse the potential benefits of employing UTAs in college classrooms. However, because very few of them actually employ data-driven empirical methods to examine the role of UTAs, the research question posited is intentionally broad. In doing so, the researchers hope to reveal a range of conclusions that will not only inform the professoriate regarding the educational value of the UTA experience, but also serve as suggestions for future research on this important topic.

Method

Participants

Participants for this examination were drawn from three sections of the CIS 590 (Internship/Apprenticeship in Instructional Communication) course offered in the College of Communication and Information at the University of Kentucky. Advanced upper division undergraduate students take this course concurrently while serving as UTAs for a variety of professors in the college. In addition to the mentoring UTAs receive from the faculty they assist, the CIS 590 course provides them with opportunities to read about, discuss, practice, and reflect on best practices pedagogical research that informs their UTA experience. More specifically, the learning outcomes for the course are to: (1) prepare and deliver three lesson plans over the course of the semester; (2) develop a reflective teaching portfolio; (3) compose a reflective analytical response about a lesson delivered by the faculty member for whom they assist; and (4) compose a self-reflective analytical essay about each of the three lessons they teach based on a pre and post coaching session with the faculty member and an observation of a recording of the class period.

Recruitment

Participants were 33 students enrolled as undergraduate apprentices during the Fall 2012, Spring 2013, and Fall 2013 semesters. Only first-time UTAs were asked to participate. These apprentices served in a variety of courses offered in the College of Communication and Information with regard to topic (e.g., journalism, workplace communication, health communication, interpersonal communication), level (e.g., 100, 200, 300, 400), enrollment (ranging from 25 students to 250 students), and purpose (e.g., skills, content, theory, methods). Permission was granted by the university's Institutional Review Board to analyze their reflective free-write essays for this study.

Procedures and Protocol

Two reflective free-write essays were examined for this study. The first essay was completed during the first week of the semester and the second was completed during the last week of the semester. For each essay, students were provided a six-question prompt asking about their perspectives on teaching, as well as expectations and actual experiences as an undergraduate apprentice (UTA). The goal in using similar prompts was to garner insight about possible changes over the course of the semester (see Table 1).

Table 1

Free Write Essay Question Prompts

Free Write #1 Prompt Questions	Free Write #2 Prompt Questions
1. Do you see teaching as more of an art, science, or skill? Why?	1. Do you see teaching as more of an art, science, or skill? Why? How has this changed (if at all) since the start of the semester?
2. What are your expectations of being an apprentice before the start of the semester?	2. What were your expectations of being an apprentice before you started the semester and how have they changed (if at all)?
3.What are the biggest struggles or challenges you think you'll experience as an apprentice and how will you try to manage them?	3.What are the two biggest struggles or challenges you've experienced as an apprentice since the semester began, and how did you manage them? Please provide examples to illustrate your point.
4. What do you think will be the most rewarding part of being an apprentice?	4. What has been the most rewarding part of being an apprentice? Please provide an example to illustrate your point.
5. When you think about your role as an apprentice, do you see yourself more as a student or a teacher?	5. When you think about your role as an apprentice now, do you see yourself more as a student or a teacher?
6. Do you think your role as an	6. Has your experience as an apprentice

apprentice will affect your role as a student in your other classes?	affected your role as a student in your other classes? If so, how?

In the second essay, students were invited to discuss continuing challenges and rewards, as well as to reflect on their previous answers to the other questions. Students were also instructed to compose these essays in a free-write "diary entry" form. In other words, they could include any information they wanted to and could frame their responses in first person narrative form. Student essays were submitted online to the course website. Thus, a digital archive of essays was available to the researchers at the end of the semester. Before giving consent, students were told that all identifying information would removed (e.g., student and instructor names) and replaced with pseudonyms (e.g., Student A through Student FF). In total, 33 students gave consent. Therefore, the researchers examined 33 reflective essays from the beginning of the semester as Free Write #1 (hereafter, called FW1) and 33 from the end of the semester as Free Write #2 (hereafter, called FW2). Thus, the researchers coded both FW1 and FW2 responses for students A through FF.

Data analysis

The researchers used a constant comparative method whereby theoretical concepts are derived from a qualitative, thematic analysis of the data (Corbin & Strauss, 2008). First, each researcher read the essays individually and completed open coding of the data. During this coding, the researchers made note of similarities and differences among the essays overall, as well as consistencies and variations across the two assignments for each student. Once this initial coding process was completed, the authors met to discuss their findings. There was high agreement about the emergent themes from this first iteration. The researchers discussed any discrepancies and came to agreement on the interpretation of the data. The researchers then returned to the data to construct comprehensive themes based on redundancy (prevalence of responses about a similar topic) and intensity (emotional valence, breadth, and depth of explanation in responses) (Lichtman, 2010).

Results

Three themes emerged from the analysis of the UTA free-write reflective essay assignments. These themes are *teaching as challenging, teaching as rewarding*, and *teaching as transformational.*

Teaching as Challenging

The first theme focuses on the variety of challenges UTAs (apprentices) experienced over the course of the semester. These challenges occurred both inside and outside the classroom. Subthemes focus on anticipated challenges, realized challenges, and unexpected challenges. The emotional valence of the narratives shifted from feelings of constraint early in the semester to feelings of confidence by the end of the term.

Anticipated Challenges. A majority of apprentices discussed anticipated challenges about taking attendance and grading. Apprentice DD wrote, for example:

> The main challenge I see myself facing currently is with coding *[i.e., grading]* for the class that I am an apprentice for the assignments are nearly all papers. I recently took theory with [my faculty mentor], who is by far the hardest professor I have had when it comes to grading papers. Since that class my expectations for a good paper have increased, but the class I am looking at papers for will be primarily sophomores and freshmen. I am terrified that I will be too hard on them since I no longer remember the level I wrote at when I was at their point in education.

Apprentice U echoed this sentiment by stating: "I fully expect to do some dirty work (grading, organizing, making copies, etc.), but at the same time, I hope to become a larger part of my students' learning experience. I expect to be challenged on several different levels— whether it is by time limits, tough questions posed by students or other matters."

A good number of UTAs also expressed concerns about preparing and teaching their own lessons. Apprentice R described such concerns this way:

> Going into this apprenticeship my expectations are to learn and to take on teacher responsibilities. I expect that I will learn how to deliver lectures in a way that students are able to understand. I feel that by actually taking on a lecture myself will help me to get over my fear of getting up front and bringing information to the classroom.

Although Apprentice R seemed hopeful about addressing the challenge of effective lesson planning, Apprentice D expressed more hesitation: "I think the biggest challenges I will face are to know whether or not my lesson plan will cover all the necessary material and whether or not I am able to teach the material well enough. I fear that I will leave information out or won't be able to transfer my knowledge skillfully enough; this in turn leaves the students at a disadvantage because they weren't taught properly."

Realized Challenges. When in the throes of the apprenticeship program, UTAs revealed how their anticipated challenges actually manifested themselves in the classroom. In particular, apprentices seem to have more clarity and awareness regarding the difficulties involved with grading, lesson planning, and teaching in general.

For example, many UTAs discussed how difficult it actually was to compose good exam questions and to grade them. They pointed out how much more work and effort it took than they had expected at the beginning of the semester. Apprentice A, for example, claimed: 'I have realized that grading papers and forming test questions isn't as easy as I expected. It is hard to be a student writing papers and taking exams and then be the person who decides the grades of others. I have to remind myself that I play two roles and have to keep them separate." Similarly, at the beginning of the semester, Apprentice DD struggled with worrying about fair grading. By the end of the semester, she reported about how she addressed this challenge:

> By the end of the course, I had started grading each paper twice, going through the entire stack once looking at the format only and writing down a score, then going through for content. This is the only way I could be sure my grading was fair and consistent.

Many apprentices also explained that over the course of the semester they realized that effective instruction is often time consuming and that far more goes into teaching a university level course than they had ever expected. For example, Apprentice A explained that "the workload for teachers is more than I ever imagined and is very time consuming." Apprentice K described her shift in thinking over the course of the semester this way. In FW1, she wrote: "I am confident in my ability to public speak, but teaching a class of 150 of my peers will definitely be scary for the first couple of classes." By the end of the semester, she acknowledged that even when prepared, there is always an element of uncertainty with teaching and lesson planning:

> No matter how much I may get ready for a class, there is always a chance that there will be a technical difficulty. Students with questions that I may not be able to answer, or some other unforeseen obstacle. I am someone who likes to feel totally ready for any circumstance; however, I am getting a better understanding for improvising and being equipped for any and every situation.

Similarly, at the beginning of the semester Apprentice D believed the main struggle would be about lesson planning and being effective in front of the class and by the end of the semester reported:

> I wanted so badly to include every point; however, I learned how to narrow things down and how to stress the most important parts while also touching on the minor stuff as well. This experience will really help me as a student, because I have been guilty of presenting everything in my studies in my presentations. Doing this has often resulted in me speaking very fast in my presentations, due to the sheer amount of information I would have to cover. However, I now realize that you cannot always cover every point and that you just have to cover the most essential parts and leave the rest of the responsibility to the student.

Unexpected Challenges. In addition to the anticipated and realized challenges, apprentices also discussed unexpected challenges that emerged during the course of the semester. One such challenge had to do with managing existing relationships within the classroom. Many apprentices explained that having friends enrolled in the class they were apprenticing for created challenges. As Apprentice G reported, "One challenge of being an apprentice…is personally knowing students outside of class…They don't see me as [an] apprentice…but as a friend." He went on to explain how a friend who was also a student in the class jokingly asked him for an A. He summed up his evaluation of this challenge by saying, "I imagine the few students I do know take my presence as an apprentice less seriously than those who don't know me." Apprentice I voiced a similar concern:

> One of the biggest struggles that I have experienced so far is having additional classes with my 'students' outside of the apprenticeship. I believe that factor hurts my credibility.

He went on to explain that this may be due to the fact that these fellow students still see him a peer student rather than an instructional assistant. To overcome this challenge, Apprentice I talked about making extra efforts throughout the semester to "lead by example" and trying to be a "more focused and participative student" in his other classes.

Many apprentices also discussed an unanticipated challenge with regard to feeling uncertain about their role alongside the faculty mentor in the classroom. More specifically, apprentices felt uncertain about whether they should speak up and participate as teachers with the faculty mentor or take a more silent and secondary role. Apprentices C and L clarify this dialectical tension:

> The professor always encourages us to add any comments during the lessons in class. I would love to speak up, but sometimes I wouldn't know if what I would say would be meaningful to the class. (Apprentice C)

> One of my biggest struggles throughout this past semester has been finding ways to try and get more engaged in the classroom, in front of the students. Although I continually paid attention and interject my feelings on certain topics being presented, I feel as if I could have been more vocal on certain issues that I felt strongly about, and been more of an asset during lecture. (Apprentice L)

In sum, apprentices reported a number of anticipated, realized, and unanticipated challenges over the course of their UTA experience. Many also believed, however, that they experienced growth in large part because they had to deal with them. Thus, the same challenges actually caused them to experience teaching as rewarding, as well.

Teaching as Rewarding

Just as subthemes about the challenges of teaching focus on anticipated, realized, and unexpected struggles, so did subthemes about the rewards of teaching. These subthemes are discussed in the following paragraphs.

Anticipated and realized rewards. Many UTAs reported how they began the semester with certain expectations that were then realized over the course of the semester. In FW1, for example, apprentices expected to become better at grading the course assignments, managing the classroom, and teaching over the course of the semester. For instance, Apprentice I discussed her initial expectations and perceptions of the apprentice experience by stating:

> I expected that I would attend class consistently. I expected that I would be a resource to the students and assist them throughout the semester. I also expected that I would be a resource to the professor by assisting her in in answering emails, grading assignments, and providing in-class media examples for the course content.

Although her expectations focused mainly on procedural tasks related to the class, she later reflected on how rewarding these activities had become for her. In FW2, the apprentice penned:

> The most rewarding part of the experience has been helping the professor and students. I realize that the professor is extremely busy, so anytime the professor needs assistance, I will make sure I do that first. This includes preparing exam questions, finding relatable media clips, and responding to general emails or concerns from students. This experience has also allowed me to help students too. My lectures

> provide examples that are current and applicable, and I also provide assistance by proof-reading their blogs and offering constructive criticism.

Hence, although some of the initial expectations of the apprentices revolved around procedural tasks, performing them well over the course of the term emerged as something rewarding for many UTAs.

In addition to expressing rewarding feelings about managing procedural tasks effectively, apprentices also described a sense of fulfillment about being able to help other students excel in the classroom. For example, in FW1, Apprentice L wrote about his expectation to help the professor manage the class and to help students succeed. He did not really describe how he would do so. In FW2, however, he described in detail about his ability to help students succeed as the most enriching part of the apprentice experience:

> The most rewarding part of being an apprentice so far is just my ability to help individuals in the class when they need it most…I have been in their shoes, just last semester, and know how stressful a test can be, so anything I can do to alleviate that stress makes me happy.

Similarly, based on FW1, Apprentice N expected to help with mundane, procedural tasks. In FW2, however, he described the intrinsic rewards he experienced when helping other students while serving as an apprentice:

> It is gratifying to know when I'm able to help someone out by clearing up something in the syllabus or making them feel more relieved and confident about an assignment that they were worrying about because it was unclear to them…Knowing I was able to help someone made me happy about what I was doing.

Overwhelmingly, the apprentices acknowledged the sense of satisfaction they felt about helping other students in their rewarding role as a UTA.

As with challenges, UTAs described expectations about being an apprentice and how these expectations were realized in rewarding ways. They also discussed unanticipated rewards, which included a bolstered sense of self-confidence and rewarding relationships with both the students enrolled in the classes they assisted with and the professors who mentored them as UTAs.

Unexpected rewards. Beyond the realization of expected rewards, apprentices also gleaned unforeseen rewards as a result of their experience as a UTA. They talked specifically about an increased sense of confidence both in their own schoolwork as students in other classes and in their ability to communicate effectively with others. In FW2, for example, Apprentice D discussed the confidence she gained from serving as an apprentice:

> The most rewarding part of my experience has been the confidence I have gotten from it. I now actually feel somewhat smart, which has not always been the case for me…It [the apprenticeship program] has really helped me in my other classes. I have no apprehension of speaking in front of others anymore, regardless of the topic.

Apprentice D also revealed how her UTA experience boosted her confidence about achieving in her other classes and when speaking publicly. Apprentice G explained it this

way. He wrote, "Knowing what goes into teaching has made me a better student. I was able to understand why my professors were assigning me certain assignments and what they were looking for." This unexpected reward about how the apprenticeship experience made them better students in their other classes was pervasive among the free write essays.

The UTAs also discussed unexpected relational rewards they experienced during the course of their time as an apprentice. Many wrote that they did not foresee a reward focused on the development of relationships with both faculty members and other students and how truly rewarding they found such relational developments to be. In FW2, for example, Apprentice Z described the unexpected reward of forging relationships with other students and with the professor as a result of serving as an apprentice:

> My favorite part of being a teaching apprentice was creating new relationships. I got to meet a lot of people my age and create fun friendships. I also enjoyed getting to know the professor more. I view her as a mentor and can now go to her for advice.

In sum, apprentices reported how many anticipated rewards were realized over the course of the semester. These included performing procedural tasks effectively and helping fellow students achieve. They also revealed unexpected rewards realized as a result of their UTA experiences such as boosts in self-confidence, improved performance as students in their other classes, and forging positive relationships with their faculty mentors and students.

Teaching as Transformational

The third major theme that emerged from the analysis is teaching as transformational. The subthemes in this area are categorized as power and role negotiation, empowerment, and perspective regarding the nature of teaching and learning in college classrooms.

Power and Role Negotiation. The first subtheme focuses generally on perceived identity as UTAs in the classroom. Specifically, apprentices found themselves continually trying to balance being both a student and a teacher throughout the semester. Apprentices expressed a dialectical tension about being a peer with students in the class and an authority figure. Apprentices discussed finding themselves on different points of the power continuum at different points and in different situations throughout the semester.

In some cases, apprentices reported feeling equal to the students they served. Apprentice F said, "One challenge of being an apprentice…is personally knowing students outside of class…They don't see me as [an] apprentice…but as a friend." Others expressed similar concerns about being friends with students in the class and the tension that sometimes provoked with regard to their identity as a UTA. Apprentice I summed it up this way: "One of the biggest struggles that I have experienced so far is having additional classes with my 'students' outside of the apprenticeship. I believe that factor hurts my credibility." Others talked about the benefits of this peer status in that students seemed more comfortable asking them questions than they did about asking the professor. In one case, a professor capitalized on that by "encouraging the students to view [the apprentice] as an 'ally'" (Apprentice B).

Ultimately, many apprentices acknowledged that they could not divorce themselves completely from the student role even though they were not students in the classes for which they were TA-ing. Apprentice G said, "As an apprentice, I feel that my role is more of

a student…in effect, I am learning right along with the class" through learning how to create lesson plans and lead a class. In other words, even though they were a different type of student (learning how to teach course content rather than just learn it), many apprentices still perceived themselves as students and, in that sense, as equal to the students they served.

Conversely, many apprentices also realized a certain power differential between them and the students they served. Apprentice D reported realizing this power difference as early as FW1 when he said, "A student asked me and the other apprentice to clear up an issue about something the professor had said. It was a minor issue, but it was still the first that that I was ever viewed as a person with authority in a classroom." Some apprentices also discussed certain experiences they used to help them and their students recognize the difference. For example, as Apprentice F explained, after teaching his own lecture, "Students began to view [me] in a more respectable light…I believe this was necessary to overcome the struggle of" not being seen as a person of authority."

Some apprentices explicitly reported how they used the power difference between them and the students they served to maintain professional distance. For example, Apprentice C said that for the majority of the time, she sees herself "as more of a teacher. I…view the students in the class as students and not classmates. I do not favor anyone in the class, even if I am friends with a few of them." She even went on to say that she emphasizes that power differential by "com[ing] to class dressed nicely and giv[ing] a good impression of myself." Similarly, apprentice E realized that he had to be perceived as the person in authority in order to keep order. He said, "[When] establishing my…status as a TA in the class environment…the primary difficulty arises when I have to establish *authority* as a TA." Moreover, "when these situations arise and if students question my role, I have to notify the students of our [class policies] as well as my status as TA." In this case, Apprentice E intentionally referred to himself as a TA to emphasize the power difference between him and the students.

Several apprentices reported tensions about this power differential dialectic when coding (i.e., grading) papers and exams. Apprentice A wrote, for example:

> It is hard to be [the] student writing papers and taking exams, and then be the person who decides the grades of others. I find myself feeling bad for giving people certain grades because I know that as a student I wouldn't want that grade.

He went on to say that he tries to deal with this tension by "continu[ing] to remind myself that I play two roles and I need to keep them separate." Apprentice B also emphasized the struggle she feels when grading papers; she says, "Grading written assignments has been a struggle for me because it is very subjective …[and] I worry about giving each student the most accurate and correct grade as possible." In this sense, Apprentice B expressed concern about owning her authority to assign grades because she understands the subjective nature of these type of assignments and failed to recognize her expertise in using an established rubric to determine them.

Finally, many apprentices talked about the power differential and role negotiation with regard to lecturing. For example, Apprentice C wrote, "The professor always encourages us to add any comments during the lessons in class. I would love to speak up, but sometimes I wouldn't know if what I would say would be meaningful to the class." Apprentice H described it this way: "It is almost as though I have a 'switch' that I flip on to forge myself into 'TA mode' [for interacting with students], even though I am still just an undergraduate student myself." And Apprentice M summarized it like this: "I feel like I am

kind of stuck on the middle of a bridge. I'm not quite sure how to present or distance myself in class from my peers, and I also don't see myself as a teacher to them."

Empowerment. The second *teaching as transformational* subtheme concerns the personal empowerment apprentices felt by the end of the semester. This subtheme was particularly visible when examining the shifts in how apprentices described their role as apprentices at the beginning (FW1) and end (FW2) of the semester. Apprentice M, for example, explained that this experience was empowering in terms of building her confidence. She wrote that "it has built a lot of confidence in myself, a confidence that I can use going forward." Apprentice O reported a similar experiential shift. In FW1, Apprentice O described personal goals for becoming a confident and credible teacher. In FW2, Apprentice O exclaimed: "I believe that [by] becoming more involved with the class and having teaching time has allowed me to achieve these goals. I now find myself being very confident and comfortable in front of the class."

Others wrote about becoming empowered as learners. Apprentice V articulated it as realizing "how deep my passion is for learning." Apprentice K noted empowerment in terms of how much she "enjoy[s] being a leader, so this opportunity is perfect for me." Moreover, she emphasized how empowered she became as she learned "effectively [to] guide students" based on the "positive feedback that I am helping students" she received.

Finally, many apprentices noted an increased sense of empowerment based on the changing ways they were treated by the faculty mentor over the course of the semester. Apprentice T summed this subtheme up well by recalling that "I see myself as a teacher when I think about my role as an apprentice…the professor I'm assisting treats me like one of her colleagues."

In sum, many of the tensions apprentices reported regarding power and role negotiations served to empower them as they sought ways to manage these roles effectively. The fact that the apprentices in this study recognized teaching to be transformational in these ways points to the educational value of utilizing undergraduate teaching assistants in the college classroom. An added benefit is revealed in the next section, which highlights the perspective transformation these apprentices experienced regarding their preconceieved assumptions about the nature of teaching and learning.

Perspective. The third *teaching as transformational* subtheme that emerged focused on how the apprentices' perspectives on teaching and learning changed over the course of the semester. This perspective transformation was most evident in terms of how apprentices (a) define teaching and (b) view other teachers.

How apprentices define teaching represents one of the most powerful changes they experienced over the course of the semester. Essentially, they all reported how much more is involved in teaching than they assumed at the beginning of the term. The apprentices were prompted in both FW1 and FW2 to describe whether they perceived teaching as more of an art, a skill, or a science. In comparing FW1 and FW2 responses, it became clear that their perspectives shifted as a result of their UTA experience. For example, Apprentice K said in FW1, "Teaching is an art…because it is ever changing …[and] each teacher teaches his or her students differently." In FW2, however, Apprentice K expanded on this point by saying "I can now say that I believe teaching is more of a skill. At first I viewed it as an art, because it is abstract and ever changing, but now I fully understand the work, preparation, and practice that is necessary."

Similarly, some apprentices perspectives grew to realize how much more creativity is involved than originally assumed. In FW1, for instance, Apprentice R saw "teaching as both an art and a skill." In FW2, however, Apprentice R realized how much artistry is involved by writing, "There are various teaching styles as there are pieces of art." Apprentice CC also realized the multifaceted nature of teaching by semester's end. Apprentice CC reported in FW1 that "I feel that teaching is definitely not a 'science'…teaching is very subjective." But by the end of the term Apprentice CC's perspective shifted to realize how much of teaching can be conceived "as more of a social science" because of "the need for objectivity" and for "keeping your emotions and biases out of the equation."

Whereas many apprentices assumed teaching to be an art, a skill, or a science at the beginning of the term, their definitions grew to account for the multifaceted nature of teaching and learning by the end of the term. Not only did these apprentices experience a perspective transformation about the definition of teaching generally, but they also experienced a similar perspective transformation regarding how they view teachers in their other classes. More specifically, these apprentices developed an increased sense of empathy and respect for what teachers do and how much effort they put into the tasks of preparing and presenting lessons, as well as assigning and grading student work. They also reported how this perspective transformation corresponded to them working harder as students in their other courses.

With regard to increased empathy and respect, for example, Apprentice N wrote in FW2:

> I do find myself feeling more sympathetic toward teachers than I did in the past—not that I didn't have respect for what they did, but now I realize how much time and effort goes into planning a class and thinking about an assignment.

Apprentice R illuminated this perspective shift using the word *empathy* and saying, "My role [as an apprentice] does affect other classes…I have more empathy for instructors." And Apprentice K explained, "I now know the true work, preparation, and practice that are necessary to succeed in teaching, and I have a new found appreciated for those who work so hard to further my person[al] education." These kinds of comments were shared in many of the FW2 apprentice essays.

Apprentices also experienced behavioral changes as students as a result of their perspective transformation. A majority of UTAs reported consciously trying harder in their other classes because of what they learned about teaching and learning in their roles as apprentices. For example, Apprentice K wrote, "I am a more attentive, respectful, and appreciative student because of my experience!" Apprentice FF said that this experience "will carry through to my student life because now I can see the other side to a classroom." Apprentice FF went on to provide an example: "Participating in class is something that I already do but now I understand why it's so important to read and ask questions." Similarly, Apprentice W wrote, "Being an [apprentice] has definitely affected my role as a student. I am a lot more understanding of professors and the amount of time and work they put into each class…this experience has helped give me a new perspective which I will try and use [as a student]." Perhaps Apprentice CC summarizes the overwhelming transformational learning experience articulated throughout the essays by saying, "It was impossible to not be affected by my experiences as an apprentice."

Discussion

The question this research project sought to answer focuses on the educational value of utilizing undergraduate teaching assistants/apprentices (UTAs) in college classrooms. To answer this question, the researchers asked apprentices to report their perceptions about the experience over the course of the semester in the form of free-write reflective essays. The focus of this analysis was specifically on the transformative learning potential of UTAs as a pedagogical strategy. In fact, the apprentices in this study did report positive learning outcomes in a number of areas.

For example, apprentices reported an improved understanding of course-related content and their ability to teach it to others. In this way, just as GTAs benefit from such experiences, so might UTAs (e.g., Darling, 1999; Henning, 2009; Levingson-Rose & Menges, 1981; Park, 2004). Moreover, however, these apprentices reported growth and empowerment as leaders with regard to classroom management, teaching/public speaking, and grading (Mendenhall & Burr, 1983). This finding confirms previous research by Owen (2011) and Roberts et al. (1995), among others. Apprentices also realized their value in serving as a "bridge between faculty and students" (Dotger, 2011, p. 158). For these reasons alone, there is clearly educational value in utilizing UTAs in college classrooms.

Foremost, however, is that this analysis extends transformative learning theory to confirm that apprentices also challenged tacit assumptions about the nature of teaching and learning and, consequently, changed their perspective in ways that demonstrate empathy and respect for the profession. In so doing, these apprentices became better students in their other courses and quite possibly may become better advocates for the teaching profession after graduation. The UTAs in this study experienced perspective transformation in terms of how they define teaching as a multifaceted and rigorous task employing creative artistry, scientific methods, and practical skills. They also experienced perspective transformation that changed the way they approach the learning experience when engaged as a teacher and as a student. Essentially, by serving as UTAs, these adult learners' preconceived notions about the world of college teaching and learning are forever changed. The way they understand, evaluate, and apply information related to teaching and learning appears to have, in fact, reframed their world view (Mezirow & Associates, 2000).

Implications

Based on this discussion, we offer four specific recommendations for programs choosing to implement a UTA program. First, university departments should focus beyond financial benefits by examining the learning outcome achievement of UTAs in the classroom. As such, UTAs should do more than take attendance and grade papers. They should engage in lesson planning and instruction, as well. They should also work closely with faculty mentors and fellow UTAs to understand fully what is involved in being an effective teacher.

Second, university departments ought to have clear selection criteria for choosing UTAs since these UTAs will be doing much more than taking attendance. The criteria should include, for example, being of upper division undergraduate status in high academic standing (e.g., GPA of 3.3 or higher), having successfully completed the course for which the student wants to apprentice (e.g., B or better), as well as being nominated by the teacher of the course and endorsed by the program director or department chair.

Third, departments must not only have a rigorous selection process for choosing UTAs, but should also select faculty members that are themselves outstanding teachers and willing to mentor the UTA throughout the process. Faculty mentors have an obligation in this process. These faculty mentors should understand that students are not just assisting in the classroom. Rather, they are apprentices and, as such, ought to experience all facets entailed in teaching a college course.

Fourth, departments ought also to create a course that mentors UTAs as a group regarding general pedagogical best practices while TA-ing throughout the semester. Such a course can prepare students to develop lesson plans, understand and practice grade norming, and create teaching portfolios that may guide them in future teaching endeavors.

Limitations

Although the results of this study provide important insight into the use of UTAs in the college classroom, caution should be taken before generalizing these results. First, in semesters one and two, the researchers asked participants to complete three free-write reflective essays. During the last round of data collection (i.e., Fall 2013), however, the CIS 590 instructor reduced the number of essays from three to two. Therefore, the research team had to discard the mid-term essays collected in semesters one and two from the analysis. Second, the sample size is small ($n = 33$) and limited to UTAs in one college and at one university. Thus, the results may not be generalizable to other populations. Moreover, the data examined in this study was perceptual self-report data offered by the apprentices. As such, it is limited to the assessment of affective and not cognitive or behavioral learning outcomes. Despite these limitations, the conclusions do provide insight and suggest several directions for future research.

Future Research

To assess further the educational value of UTAs in college classrooms, additional research efforts are needed. Certainly, studies like this one ought to be replicated at other institutions and in other departments and colleges to determine potential generalizability. Do UTAs helping with courses in the hard sciences, humanities, and fine arts experience similar types and degrees of transformative learning? Likewise, do UTAs helping with courses in other types of institutions (e.g., tribal colleges, community colleges, private liberal arts colleges, four year public colleges and universities) experience similar transformational perspective shifts as these apprentices at a public research university in the mid-south did? Finally, additional research methods/designs ought to be employed to enhance our understanding about the kinds of learning outcomes achieved and to what degree they might emerge from UTA experiences like the one described here. Although this present study revealed dramatic perspective transformations with regard to affective learning, additional studies ought to be designed and conducted that focus similarly on cognitive and behavioral learning outcome achievement.

With these ideas for future studies articulated, we have come full circle in terms of the present study. Just as there exist both economic and educational benefits for employing graduate teaching assistants (GTAs) in college classrooms, so, too, does there appear to be both economic and educational value in utilizing undergraduate teaching apprentices (UTAs) in such ways. Benefits range from content mastery, leadership skill development, and course management achievement to perspective transformation of students' tacit assumptions and

world-view regarding the nature of teaching and learning in college classrooms. Perhaps, together, faculty mentors and UTAs can make a difference in changing the world of higher education in important and meaningful ways.

References

Barr, R. B., & Tagg, J. (1995). From teaching to learning: A New paradigm for undergraduate education. *Change, 27*, 13–25.

Bruner, J. S. (1966). *Toward a theory of instruction.* Cambridge, MA: Belkapp Press.

Corbin, J., & Strauss, A. (2008). *Basics of qualitative research: Techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Cranton, P. (1996). *Professional development as transformational learning.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1996.

Darling, A. L. (1999). Becoming a professional. In A. L. Vangelisti, J. A. Daly, & G. W. Friedrich (eds.), *Teaching communication: Theory, research, and methods* (pp. 49–60). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.

Dewey, J. (1938). *Experience and education.* New York: Kappa Delta Pi.

Dotger, S. (2011). Exploring and developing graduate teaching assistants' pedagogies via lesson study. *Teaching In Higher Education*, *16*, 157–169. doi:10.1080/13562517.2010.507304

El-Khawas, E. (2003). The many dimensions of student diversity. In S. R. Komives, D. B. Woodward Jr., & Associates (Eds.), *Student services: A handbook for the profession* (pp.45–64). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Fingerson, L., & Culley. A. B. (2001).Collaborators in teaching and learning: Undergraduate teaching assistants in the classroom. *Teaching Sociology, 29*, 299–315.

Firmin, M. W. (2008). Utilizing undergraduate teaching assistants in general education courses. *Contemporary Issues in Teaching Research*, 1(1), 1–6.

Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed.* New York: Continuum.

Fremouw, W. J., Millard, W. J., & Donahoe, J. W. (1979). Learning through teaching: Knowledge changes in undergraduate teaching assistants. *Teaching of Psychology*, 6 (1), 30–32.

Glasser, W. (1996). Then and now: The theory of choice. *Learning, 25,* 20–22.

Goldschmid, M. L., & Goldschmid, B. (1976). Peer teaching in higher education: A review, *Higher Education*, 5, 9–33.

Helland, P. A. (2010). Espousal of undergraduate teaching normative patterns of first-year teaching assistants. *Journal of Higher Education*, *81*, 394–415.

Hennings, J. M. (2009). Tales of teaching: Exploring the dialectical tensions of the GTA experience. *Master's Thesis*. Paper 3705. Retrieved from://scholarworks.sjsu.edu/etd_theses/3705

Keup, J. R., & Kinzie, J. (2007). A national portrait of first-year students. In M. S. Hunter, B. McCalla-Wriggins, & E. R. White (Eds.) *Academic advising: New insights for teaching and learning in the first year* (pp. 19–38).

Kolb, D. A. (1984). *Experiential learning: Experience as the source of learning and development.* New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

Laanan, F. S. (2006). Editor's notes. In F. S. Laanan (Eds.), *Understanding students in transition: Trends and issues* (pp. 7–16). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Levingson-Rose, J., & Menges, R. (1981). Improving college teaching: A critical review of research. *Review of Educational Research, 51,* 403–434. doi: 10.3102/00346543051003403

Lichtman, M. (2010). *Qualitative research in education: A user's guide.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Maslow, A. (1954). *Hierarchy of human needs: Motivation and personality.* New York: Harper & Row.

Mendenhall, M., & Burr, W. R. (1983). Enlarging the role of the undergraduate teaching assistant. *Teaching of Psychology*, 10, 184–185.

Mezirow, J. (1991). *Transformative dimensions of adult learning.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Mezirow, J., & Associates. (2000). *Learning as transformation: Critical perspectives on a theory in progress.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Nicklow, J. W., Marikunte, S. S., & Chevalier, L. R. (2007). Balancing pedagogical and professional practice skills in the training of graduate teaching assistants. *Journal Of Professional Issues In Engineering Education & Practice*, *133*, 89–93. doi:10.1061/(ASCE)1052-3928(2007)133:2(89)

Owen, J. E. (2011). Peer educators in classroom settings: Effective academic partners. *New Directions for Student Services*, *133*, 55–64. doi:10.1002/ss.384

Park, C. (2004). The graduate teaching assistant (GTA): Lessons from North American experience. *Teaching in Higher Education, 9,* 349–361. doi: 10.1080/1356251042000216660

Piaget, J. (1926). *The language and thought of the child.* London: Routledge and Kegan.
Pruett, R. E. (1979). The use of undergraduates as teaching assistants. *Association for Communication Administration Bulletin, 8*(27), 31–32.
Roberts, E., Lilly, J., & Rollins, B. (1995). Using undergraduates as teaching assistants in introductory programming courses: An update on the Stanford experience. *SIGCSE Bulletin*, (*27*) 1, 48–52.
Rogers, C. (1969). *Freedom to learn: A view of what education might become.* Columbus, OH: Charles Merill.
Socha, T. J. (1998). Developing an undergraduate teaching assistant program in communication: Values, curriculum, and preliminary assessment. *Journal of the Association for Communication Administration, 27,* 77–83.
SUNY University Faculty Senate, Undergraduate Programs and Policies Committee Members. (2012). *Guide for Undergraduate Teaching Assistantships*. Retrieved from http://www.suny.edu/facultysenate/UndergraduateTAGuideFinalversion.pdf
Taylor, E. W. (1998) *Transformative learning: A critical review.* ERIC Clearinghouse on Adult, Career, and Vocational Education (Information Series No. 374).
Taylor, M. (2010). Teaching generation next: A pedagogy for today's learners. *A Collection of Papers for Self-Study and Institutional Improvement (26th Ed.).* The Higher Learning Commission.
Vygotsky, D. (1962). *Thought and language.* Cambridge, MA: MIT press.
Watson, J. B. (1930). *Behaviorism* (rev. ed.). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Journal of the Association for Communication Administration
Volume 33, #1, Winter-Spring 2014, pp. 35-46.

The Undergraduate Teaching Assistant: Scholarship in the Classroom

Sarah M. Flinko[1]
Ronald C. Arnett[2]

This essay casts the role of the Undergraduate Teaching Assistant (UTA) within a Kantanian sense of imagination—the not yet pushes off of the actual and the tangible (Kant, 1781/1963). The UTA accesses a temporal glimpse into a professional scholar/teacher vocation through experience in a lived context that unites teaching and scholarship. The role of the UTA offers what Martin Buber (1965/1988) called "imagining the real" (p. 60), a moment of creative ingenuity that begins with the doing of concrete tasks within the profession.

Keywords: undergraduate, undergraduate teaching assistant, mentorship, communication, undergraduate research, and communication education

Thomas J. Socha (1998) conceptualized the Undergraduate Teaching Assistant (UTA) as a mentor-mentee relationship, designed to shape a student professionally and personally: "UTA programs represent an untapped, potentially effective means to help socialize the field's best and brightest undergraduates into the communication professoriate" (p. 82). Being introducing as a UTA to the communication professoriate can provide an important part of an education for any student. A glimpse into a profession permits the student to walk alongside the professor, gaining insight into a future vocation. Egerton (1979) stressed the insights of Wilbert J. McKeachie, the then-president of the American Psychological Association, who commended programs at Cornell and Dartmouth for their UTAs, citing the specific training and the supervision that the UTA received (p. 61). By framing the role of the UTA within a guiding program that explicitly states appropriate and inappropriate responsibilities of the student within the role, the UTA experience both benefits the TA and enhances the collegiate classroom. These advantages are the focus of this essay.

This essay examines the UTA in five sections: (1) a scholarly and professional explication of the UTA;, (2) an analysis of the UTA within the communication classroom; (3) an examination of the UTA as an instance of preparing future faculty; (4) the concrete experiences of one of the authors; and (5) future implications for the field of communication tied to the inseparability of scholarship and teaching. This essay serves an additional function of envisioning the UTA role in the Department of Communication & Rhetorical Studies at Duquesne University as we align the UTA with the larger research initiative of the department. Content-oriented teaching begins with scholarship that comes to life in classroom engagement.

Undergraduate Teaching Assistant: Research and Professional Explication

Appropriate professional questions regarding the UTA emerged in initial scholarship on the Undergraduate Teaching Assistant. Are UTAs utilized to conserve monetary

[1] Duquesne University
[2] Duquesne University

resources? Are there educational standards for UTA utilization? Fremouw, Millard, and Donahoe (1979) posed these initial questions, which continue to shape the discussion forty years later. Their concern was threefold: (1) lack of information regarding the benefits tied to the UTA; (2) potential eroding of education standards for other undergraduate students; and (3) use of the UTA as an alternative source of cheap labor. The assertion about "cheap alternative sources of labor" was widely voiced (p. 30). Acknowledging this concern, this essay examines the benefits of such a role.

In addition to the question of resources, there is a query about impact on the UTA's fellow students. Filz and Gurung (2013) conducted a study on the experience of the UTA, examining characteristics and advantages of the UTA experience. The authors discovered that student perception of the UTA either enlarged or diminished the classroom possibilities. Filz and Gurung (2013) suggest that the following characteristics are essential in a UTA: (1) approachability; (2) confidence; (3) enthusiasm; (4) effectiveness as a communicator; (5) flexibility and open-mindedness; (6) good listening skills; (7) positive attitude; (8) knowledge of course material; (9) professional demeanor; (10) respectfulness; and (11) responsiveness and preparedness (p. 49). These representative traits provide a framework of responsiveness, responsibility, care, and enthusiasm that are vital for the success of the UTA's impact on other students in the classroom.

Perhaps due to this concern of placing an undergraduate student in a teaching role akin to "preparing future faculty," and although the UTA, according to Mendenhall and Burr (1983), is effective for pedagogical purposes with small groups of students, professors appear to have reservations in giving the UTA more responsibilities in a teaching role (p. 184). By examining concrete experience reported by the UTA, Mendenhall and Burr discovered that UTAs grew personally and professionally from the experience. The UTAs utilized material that they had learned in coursework and developed personal and professional skills such as facilitating group discussion, enhancing leadership abilities in others, administrative skills and mentoring/counseling expertise (p. 185). Such learning follows when clearly defined roles and responsibilities enhance the experience for all concerned.

For instance, in the academic year 2011—2012, the State University of New York (SUNY) Faculty Senate introduced a "Guide for Undergraduate Teaching Assistantships." According to the SUNY Faculty Senate (2012), the teaching experience can lead to "better understanding of the teaching and learning process, deeper appreciation of the subject matter, pre-professional training, improvement of writing and presentation skills, development of leadership and self-confidence, and better time management skills" (p. 2). Mentorship and engagement are important points of contact between the UTA and the faculty member. Furthermore, ongoing assessment is required in order to ensure learning for both the UTA and the other students enrolled in the course. Assessment within a UTA program also requires discernment to make sure that the experience is demonstrably beneficial to students enrolled in the course. The SUNY Faculty Senate highlighted the benefits of a student functioning in the role of mentor, giving a peer direct access. Such availability can "lead to increased engagement through greater time spent in out-of-class learning activities facilitated by the TA" (p. 2). Peer mentoring provides the students in the course an opportunity to engage academic material with individuals closer to their own life experiences.

At the University of Pittsburgh in the Dietrich School of Arts & Sciences, the guidelines for the teaching experience address both appropriate UTA teaching-related activities, such as facilitating regular discussions and assisting the instructor, and

inappropriate UTA teaching-related activities, such as grading papers or quizzes, giving final grades, or consistently lecturing to the students in the course (University of Pittsburgh, 2013). Additionally, a UTA must have an appropriate grade point average and have completed the course (University of Pittsburgh, 2013).

As the UTA responsibility is examined throughout academe, both appropriate roles and inappropriate roles require exploration. For example, appropriate roles include activities such as delivering lectures and presentations, holding office hours and tutoring sessions, and assisting the instructor to enhance the classroom through dialogue with students (Seiler, 1983; Seiler & Fuss-Reineck, 1986; Socha, 1998; SUNY University Faculty Senate, 2012; University of Pittsburgh, 2013) This result, however, can be dampened by inappropriate roles, such as lecturing too frequently, not being properly prepared, and being asked to assign grades for papers, presentations, and exams (Seiler, 1983; Socha 1998, SUNY University Faculty Senate, 2012; University of Pittsburgh, 2013). Supervision and training of the UTA must be structured and publicly professional in order to maintain credibility for UTA use and to enhance student learning.

Having an immediate person, someone close to the student experience, to consult with is of equal importance to the faculty member. John Egerton (1979) details a course taught by George Christian Jernstedt, a psychology professor who had taught at Dartmouth College since 1967. Jernstedt's course, "Psychology 22: Learning," utilized the UTA as a way to connect to the undergraduate students in the course (Egerton, 1979, p. 58). The goal of connecting with the students was vital and was accomplished via dialogue with one another, the other students, and the faculty mentor.

The Undergraduate Teaching Assistant in the Communication Classroom

A number of communication professors have contributed to this conversation about appropriate UTA activity in the classroom. Socha (1998) examined the benefits of a UTA within the communication classroom, and as past president of the Southern States Communication Association (2010 through 2011) and candidate for the second vice president of the National Communication Association, he articulated why the use of UTAs in the classroom is extremely beneficial. He explained, "They [the students] were provided additional points of view about the course, interacted with top communication students, were introduced to topics in UTA lectures that might not have been otherwise covered, and had a knowledgeable peer to talk with about the course" (1998, p. 81). Furthermore, UTAs are socialized into higher education as faculty members shape the teaching capabilities of those students. Socha explicated the advantages of undergraduate leadership engaged with a faculty member and students within the class. The UTA's education is given priority as a direct byproduct of meeting with a seasoned faculty member. The UTA is invited into a standard-bearer role. Socha wrotes, "Students should benefit by exposure to top-rated students who might serve as role models" (p. 77). UTAs engage in educational performativity that guides students in the course with content and example.

Socha (1998) cited Baisinger, Peterson, and Spillman (1984), who articulated further outlines advantages to UTAs, faculty members, university departments, and students in the communication course. Baisinger et al. characterized the "primary benefit to the department" of the UTA as permitting the department to respect university requirements and policies while structuring an opportunity for professional and vocational development of a student (p. 62). Furthermore, the authors cited that the UTAs "have much empathy for their charges" (p. 62). Other benefits included an enriched understanding of the field of

communication. The authors also found that students who took the course felt more comfortable asking their peers for assistance, contributing to a positive classroom learning environment.

Socha (1998) also cited Pruett (1979), who explained the development of a program taking place during the academic year 1974–1975. Pruett addressed a resource issue of limited staff by pursuing a "little red schoolhouse" model that placed students within a collaborative teaching role. They openly admitted some of the concerns listed related to resources and additional staff. Due to the fact that the Department of Communication had just been formed, securing additional staff was unlikely, making the UTA program pragmatically essential (Pruett, 1979, p. 31). The program was extremely successful, with only one of eight accepted UTAs proving to be "ineffective" (Pruett, 1979, p. 32). Furthermore, Pruett pointed out that UTAs found a wide array of learning from this pre-professional opportunity. Pruett stated:

> For example, it has given them [the UTAs] a greater appreciation of what it means to be a teacher and made them better students. It has provided the opportunity of working closely with a faculty member. It has given them a position, which offers responsibility. It has allowed for the development of personal skills. […] it has provided experiences which have made them strong candidates for receiving graduate teaching assistantships (p. 32).

Pruett viewed the experience as central to a number of students who decided to pursue an academic career.

Seiler (1983) addressed the Personalized System of Instruction (PSI), grounding the UTA's position within the classroom as holistically advantageous to both the UTA and the students. His work, which originally appeared in basic psychology courses, became an important facet of communication education. Seiler framed a PSI with five separate characteristics: "(a) mastery learning, (b) self-pacing, (c) a stress on the written word, (d) instructor assistants, and (e) the use of lectures to motivate rather than to supply essential information" (1983, p. 16). Seiler explained that the instructor assistants were typically proctors or tutors, most of them undergraduate students who had successfully completed the course (p. 16). Seiler noted that within the basic speech communication course (i.e. public speaking), the five elements characterizing the PSI are already present. Moreover, Seiler recommended that only high-performing undergraduate students who had already taken the course be considered as instructors. Within the high-enrollment basic speech communication course with high enrollment, instruction is divided between graduate teaching assistants and professors, permitting the UTA an opportunity to learn from mentors, who supervise a variety of pedagogical techniques, presentations, group activities, and lectures involving students from diverse backgrounds.

Seiler expanded the PSI within the basic speech communication course with co-author Fuss-Reineck. Seiler and Fuss-Reineck (1986) noted student appreciation for personal access to professors, proctors, and assistants, which propelled student performance. The authors also explained that new instructor assistants, a term used by the authors referring to teaching assistants, are given manuals and training sessions in an effort to prepare them for the classroom. Students are vetted as academically competent and must have already been successful in the course for which they will serve as instructor assistant. As Galvin (1999) states, "issues of sensitivity to students, a scholar's curiosity, academic ethics and values, publication directions, and personal boundaries may be explored over time between mentor

and student, a relationship that enhances both parties" (p. 251). This professional relationship is mutually beneficial and enhances the experiences of all.

Situated within this scholarly and professional explication of the role of the UTA is the ongoing importance of the student witnessing what it means to be a teacher in a professional walk alongside the professor. The student engages the material at a deeper level while enhancing pedagogical techniques that improve communication skills. Furthermore, the faculty member is given additional support—support that is close to the student experience. We now move to explication of the UTA as an apprenticeship model tied to scholarship, framed from the vantage point of our own local academic home, Duquesne University.

Preparing Future Faculty: A Scholar/Teacher Apprenticeship Model

The Department of Communication & Rhetorical Studies at Duquesne University enacts an apprenticeship model that engages faculty and students at the graduate level. The Department embraces the UTA experience aligned with a research commitment. The graduate level apprenticeship model is a model for our UTA program, which offers a temporal glimpse into the profession and into graduate study.

At the M.A. graduate level, students on assistantship function as research assistants, assisting faculty while learning practices that enhance their own scholarship. One-half of each Ph.D. assistantship is also devoted to work as a research assistant, with the other half dedicated to work as a teaching assistant. Through this apprenticeship model, students are given opportunities to understand the vital importance of scholarship in the vocation of teaching. This apprenticeship model privileges scholarship and research as the path to teaching in a 21st-century recognition of information and interpretive diversity.

Preparing Future Faculty (PFF) requires faculty and students on assistantship to attend colloquia consisting of scholarship offered by invited faculty and fellow doctoral students. Additionally, PFF includes *hesed* (must be done for the good of the community, but cannot be demanded) dinners, which provide doctoral students an opportunity to receive instruction and information on departmental activities, professional deadlines, and university-wide initiatives. The graduate directors, chair, and invited faculty discuss various aspects of the profession at each meeting, followed by a meal together. This *hesed* dinner takes place approximately twice a semester. Furthermore, weekly meetings for teaching assistants are held to enhance students' communication education motivation, knowledge, and skills. The meetings are led by two graduate students who assist the chair in the direction of two classes—Public Speaking, which serves as a course option for one element of the the university core curriculum, and Business and Professional Communication, a required course for students in the business school. The discussion also centers on a selected scholar whose work assists knowledge in philosophy of communication. All give presentations on this scholar's material, which requires use of and explanation of pedagogy. Importantly, the focus is first on ideas with openness to a variety of pedagogical styles.

Additionally, the Department of Communication & Rhetorical Studies at Duquesne University holds a PFF orientation for all graduate students (both M.A. and Ph.D.) during the entire week prior to the start of the fall semester and for one day preceding the start of the spring semester. This initiative is coordinated by co-directors of the graduate program, who involve faculty and the chair in lectures/discussions on topics such as rhetoric and philosophy of communication scholarship, scholarship as learning, professional development void of shortcuts, teaching as vocation, learning while studying for

comprehensive exams, professional discipline in dissertation work, and the importance of service to one's local academic home, the profession, and the community. The PFF initiative permits students to learn about professional obligations and expectations and to give them an opportunity to learn about teaching and scholarship as a vocational commitment.

Finally, PFF meetings take place each Friday afternoon throughout the duration of the semester, again with a focus first on ideas, followed by an examination of TA preparation for upcoming teaching obligations. This zero-credit course uses scholarly literature and books that students present as part of pedagogical practice with the objective of enhancing their understanding of a scholar/teacher vocation. Meetings are also held for graduate teaching assistant instructors teaching their own sections of basic courses such as Public Speaking, Business and Professional Communication, Exploring Interpersonal Communication, and Exploring Intercultural Communication. The meetings tender an occasion to meet with a faculty member to ensure teaching success. Activities engaged throughout PFF (the week-long initiative, as well as Friday afternoon meetings) socialize graduate students into the virtues, attitudes, behaviors, and communicative patterns central to a scholar/teacher commitment.

Graduate school socialization is an important step toward professional engagement at a college or university, with the "graduate teaching assistantship… [serving as]… the best preparation for the future faculty role […]" (Darling, 1999, p. 50). The goal is to integrate such socialization with the UTA experience. As Staton (1999) states, such socialization begins the road to professional attitude and value assimilation. The experiences of one of the co-authors in the UTA role reflect the findings of professional assimilation and vocational welcome. Our UTA program will adapt some of the insights from the graduate program on PFF with the goal of inviting an increasingly seamless connection between graduate and undergraduate education.

In recognition of Duquesne University's scholarly expectations,[3] the provost encourages a similar commitment tied to undergraduate education. Provost Timothy Austin (personal communication, October 2, 2013) emphasized our participation in the Council on Undergraduate Research (CUR) and noted the introduction of an enhanced membership, which coincides with our research objectives at the University. This scholarly initiative united with teaching yields a scholar/teacher model of higher education as the defining characteristic of the Duquesne experience.

Scholar/Teacher Implications[4]

As a former UTA at Duquesne University, I offer a personal example of my experience. I began my familiarity with graduate study as I served as an undergraduate teaching assistant for Ronald C. Arnett in an undergraduate course. The program is known for its work in communication ethics,[5] the course for which I engaged the UTA role and that serves as the cornerstone of the Department of Communication & Rhetorical Studies.

---

[3] In 2010, The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching moved Duquesne University forward in the Carnegie Classifications to a Research University (High Research Activity). For more information, visit http://classifications.carnegiefoundation.org

[4] This section is written by author Sarah Flinko, who served as a UTA for Ronald C. Arnett. Ronald C. Arnett served as a UTA for Paul Keller in an interpersonal communication Course. Paul Keller was a highly respected and "much sought-after expert in conflict resolution and interpersonal communication" (In memoriam., 2003, p. 24). He co-authored one of the "first books on interpersonal communication" (In memoriam., 2003, p. 24).

[5] Duquesne University hosts the biennial National Communication Ethics Conference. Furthermore, many of the works that have come from the department are scholarly explications of communication ethics. See, for

Communication Ethics is a senior-level, writing-intensive course focused on theoretical and philosophical engagement of communication ethics through the lens of the historical periods (antiquity, medieval, renaissance, modernity, and post-modernity). Arnett, Fritz, and Bell (2009) consider the necessity of attending to the good of each period, which the authors describe as "a central value or set of values manifested in communicative practices that we seek to protect and promote in our discourse together" (p. 2). Students are called to employ ethical questions that define a given moment in a writing-intensive course that engages ideas in philosophy of communication ethics, novels connected to each time period, and discussion of the importance of contending perspectives on communication ethics.

I was introduced to the UTA role after concluding the communication ethics course in the spring of my junior year. Ronald C. Arnett and his doctoral teaching assistants inquired about my interest in serving as a UTA for Communication Ethics in the spring semester of my senior year. I accepted, knowing that I was considering graduate study. Additionally, I recognized the opportunity of an apprenticeship model and was excited to begin the experience.

After I had accepted the responsibility connected to the role of the UTA within Communication Ethics, preparation for the course began. Immediately after the conclusion of the course at the end of the spring semester, I joined a group of undergraduate and Ph.D. students, who met to discuss what had and had not been successful within the classroom in the previous semester. We examined the course framework, studied the structure of quizzes and papers, and reviewed the pedagogical techniques employed. My role in planning the course began with input and voice; I offered my opinion as an undergraduate student. The materials for this particular class shift yearly, and preparation each year is led by conversation about scholarship in communication ethics, an element of professional training for the doctoral teaching assistants. Seiler (1983) recommends that UTAs be trained by graduate students, who serve in the role of supervisor within the classroom (p. 18). This orientation was reflective of my UTA experience. Graduate students supervised the work that I did, prior to my bringing anything into the classroom, while giving me the opportunity to grow and to be creative pedagogically.

The course carried the mark of the instructor, whose scholarship formed the foundation of the course, which was designed to engage communication ethics in a philosophical and theoretical manner.[6] Furthermore, the historical periods (antiquity, medieval, renaissance, modernity, and post-modernity) were studied and examined as guiding epochs that announced differing goods associated with them. Novels reflecting these goods were assigned to each period. The final paper was aimed at identifying the key metaphors in each moment, situated within literary selections. For example, from antiquity, the students read Homer's *Iliad*. This work exemplified this classical era through an examination of the protection of the polis. The medieval era was represented by Chaucer's *Canterbury Tales*. The good of this moment was the church, which is evidenced within the novel through the characters' dedication to the church. Machiavelli's *The Prince* was the selection from the renaissance. The church with dispute is the good of this novel, which is clearly evident in

---

example, Arnett, R.C., Fritz, J. M. H., & Bell, L.M. (2009). *Communication ethics literacy: Dialogue and difference.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

[6] *Communication Ethics Literacy: Dialogue and Difference*, written by Ronald C. Arnett, Janie M. Harden Fritz, and Leeanne M. Bell; *Ethical Communication: Moral Stances in Human Dialogue*, edited by Clifford G. Christians and John C. Merrill; and *Dialogic Confessions: Bonhoeffer's Rhetoric of Responsibility*, written by Ronald C. Arnett.

this work, as the novel advocates personal power than maintains influence outside the role of the church. *The Sun Also Rises,* by Hemingway, represented modernity. The focus of the novel is upon the individual, a major metaphor situated within this time period. Finally, *The Alchemist*, by Coelho, represented a postmodern attentiveness to difference. This metaphor was present throughout the book, as characters were forced to overcome cultural differences in various contexts.

UTAs in the Communication Ethics course are provided opportunities to give content-driven presentations to the students. UTAs give presentations on books connected to historical moments. As a UTA, I presented *The Sun Also Rises* as part of my scholarship in the classroom as a UTA. Throughout my presentation, I was called to examine the book, analyze the historical moment and the given situation rhetorically, and offer helpful metaphors that pointed to the specific good of that particular historical moment. I was also called upon to provide advice and to tutor students by explaining assignments, offering suggestions on papers, and listing resources on Blackboard for the students. However, I did not participate in any grading, nor did I ever see grading take place.

As an undergraduate teaching assistant, my encounter with the material in the course varied from my experience as a student enrolled in the course. Based on several experiments with UTAs in the classroom, Fremouw, Millard, and Donahoe (1979) found that the TAs "displayed greater knowledge of information…." (p. 32). This observation resonates with my own experiences as a UTA.

As a student in the course, the material often required careful and thoughtful consideration in order to grasp the implications for communication ethics in practice. This inquiry provided the framework for me to flourish in my UTA experience. Engaging the content as a UTA opened my eyes to a variety of theoretical interpretations. I found that the encounter with the course a second time—and, eventually, a third time—informed my understanding of communication ethics significantly. Baisinger, Peterson, and Spillman (1984) found a similar engagement by the UTAs within their courses. The authors wrote that the UTAs indicated that they understood communication in a deeper fashion after serving in the role of the UTA. The experience teaches the UTA to engage the material differently and to move those skills into other academic settings.

The syllabus in our particular course on communication ethics clearly defined the expectations of the students, teaching assistants, and the professor. The course purpose, within the syllabus, was articulated as follows:

> This course follows the Department of Communication and Rhetorical Studies' mission of "Walking the Humanities into the Marketplace" and "The Ethical Difference." Our task is to invite students to ideas or, as Robert Hutchins stated, to the "civilization of dialogue." Civilized dialogue emerges from the dialectic of freedom and restraint. To paraphrase Martin Buber: I love freedom. With freedom, I rejoice with my right hand and with my left hand, I restrain the action of the right. Communication ethics rests in the juncture between restraint and freedom.

As a UTA, I was instrumental in the selection of the novels. In fact, the UTAs were asked to bring two novels exemplifying each historical period, from which we then selected the novels for the class as a group. The syllabus listed books that the professor would be lecturing from and those that were recommended reading. Students were evaluated on five key components: (a) interpretive essays, including a midterm historical event essay and a final

humanities case study essay, (b) exams, (c) quizzes, (d) reading of all assigned materials, and (e) attendance. All evaluation involved the professor and the doctoral assistants.

Socha (1998) elucidates the need for clearly defined roles of the UTA, diversity in the assistants selected, the importance of formal instruction as well as *supervised* experiences in which the faculty works in a "mentor" role, and finally, a healthy respect for the student's overall capabilities (pp. 77–78). His call for clearly defined roles aligns with my experience as a UTA within the Communication Ethics course. The most important elements of the UTA, looking back on my experience, were fourfold: (1) having already taken the class; (2) being intimately involved in the construction of the course for the next time; (3) offering presentations in the class; and 4) offering advice on the papers. These components are reflective of what Socha (1998) outlined in his article—clearly defined roles and values associated with the UTA shape the quality of the experience of all involved in the activity of learning. The UTA experience, then, became a learning occurrence that generalized to other classes and other parts of my life. This learning was similar to what I experienced when enrolled in the course, only enhanced as a UTA. As a tutor, and during my office hours, my ability to explicate material in a clear and concise manner was due to the scholarship engaged in the class, which further enhanced my education.

All UTAs engage pedagogical scholarship, beginning with preparation for the course and later UTA work in the course. As previously explicated, I presented two novels in each of my two years as a UTA and offered a humanities case study essay as an example for the class. I grounded the novels within their respective historical moments, considered the metaphors that emerged, and explored the implications of the novel within a communication ethics framework. All UTAs within the course were required to give similar presentations. Engaging the material in this manner permitted content to drive the UTAs' discussion of ideas. The research initiative required in the UTA role provided a temporal glimpse into a vocational commitment of not only teaching, but of scholarship and service as well.

The Department of Communication & Rhetorical Studies is both congruent and an outlier in the research on UTAs. The goal is to move the graduate PFF into undergraduate education, providing a structured experience consistent with a scholar/teacher model, further exemplifying the scholar/teacher model throughout all three programs (B.A., M.A., and Ph.D.).

Implications and Future Considerations

The Undergraduate Teaching Assistant gains a temporal glimpse of a profession and what a vocational commitment to the task might entail. This perspective assumes that "total understanding of the other [and a vocation] is impossible" (Arnett, 1981, p. 210). However, it is possible to imagine the real by temporarily stepping into the role, learning alongside a faculty member who embodies the life of an academic.

UTAs, through imagining the real, are given the opportunity to "learn much about what it means to be a teacher" (Baisinger, Peterson, and Spillman, 1984, p. 62). This opportunity to engage some of the practices of a vocation of serving students through education becomes a unique and defining facet of one's connection to and with higher education. Fingerson and Culley (2001) frame the heart of the experience: [The UTA] is offered "[…] an opportunity […] to take on roles, responsibilities, and authority that are rarely provided to most undergraduates. This can benefit students choosing to pursue work in graduate school, as well as give them an experience that can be used in their future careers" (p. 301). This glimpse into a possible future is a form of dialogic education (Arnett,

1992) in action. The notion of dialogue plays a fundamental role in this discussion, with communication between and among students and faculty opening space for new insights. Through discussing ideas and experiences, a holistic image emerges of the experiences of the UTA and the enhanced education that a UTA will receive.

Implementing a program to enhance the experiences of both the UTA and the faculty involved in the mentoring of the UTA is a "first step in higher education socialization" (Socha, 1998, p. 81). The classroom provides a setting for higher education socialization. In fact, Galvin (1999) contends that classrooms are *the* places where higher education socialization is most prevalent, casting light on a discipline and an entire school of thought. Furthermore, "teachers serve as gatekeepers to a world that represents their field as well as the values, assumptions and types of intellectual life that characterize their discipline" (Galvin, 1999, p. 251). Galvin explains that a faculty member and a student may form a mentor-mentee relationship, in which the student is immersed into academe, invited into the vocation of the communication professoriate. This guide to academe provides the UTA with an opportunity to grow and to flourish as a potential professional with a vocational commitment to communication education.

Communication education is goal-oriented, according to Sprague (1999). She points to four distinct goals in higher education: transmitting cultural knowledge, acquiring increased intellectual capacities, developing career skills, and reshaping the values of society (pp. 16–17). Sprague writes, "A stronger statement of our field's role in the liberal arts positions communication as the central process by which a culture develops and survives" (p. 19). Without understanding the importance of communication's role in shaping culture and the imperative of the field's central role in higher education, cultural and historical implications of the field are lost and cannot be passed down to future generations of academic practitioners.

A dialogic communication education in action offers a unique advantage to the UTA, transforming the student professionally and personally. Furthermore, engaging the UTA within the classroom can improve the quality of education that everyone receives—the UTA, the students, and the faculty member. Egerton (1979) offers a quote from Jernstedt, the professor whose course is highlighted within Egerton's essay. Jernstedt stated, "'Undergraduates […] are the greatest untapped potential we have for the improvement of education'" (p. 60). To improve education requires continual assessment of educational experiences that provide input from a larger segment of the classroom population and invite one into a momentary understanding of a vocation seeking to serve others.

Situated within this understanding of what a vocation tied to higher education means, the Department of Communication & Rhetorical Studies at Duquesne University intends to create a document titled, "Preparing Future Faculty: Undergraduate Teaching Assistants and Scholarly Engagement." This document will be similar to that one that guides the graduate program and will outline the roles, responsibilities, and duties of the Undergraduate Teaching Assistant. This pedagogical task is grounded in a hermeneutic engagement of Buber's (1965/1988) "imagining the real" (p. 60). Our commitment is to imagine the practices with the potential to yield an Undergraduate Teaching Assistant experience offering a glimpse of the reality of teaching of a scholar/teacher vocation. Such an education needs to uplift content, pedagogical skills, and human hearts. Together, students in the classroom, students offering content enhancement in the classroom, and teachers assist one another in learning and practicing creative remembrance—education and the people within the classroom matter.

References

Arnett, R. C. (1981). Toward a phenomenological dialogue. *Western Journal of Speech Communication, 45*(3), 201–212.

Arnett, R. C. (1992). *Dialogic education: Conversation about ideas and between persons.* Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.

Arnett, R. C. (2005). *Dialogic confessions: Bonhoeffer's rhetoric of responsibility*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.

Arnett, R.C., Fritz, J. M. H., & Bell, L.M. (2009). *Communication ethics literacy: Dialogue and difference.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Baisinger, W. H., Peterson, G. L., & Spillman, B. (1984). Undergraduates as colleagues: Using undergraduates as teaching assistants in the basic course. *Association for Communication Administration Bulletin, 13*(47), 60–63.

Buber, M. (1988). *The knowledge of man: Selected essays.* Atlantic Highlands, NJ: Humanities Press International, Inc. (Original work published 1965)

Chaucer, G. (2003). *The Canterbury tales* (N. Coghill, Trans.). Westminister, London: Penguin Classics. (Original work published 1478)

Christians, C. G., & Merrill, J. C. (2009). *Ethical communication: Moral stances in human dialogue*. Columbia: University of Missouri Press.

Coehlo, A. (2006). *The alchemist* (A. R. Clarke, Trans.). New York, NY: HarperCollins.

Darling, A. L. (1999). Becoming a professional. In A. L. Vangelisti, J. A. Daly, & G. W. Friedrich (Eds.), *Teaching communication: Theory, research, and methods* (pp. 49–60). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Egerton, J. (1976). Teaching learning while learning to teach. *Change, 8*, 58–61.

Filz, T., & and Gurung, R. A. R. (2013). Student perceptions of undergraduate teaching assistants. *Teaching of Psychology*, *40*, 48–51.

Fingerson, L. & Culley, A. B. (2001). Collaborators in teaching and learning: Undergraduate teaching assistants in the classroom. *Teaching Sociology, 29*, 299–215.

Fremouw, W. J., Millard, W.J. & Donahoe, J. W. (1979). Learning-through-teaching: Knowledge changes in undergraduate teaching assistants. *Teaching of Psychology, 6*, 30–33.

Galvin, K. M. (1999). Classroom roles of the teacher. In A. L. Vangelisti, J. A. Daly, & G. W. Friedrich (Eds.), *Teaching communication: Theory, research, and methods* (pp. 243–255). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.

Hemingway, E. (2006). *The sun also rises.* New York, NY: Scribner. (Original work published 1926)

Homer. (1998). *The iliad* (R. Fagles, Trans.). Westminster, London: Penguin Classics.

Kant, I. (1963). *Critique of pure reason* (N. K. Smith, Trans.). New York: St. Martin's Press. (Original work published 1781)

(2003). In memoriam. *Spectra, 39*(9), 24.

Machiavelli, N. (1992). *The prince.* Mineola, NY: Dover. (Original work published 1532)

Mendenhall, M. & Burr, W. R. (1983). Enlarging the role of the undergraduate teaching assistant. *Teaching of Psychology, 10*, 184–185.

Pruett, R. E. (1979). The use of undergraduates as teaching assistants. *Association for Communication Administration Bulletin, 8*(27), 31–32.

Seiler, W. J. (1983). PSI: An attractive alternative for the basic speech communication course. *Communication Education, 32*, 15–25.

Seiler, W. J. & Fuss-Reineck, M. (1986). Developing the personalized system of instruction for the basic speech communication course. *Communication Education, 35*, 126–133.

Socha, T. J. (1998). Developing an undergraduate teaching assistant program in communication: Values, curriculum, and preliminary assessment. *Journal of the Association for Communication Administration, 27,* 77–83.

Sprague, J. (1999). The goals of communication education. In A. L. Vangelisti, J. A. Daly, & G. W. Friedrich (Eds.), *Teaching communication: Theory, research, and methods* (pp. 15–30). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.

Staton, A. Q. (1999). An ecological perspective on college/university teaching: The teaching/learning environment and socialization. In A. L. Vangelisti, J. A. Daly, & G. W. Friedrich (Eds.), *Teaching communication: Theory, research, and methods* (pp. 31–47). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.

SUNY University Faculty Senate, Undergraduate Programs and Policies Committee Members. (2012). *Guide for Undergraduate Teaching Assistantships.* Retrieved from http://www.suny.edu/facultysenate/UndergraduateTAGuideFinalversion.pdf

University of Pittsburgh: The Dietrich School of Arts & Sciences (2013). *Guidelines for arts and sciences undergraduate teaching experience.* Retrieved from http://www.as.pitt.edu/fac/teaching/guidelines-arts-and-sciences-undergraduate-teaching-experience

Vangelisti, A.L., Daly, J. A., & Friedrich, G.W. (Eds.). (1999). *Teaching communication: Theory, research and methods.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Journal of the Association for Communication Administration
Volume 33, #1, Winter-Spring 2014, pp. 47-56.

Undergraduate Instructor Assistants (UIAs): Friend or Foe

William J. Seiler[1]
Jenna Stephenson Abetz[2]

Undergraduate students have been and continue to be employed as instructor assistants (UIAs) in a variety of courses across disciplines. However, relatively little empirical research has been published regarding the educational merits for them or their students. The present essay extends such research by focusing specifically on UIAs' perceived value of the Personalized System of Instruction (PSI) on their learning and personal growth. The authors conducted in depth interviews with six former UIAs and employed a qualitative thematic analysis of their responses. Perceived benefits that emerged from the analysis include, for example, learning how to balance many different roles and responsibilities, gaining a unique perspective on teaching, and developing leadership skills. The findings support previous research that the UIA experience benefits both the UIAs and the instructional process.

Keywords: undergraduate instructor assistants, personalized system of instruction, mastery learning,

Undergraduate students are employed as instructor assistants (UIAs) and/or tutors in a wide variety of courses. They are often used in Personalized System of Instruction (PSI) taught courses or as assistants to instructors teaching lab courses. In fact, it is estimated that over six thousand PSI courses have been taught at all curriculum levels at one time and that there are a significant number of universities presently utilizing UIAs in the classroom (Sherman, 1974, Carnegie Mellon, 2002, Fuller & Winch, 2005, Seiler, 1982, Seiler, 2014). There are no specific data in the literature to suggest the extent to which undergraduates are used in the classroom as assistants or as tutors at the present time. There are, however, a number of communication programs presently using undergraduates as apprentices, tutors, or instructor assistants.

Undergraduate students have been an essential part of the PSI method of instruction for over a half century. The system is often referred to as the Keller Plan, named after Fred Keller, who founded the method (Keller, 1968). The data regarding the use of undergraduate students in PSI and in lab courses have been either sparse or non-existent in recent years. Therefore, although what is known about the role of undergraduates in the college classroom is generally dated, it is still important to the understanding of the role that undergraduates can play in the classroom. Boylan (1980) reported in the 1980s that there were over thirteen hundred individuals using the PSI method in a variety of course offerings and that over 80 percent of those reporting using undergraduates as instructor assistants in their courses were at four year institutions. In this essay, we explain how and why undergraduate students are employed as UIAs. We begin by describing the PSI method, then explaining how the UIA role has changed over time, and ultimately exploring specific ways in which both UIAs and the students they work benefit from the experience.

[1] University of Nebraska-Lincoln
[2] College of Charleston

PSI Described

Keller developed the PSI method because he believed that students were not learning as efficiently as they could and were not being reinforced for what they did learn (Keller, 1968, Kulik, Kulik & Cohen, 1979). The PSI method is comprised of five defining characteristics: (1) mastery learning, (2) self-pacing, (3) a stress on the written work, (4) instructor assistants, and (5) the use of lectures to motivate rather than to supply essential information (Sherman, 1974; 1982).

The *mastery* aspect requires students to perfect some aspects of the instruction. Keller and his associates believed that accomplishment was best detected through behavior or performance. Thus, Keller believed that frequency of responses that had consequences increased student learning. The theory behind Keller's approach is repeated trials that aid student learning, especially if those trials are not penalized when not done to perfection. Moreover, Keller believed it is important to reward success. In other words, grades should reflect accomplishment, not the number of mistakes made, and grading should be determined on absolute rather than on normative standards, which are competitive or comparative (Scott & Young, 1976).

The second feature of PSI is *self-pacing*. Given that at least some part of the PSI method requires either partial or complete mastery, students must be afforded an opportunity to go at their own pace. Because of individual learning differences, mastery cannot always be scheduled or timed. Obviously, there must be some mandatory deadlines (i.e., the minimum level of tasks must be set within the time frame of the course—a quarter, a semester, or other) (Seiler, 1983).

Third, the PSI method as first conceived tended to rely heavily on the written word. Today, however, thanks to accessibility of information via the Internet, the written word can easily be complemented with or replaced by video lectures and other electronic materials.

The fourth feature is *undergraduate instructor assistants*. These UIAs have previously taken the course and assist the instructor as proctors and tutors. UIAs are necessary to ensure more personalized attention and to aid the instructor in allowing students to work at varying paces in learning the course's content and mastering the learning outcomes.

The fifth feature is that the *lecture*, under the original design of PSI, was used only for motivation. Today, however, lectures can be available to students at any time of day or night via technology, thereby supplementing and supplanting the written word as the primary means of instruction.

Undergraduate Instructor Assistants

Undergraduate instructor assistants are being used more and more in classrooms today, due in part to diminishing economic resources (Seiler, 1983, 2014). In addition, as enrollments increase, undergraduate assistants can help to address the demands of larger class sizes. It has also been shown that the relationship between an undergraduate instructor assistant and student can be beneficial to both as well as to the instructor and the instructional process itself (Fuller and Winch, 2005).

A major question that often arises with use of undergraduates as instructor assistants, tutors, or apprentices is: Does the use of undergraduate students as teaching assistants provide high quality instruction for students? This question is not easy to answer. Over the past 30 or more years that UIAs have been utilized in our introductory communication course, student evaluations of them suggest an overwhelming "yes!" Although this

contention is not based on a scientific study, it does reflect thousands of students' evaluations of UIAs, which show that UIAs are rated as friendly, caring, and generally perceived by students who work with them as competent.

Unfortunately, relatively little research exists to support or denounce UIAs as effective in the classroom. In one of the first studies of undergraduate students as UIAs, Buerkel-Rothfuss and Yerby (1982) found that students rated working with undergraduates as helpful. This outcome, however, does not indicate that undergraduates are competent instructors.

In a more comprehensive study of the use of undergraduate students as IAs, Jones and Seiler (2005) explored the relationship between perceived instructor assistant communication skills, immediacy, and credibility and student motivation. Although there were a number of limitations to the study, the authors did find that UIAs who were perceived by their students as having better communication skills were also perceived to have higher levels of verbal and nonverbal immediacy. As in previous research, the results here suggest that there is considerable overlap between behaviors that represent communication skills and verbal and nonverbal immediacy.

Jones and Seiler (2005) also found that UIAs that displayed both verbal and/or nonverbal immediacy behaviors had a strong positive influence on student motivation. In a PSI taught course, with its self-pacing feature, UIAs who can motivate students to complete the course successfully are perceived as competent. Moreover, those UIAs who had strong communication skills were also seen as more credible. Jones and Seiler concluded their studies by stating that their findings "prove important for students, instructor assistants, peer tutors, teachers, course directors, department chairs, and university administrators because they show that the communication with the UIA-student relationship is vital to the success of students" (p. 23).

The use of undergraduate students does create some concerns related to quality control, but much of this disadvantage can be overcome with training and control checks to prevent problems from occurring. Thus, if the selection process is effective and high quality students are selected, training is sufficient and complete, and quality control measures are in place, then the use of UIAs can be justified and a value resource to the instructor.

Although research on the use of undergraduate students as instructors is limited, there is sufficient evidence to support their use. The research related to the benefits acquired by the undergraduate instructors has been minimal and not definitive. There are some anecdotal but nevertheless attractive reasons for using UIAs. In a quick survey of UIAs, Seiler (1982) identified several relevant outcomes:

1. *UTAs learn the course materials more thoroughly than when they took the course originally.* The UTAs are exposed to the course's content a second time, and when they have to explain concepts and terms to the students they work with, they have to know what they are telling their students.
2. *UTAs gain experience in working with others.* They understand better behaviors associated with teaching and how it feels to be on the teaching side of the learning experience.
3. *UTAs find the experience very satisfying.* This was evident in that about 30% of the UTAs who are able to do so request to participate in the UTA experience a second time. The UTAs comments when asked almost always indicate an extremely positive experience.

The research question we attempt to answer in this study is how UIAs benefit from serving as instructional assistants in the basic communication classroom.

Method

To understand how undergraduate students benefit from their experiences as UIAs, we interviewed six former UIAs about their experiences and employed qualitative methods to discover emergent themes among their responses. More specifically, we asked them the following questions:

1. How would you describe the responsibilities or role you had as an IA in Comm. 109?
2. As a student yourself, how did the students that you worked with treat you?
3. How did the instructor responsible for the course that you worked in treat you?
4. Describe the training you received and how well it prepared you to do your job.
5. What, if any, challenges did you face as an IA? How did you deal with them?
6. If you had a chance to be an IA again would you? Why or why not?
7. What did you learn from being an IA about yourself? About the course's content? About teaching? About Students?
8. On a 1 to 5 scale with 1 being Extremely Positive and 5 being Extremely Negative, how would you rate your experience as an IA? Explain your rating.

We conducted two interviews in person, two interviews via telephone, and two interviews via email. Four of the UIAs had served in the role for two semesters and two had served for four semesters in the role.

Results

The UIAs who shared their experiences with us reflected candidly on what it meant to them, how they benefitted from the experience, and the challenges they faced during the process. Here, we describe and discuss reflections from the six UIAs who discussed their reflections with us.

"I learned how to balance many different roles and responsibilities"

The UIAs were responsible for many different tasks within our PSI system. When asked how they would describe the responsibilities and roles they had as an UIA in the introductory course, one student responded:

> Being an UIA was definitely a responsibility. There were so many new things that I had to take on. I had to figure out how to teach my group in a way that they could understand and also in a way that kept them interesting and engaged. I had to send out reminder emails and make sure that they were on top of their speeches and papers. I also had to answer any questions that they would have. I had to conduct workshops and breakout sessions with the students, facilitating participation amongst the students, grading speeches and other various assignments, and keeping attendance records. I really had to keep on top of everything and it helped me to understand how important it was to be organized.

This student reflected on the various responsibilities he held as well as the value of the organizational skills. Some UIAs classified their responsibilities as falling somewhere in between that of peer and instructor and described how they needed to find their place as they navigated their various roles:

> I do feel the role is closer than an instructor; our role is somewhere in between a peer and a teacher. The students treated me like I was one of them; they could relate to me but they also looked to me as a mentor who had the knowledge they needed. My students were very attached to me. I really had to figure out how to balance these different roles I had with them. I had to grade them when some of them saw me as a peer but I also had the responsibility to show them I was not their friend and had to take on that position of authority.

This student reflected on how to balance the roles of student/peer and that of leader/mentor. Because the UIAs were simultaneously students themselves, they often discussed how they related well to students while simultaneously needed to find their place as a leader among their peers. UIAs admitted that they initially felt nervous about how students would treat them and shared how they gained the respect of the students in their group:

> At first I was worried how students would react to being taught by someone so close to their age group. However, I established myself right away as serious and credible. I specifically dressed in suits and business attire to emanate the fact that I took my role seriously, just as I demonstrated enthusiasm for the course material and communication's importance in our everyday life. The students in turn respected my instructions, advice, grades, and feedback to them regarding their work.

"I was able to get a behind-the-scenes look at teaching"

UIAs often shared that their experience allowed them to gain glimpse of what a teacher's job entailed. Some UIAs talked specifically about how the UIA experience was an opportunity to engage students in Communication Studies and witness how different learning styles influenced the way they related to the course content:

> The course content is so important, as communication is key to any relationship. The introductory communication course is an important course for any college student to take. I liked teaching the many freshmen in the course in hopes of getting them either interested in Communication Studies or cognizant of their everyday communication skills and uses. I do like the teaching aspect of being an UIA, as I love being a leader and having others listen intently to what I am saying; I aspire to make impacts in others' lives. As for the students, I had the opportunity of observing different learning styles between each student. I liked to see certain methods work better than others so I could hone what worked best for each group of students I had.

Because UIAs work closely with instructors, they often shared how this relationship shaped their experience as an UIA:

> The instructors I worked with were very respectful and appreciative of my contribution to the class. I assisted an instructor in one of my courses that was fairly new to the Communication program, so I was able to contribute my gained knowledge of the UIA program. Not only did I feel very helpful and appreciated, but it also helped the flow of the course. Overall, the instructors I worked with cared that UIAs were an essential part to the dual-learning program the introductory communication course offers.

Other UIAs remarked that gaining a perspective from the teacher's side helped them appreciate the challenges teachers faced. One student commented:

> I learned that teaching is more difficult than one might anticipate, especially if you are working with students that show no enthusiasm or motivation. At first, many students seemed apathetic and indifferent to the material and had absolutely no desire to be there and therefore it [was] increasingly more difficult to get them to engage with one another. It's also simultaneously rewarding when working with engaged and diligent students.

UIAs commonly shared that they discovered teaching was more challenging than they originally expected. Some students who were considering becoming teachers prior to serving as UIAs shared how the experience shaped their ambitions:

> I learned that I should not be a teacher. Not that I didn't love being an UIA, but I figured out that I am not very good at thinking of more questions to keep a discussion going. It was also a struggle sometimes to keep them focused.

Other students expressed that the various responsibilities they held allowed them to understand what teachers faced in the classroom. One UIA remarked:

> I really had to be on top of answering emails and making sure I posted grades on time; otherwise, students would get upset or feel lost. With grading especially I had to be able to justify why I gave a certain grade, because students can be very grade focused. I definitely developed respect for teachers through the process of grading and emails.

"I developed leadership skills"

When reflecting on their experiences, UIAs commonly expressed that the process helped them to develop and enhance their leadership skills, particularly their ability to facilitate discussion and to have confidence in interacting with students. One student shared:

> Well we got internship credits for being an UIA and that's really how I approached it, as an opportunity to develop these new skills. I enjoyed earning credits for the internship, and also appreciated how applicable the experience was for my future as a leader but as a communicator as well.

This student mentioned how receiving internship credits while serving as an UIA shaped the seriousness with which he approached his UIA responsibilities. Other students expressed similar sentiments:

> I took the role of "leader" from the beginning. In this, being a mature role model for all of the Comm classes was important in establishing credibility and respect. I accepted the responsibilities of showing up for class on time, showing attention and interest during lectures, grading speeches fairly, and effectively teaching the coursework in different ways I saw that worked for each of my groups of students.

Other students shared how the challenges they faced helped to develop their confidence in their own leadership abilities:

> The first time that I was with my group I definitely felt intimidated. Just because there were so many students, and I didn't know what they were like or if it would be a struggle to get them to listen to me or not. I wondered, "Would they listen to me?" "Would they see me as being in a position to evaluate them?" Even though I knew what I was doing, I was still nervous. But by the end of the semester, I realized how much I had grown in my own ability to lead discussion, answer questions, and just understand how to be confident

One student discussed the importance of the patience she developed during the process of being an UIA:

> Being an UIA helped me to have more patience with others and I think that helped me develop as a leader. Working with the students helped me to realize that having patience is a very necessary thing. Some of the students ended up surprising me. I had high expectations of them to begin with, but a few of the students in my group went above and beyond of what the assignment had asked of them.

Students often reflected how they saw their communication skills develop during the semester because of the roles they assumed within the classroom. One UIA shared:

> At first, I don't think that the students really knew how to interact with me. They were very respectful but didn't say much and it was like pulling teeth to get them to participate in the discussions. Over time, I learned that I just needed to give them time to answer and figure out different ways to facilitate discussion. After several weeks of meeting together, they became more comfortable around me and the other group members. They were still respectful but we treated each other as equals, which I think benefited our group. I think that's part of leadership is that mutual respect.

Other students reflected on the challenges they faced and how these challenges helped to develop their leadership skills:

> As a UIA the only challenge I feel that I faced was that some students took my kindness for weakness. And to let them know I was serious and that I gave them the grade they earned for the assignment. I learned to be more assertive to have confidence in my ability to do the job.

"The training workshops helped prepare me for my role in the classroom"

The UIAs participated in weekly training sessions over the course of the semester that focused on preparing them to lead in-class workshops, grade speeches, and answer questions from students. The UIAs discussed what they found most useful about their training and what it meant to their experience in the classroom. One UIA responded:

> The training sessions helped me develop better time management, leadership and organization skills and were just a chance to ask questions and make sure we were all on the same page. I had to work hard and answer questions from students that had concerns or needed help on certain aspects of the course and the trainings helped me make sure I knew how to do that.

Other UIAs reflected on how the trainings prepared them to be fair and consistent graders:

> A big part of our responsibility is grading student speeches so we focused on how to do that in training by watching speeches from students in the past and practicing grading it so we could make sure we understood the grading process. That was when we could ask questions about why were grading something a certain way, like making sure we knew what a thesis statement looked like, that kind of thing.

Because grading student speeches was a large part of the role of the UIAs, they remarked on what they learned about the grading process from the training they received:

> I learned that it's really important to be consistent across students, because you're going to be accountable for those grades and sometimes it was hard to give low grades when I could tell students were nervous, but training was a chance to practice the grading and talk it through as a group. We also talked about how giving too high of grades is harmful because it hurts the students who actually give "A" speeches. I felt confident about how I graded from the training; we practiced it a lot.

UIAs also reflected on other aspects of the training they received and how it prepared them to do their job:

> The original training UIAs received was very helpful to feel confident in grading the different speeches and instructing the course activities each class. I felt comfortable being able to talk about the different topics like persuasion, problem solving, listening after. It was especially helpful since we actually practiced doing the activities ourselves as well as grading practice speeches before the real speeches. It was very reassuring to know that I was giving out similar grades for certain material as the other UIAs.

Overall, the UIAs interviewed for this analysis reflected positively on what the experience taught them and the various ways it prepared them to work with students. On a 1 to 5 scale (with 1 being Extremely Positive and 5 being Extremely Negative) students on average gave their experience a 2. And all but one vehemently responded that they would want to be a UIA again if they had the chance. As one student commented, "Getting course credit and

helping further other students' education was very fulfilling. I thrill off of being a leader and enjoyed my experience and the instructors I had the privilege of getting to know."

Limitations and Future Directions

In seeking to understand how UIAs benefit from the experience of assisting instructors, we asked UIAs themselves to share their reflections about doing so with us. While we gathered rich data from the interviews of the UIAs who talked with us, a potential limitation is our focus only on self-report data. Although self-report data is important, it is useful to note that collecting other types of data (e.g. through fieldwork) would provide additional avenues to gain a richer understanding of UIAs experiences. Second, our sample of participants was small and reflected very positively on their experience. While this finding supports previous research suggesting that UIAs find the experience very satisfying (Seiler, 1982), it would be useful to obtain a larger sample in order to assess a wider range of experiences. While we lacked an ethnically diverse sample, future researchers could design studies that aim to assess the way various social locations, such as race and gender, impact the way UIAs experience their roles. We approached this study by interviewing the UIAs individually, but future researchers could usefully examine the experiences of UIAs from the perspective of faculty, from the perspective of undergraduate students enrolled in courses using the PSI system, or through conducting focus groups that bring UIAs and students together to talk about the challenges and benefits of this method of instruction. Clearly, additional research aimed at understanding both how UIAs benefit from the experience of assisting instructors and how students benefit from the assistance of UIAs is warranted.

Conclusion

The goal of this study was to examine how undergraduate instructor assistants (UIAs) benefit from the experience of assisting instructors. While UIAs admitted a number of challenges, such as striving to find their place as both leader and peer, they overwhelmingly reported the experience as positive. As financial resources become more limited and enrollments continue to grow, utilizing UIAs can help meet the unique demands of the contemporary college classroom. The findings described how UIAs learned to balance many different roles and responsibilities, gained a unique perspective on teaching, developed leadership skills, and grew from the training they received in ways that prepared them for their role as classroom UIAs. These findings support previous research that explores how UIAs can be beneficial to students, as well as the instructional process. The PSI method is one powerful method for individualized instruction and UIAs play an essential role in ensuring that students receive more personal attention and foster an environment where students can work at varying speeds in learning course content. Through examining how UIAs themselves reflect on and describe their experiences, these findings shed light on the benefits and challenges students encounter as they assume this unique role within the classroom.

References

Boylan, H. R. (Spring 1980). PSI: A survey of users and their implementation practices. *Journal of Personalized Instruction*, *4*, 40–43.

Buerkel-Rothfuss, N. & Yerby, J. (1982). *PSI vs traditional model of instruction.* Paper presented at the meeting of the Speech Communication Assocication, Louisville, KY.

Carnegie Mellon University (2002). Obligations and expectations for undergraduate teaching assistants. *Eberly Center for Teaching Excellence,* 1–5.

Fuller, R., & Winch, D., (2005) The personalized system of instruction (PSI), or Keller Plan, thirty years later. http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/physicspsikeller/8.

Jones, A., & Seiler, W. J., (2005). *Exploring the relationship between perceived peer instructor communication skills, immediacy, credibility, and student motivation in the PSIi-taught basic communication course.* Paper presented at the meeting of the National Communication Association, Boston, MA.

Keller, F. S. (1968). Goodbye teacher. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis, 1,* 79–89.

Kulik, J. A., Kulik, Chen-Lin C., & Cohen, P. A., (1979) A meta-analysis of outcome studies of Keller's personalized system of instruction, *American Psychologist, 34,* 307–318.

Scott, M. D., & Young, T. J. (1976). Personalizing communication instruction. *Communication Education*, *25,* 211–221.

Sherman, J. G. (1974). *Personalized System of Instruction: Forty-one germinal papers.* Menlo Park, Calif.: W. A. Benjamin.

Sherman, J. G. (1982). PSI today. In F.S. Keller & J. G. Sherman (Eds.), *The PSI Handbook: Essays on personalized instruction* (pp. 72–78), Lawrence, KS: TRI Publications.

Seiler, W. J. (1982). *Undergraduate teaching assistants: Friend or foe to the basic course director.* Paper presented at the Midwestern Basic Course Directors' Conference, Amana, IA.

Seiler, W. J. (1983). PSI: An attractive alternative for the basic communication course. *Communication Education*, *32,* 15–25.

Seiler, W. J. (2014). A search via Google of schools using UTAs found a significant number of university and colleges of all sizes using them in a variety of courses and situations.

Journal of the Association for Communication Administration
Volume 33, #1, Winter-Spring 2014, pp. 57-59.

Book Review

Review of Wheeler, D. (2012). *Servant leadership for higher education: Principles and practices.* San Francisco, CA: John Wiley & Sons.
ISBN: 978-1-118-00890-4 (hardcover, 208 pp.) $40.00

John Howard III[1]

For those who find administration challenging and frustrating and also find many of the extant works on management and leadership to be mechanical or push persons outside of their comfort zone, Daniel Wheeler's Servant Leadership for higher education is a refreshing and encouraging read.

Wheeler's text takes Robert Greenleaf's (e.g., 1977) work on servant leadership and more than three decades of subsequent contributions and comfortably places them in the context of higher education administration. Those familiar with leadership literature and servant leadership in particular will find it no surprise that the manuscript has a strong collaborative and communicative appeal. However, this appeal extends beyond the simple tenets and principles of servant leadership and social interaction. Wheeler has discussed the processes as experienced social phenomena through case studies and his own research. The reader comes away with an understanding that although servant leadership has specified, defined characteristics, it can be realized in practice with great diversity and a modicum of personal change. Instead of reinventing oneself, being a servant leader requires creating and understanding oneself; it is not a change to something different, but a realization of something aspired to.

Wheeler's text begins with a thoughtful introduction of servant leadership and how a passage of Peter Senge's led him to consider the approach as practically and theoretically valuable. The first chapter reviews "unsuccessful" leadership models and highlights many of the traditional misconceptions about leaders, leadership, and social dynamics. Such views tend to focus on hierarchy, authority, centralized power, and one-way communication. He further discusses the challenges of finding who self-defines or could be defined as a "servant leader" in his research among higher education administrators. Chapter two defines a "philosophy of living" via servant leadership that characterizes the holistic experience of the leader as individual and group member. The philosophy serves as a counterpoint to the traditional views of leadership and illustrates how "service" is leadership.

The philosophy in chapter two is further articulated in the next 11 chapters of the book. Chapter three summarizes Wheeler's ten principles of servant leadership: service to others, meeting the needs of others, fostering problem solving and responsibility, promoting emotional healing, means as important as ends, attending to the present and the future, embracing paradoxes and dilemmas, leaving a legacy, modeling servant leadership, and developing more servant leaders. Wheeler's list shares many principles with other extrapolations of Greenleaf's work, most notably Kent Keith's (2008) seven key practices, Larry Spears's (2002) ten characteristics, and James Sipe and Don Frick's (2009) seven pillars. Wheeler's perspective variously supports and supplants these other approaches as he articulates his vision in the subsequent chapters.

[1] East Carolina University

Chapter four, "Principle One: Service to Others is the Highest Priority," captures the essence of Greenleaf's beliefs regarding leadership. Leadership is embodied in working with others for the best interests of all. Service is not martyrdom–it is the thoughtful and purposeful contribution of one's efforts to a greater (organizational) good. The well-being of an educational institution is predicated on the efforts of all levels and all members.

Chapter five, "Principle Two: Facilitate Meeting the Needs of Others," features how needs are opportunities to lead/serve and how meeting those needs fosters organizational health and success. Chapter six, "Principle Three: Foster Problem Solving and Taking Responsibility at All Levels," addresses the role of individual initiative and integrity. Solving problems (a significant responsibility of administrators) involves ownership of the processes and outcomes. A decision does not end with its arrival or execution; it has ramifications that servant leaders must recognize and work with.

Chapter seven, "Principle Four: Promote Emotional Healing in People and the Organization," features the role of the servant leader as a human being, albeit one with organizational and individual commitments. It features the humanity of collective/organizational action and the significant role that personal connection plays in well-being and successful organizational efforts.

Chapter eight, "Principle Five: Means Are as Important as Ends," illustrates the importance of how leadership activities are conducted. Investing in others, providing guidance, and giving constructive criticism are important in content but also in presentation. As servant leaders support, motivate, and evaluate others, they wisely attend to the process and the outcome.

Chapter nine, "Principle Six: Keep One Eye on the Present and One on the Future," articulates the simultaneous short and long-term efforts administrators must balance in the service of their organizations. It is only by living in the present and attending to the "now" that a path can be constructed to reach some future state or goal.

Chapter ten, "Principle Seven: Embrace Paradoxes and Dilemmas," should remind many scholars of Baxter's (1988) "dialectical tensions" and the regular discussions of boundaries and "work-home balance" (e.g., Deetz, 1992; Hochschild, 1989) in the organizational communication literature. By definition, one is an individual and a group member, a co-worker and a supervisor (or subordinate), a part of an organization and apart from it. Servant leadership is characterized by navigating paradoxes and contradictions within oneself and among others.

Chapter eleven, "Principle Eight: Leave a Legacy to Society," notes that not just any legacy qualifies for the servant leader. The legacy is one that builds and upon which others can build. It is a legacy of service to others rather than one of looking up to leaders past. Succession planning, creating sustainable policies and benefits, and leaving society better off than one found it are all manifestations of the legacies Wheeler sees in his model of servant leadership.

Chapter twelve, "Principle Nine: Model Servant Leadership," reveals that servant leadership has many manifestations. As noted by Senge (1990) in his work on "learning organizations," there isn't any one "learning organization"; the learning organization is a type of organization. Embodying servant leadership means living and practicing it as part of one's own leadership, professional development, and fulfillment of professional and personal goals.

Chapter thirteen, "Principle Ten: Develop More Servant Leaders," concludes the review of Wheeler's principles. One of the best legacies a servant leader can leave is a succession of others who serve the greater good, sustain good programs and policies, and

foster positive change within and beyond the academy's walls. It is another example of how servant leadership is not simply a characteristic, practice, or trait – it is a collaboration of many who lead by serving and pass that on to subsequent servant leaders.

Chapter fourteen, "Care and Feeding of Servant Leaders," summarizes the means by which servant leadership can be sustained and expanded. Servant leaders function best in an environment that encourages and recognizes service and that defines leadership in terms of process and product—rather than title or simply outcome (see Senge, 1990, 1996; Spears, 2002).

Wheeler concludes in chapter 15 with "Some Common Questions (Myths) Regarding Servant Leadership. He makes explicit references to some things that may be easily misconstrued in the definition of servant leadership (e.g, subservience, being "soft") or are promoted by colloquial misunderstandings (e.g., servant leadership is religious. The chapter is short but forms a neat and concise closing to a book that addresses an ambiguous concept in a meaningful fashion without oversimplifying it.

Readers of "Servant Leadership for Higher Education" will likely find it a relaxed and engaging read. The case studies in the chapters bring the concepts (and challenges) to life and draw upon the academic context university administrators know so well. Furthermore, those aspiring to be servant leaders will be validated in their pursuits as leadership is not defined via title or position but as an activity of supporting the good of an organization and beyond (see Chaleff's 1995 book, *The Courageous Follower).* Academics have a unique vantage point to appreciate what it means to serve given their triumvirate obligations to educate (serve), research/or create (serve), and to engage in service (serve). Wheeler's work naturally fits with the commitments university members encounter on a daily basis and provides a thoughtful and encompassing approach from which the well-seasoned and novice leaders may benefit.

References

Baxter, L.A. (1988). A dialectical perspective on communication strategies in relationship development. In S. Duck (Ed.), *Handbook of Personal Relationships*, 257–273.

Chaleff, I. (1995). *The courageous follower: Standing up to and for our leaders*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.

Deetz, S. (1992). *Democracy in an age of corporate colonization: Developments in communication and the politics of everyday life*. New York : SUNY Press .

Greenleaf, R. K. (1979). *Servant leadership: A journey into the nature of legitimate power and greatness*. Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press.

Hochschild, A. R., & Machung, A. (1989). *The second shift: Working parents and the revolution at home*. New York: Viking.

Keith, K. M. (2008). *The case for servant leadership*. Westfield, IN: The Greenleaf Center for Servant Leadership.

Senge, P. M. (1990). *The fifth discipline*: *The art and practice of the learning organization*. New York: Currency Doubleday.

Senge, P M. (1996). Leading learning organizations. *Executive Excellence, 13*(4), 10–12.

Sipe, J. W., & Frick, D. M. (2009). *Seven pillars of servant leadership: Practicing the wisdom of leading by serving*. Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press.

Spears, L.C. (2002). Introduction: Tracing the past, present, and future of servant- leadership. In L. Spears & M. Lawrence (Eds.), Focus on leadership: Servant leadership for the twenty-first century (pp. 1-16). New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Spears, L. C. (2010). Character and servant leadership: Ten characteristics of effective, caring leaders. *The Journal of Virtues & Leadership*, *1*, 25–30.

Journal of the Association for Communication Administration
Volume 33, #1, Winter-Spring 2014, pp. 60-62.

Briefly Noted
Mentoring Faculty Members into (and away from) Serving as Department Chair

Sue Pendell[1]

1. The positives about being a department chair:

    a. You get to mentor new faculty members toward successful careers, including tenure and promotion and promotion to full.
    b. You can have a significant, positive, long-term impact on a department and its programs, a larger impact than is possible as a non-administrative faculty member.
    c. Your work as chair is central to the well-being of your discipline.
    d. You get to develop opportunities for faculty and students.
    e. You get to solve problems.
    f. There's a lot of organizational work which can offer the satisfaction of accomplishing multiple tasks.
    g. You can do great public relations for your department and your discipline with the college, the university, and the public.
    h. You can support and encourage faculty scholarship and teaching.
    i. You can help guide faculty in strengthening the quality of the curriculum.
    j. It will be an adventure.
    k. You get to build a larger professional network.
    l. You develop and enhance your administrative skills and abilities.
    m. You're part of a bigger vision.
    n. You help students toward better lives.
    o. You get free food and drink at the receptions you have to attend.

2. The negatives of being a department chair:

    a. You work 12 months! (But you get annual leave, hopefully at least 24 days a year—almost five weeks!)
    b. "At some point you will generate disagreement with almost everyone in the department" (Hess, 2013, p. 8).
    c. You're responsible for everything, but
    d. You may lack the authority to do what you need to do.
    e. You don't have a lot of control over your time and agenda.
    f. A lot of the organizational work is routine, and it takes a lot of your time.
    g. Revenue generation/resource support has become a major driver, so you need to think in terms of recruiting students, offering more online courses, developing for-profit centers, selling coursebooks for multi-section courses, naming rights, and anything else to generate revenue.
    h. Your relationships with some of your colleagues will change.
    i. It will be scary at times.
    j. You spend a great deal of time on personal issues.

[1] Professor and Chair Emerita, Department of Communication Studies, Colorado State University

k. Your research suffers.
l. You don't get to teach as much as you might like.
m. You can't make everybody happy.

3. Personal qualities that help with being a chair:

   a. You need to be able to set aside your interests because your concern is the department.
   b. You need a thick skin to deal with problems, especially people problems.
   c. You need to be good at organization.
   d. You need to be flexible and good at multi-tasking.
   e. "If you have a concern for the common good, an insightful sense of vision, a love of making things better, and tenacity in pursuing those goals in the face of obstacles, the chair's office offers a unique opportunity to contribute" (Hess, 2013, p. 8).
   f. You need to have strong interpersonal skills, including the ability to deal with conflict.
   g. You need to be able to work effectively with a number of constituents.
   h. You need to have strong time and email management skills.
   i. You need the discipline to make notes to file about every conversation every day.

4. Outcomes of being a department chair:

   a. "Your success as a chair is measured by how well you make your department and its members better" (Hess, 2013, p. 9).
   b. Personally, you gain a broader understanding of how the department, college, and university work;
   c. you will have a "new appreciation of the positive elements of faculty life,"
   d. and you may develop "aspirations of an administrative career path" (Hess, 2013, p. 11).
   e. You will garner skills to prepare you for other administrative positions.
   f. You will develop a larger network to help your department and your career.
   g. You can make people's lives better.

5. Preparation for becoming a department chair:

   a. The more you know about how departments/colleges/the university works the better.
   b. The more contacts you have in the university the better.
   c. The more contacts you have in the discipline the better.
   d. The more budget/financial experience you have the better. If you don't have this going in, you need to start learning about it as soon as you accept the position. The budget enables not only your department's strategies but also faculty and staff happiness.
   e. The more department service you've done the better.
   f. The more college and university service you've done the better.
   g. Conflict management training is extremely helpful.
   h. The more you know about development/fund raising the better.

i. The more experience you've had with assessment, program review, and accreditation the better.
j. Take advantage of any seminars/workshops/training offered by your discipline, your university/college, and other sources. (See 6.e.)
k. Experience on college/university P&T committees is highly desirable where possible.
l. Learn the names of the key staff persons in each administrative office. They may well be the key to campus success.

6. What can you do to develop/mentor someone into the chair's role?

   a. Involve good possibilities for becoming chair in meetings with the Development people so they begin to learn what a chair does in that area.
   b. Encourage them to serve on College and University committees so they get the bigger picture.
   c. Make sure they have experience on your Executive Committee.
   d. Have them serve as Director of Graduate Studies, Director of Undergrad Studies, Assistant/Associate Chair, etc.
   e. Send them to conventions/conferences/sessions that have department chair training. In addition to chair training through your academic discipline, a number of dedicated programs are available: The Academic Chairpersons Conference put on by Kansas State University is recommended particularly as being both high quality and reasonably priced. The American Council on Education (ACE) has a Leadership Academy for Department Chairs—more expensive than the Academic Chairpersons Conference and, according to some, not as valuable as it could be. The ACE's also puts on Regional Women's Leadership Forums; in Colorado, the Academic Management Institute for women is sponsored by the Colorado Network of Women Leaders, the ACE's Office of Women state affiliate. Higher Education Resource Services (HERS) has institutes for Women in Higher Education Administration which are more broadly based than just for department chairs but very educational and particularly strong on getting the broader, university-wide perspective on administration.

*A number of these ideas are from Hess, J.A. (May, 2013). The risks and rewards of serving as a department chair. *Spectra, 49* (2), 8-11. Others come from the Colorado State University College of Liberal Arts department chairs and the National Communication Association Department Chairs Advisory Committee members.

Journal of the Association for Communication Administration

Guidelines for Submission

JACA is a scholarly, academic journal sponsored by the Association for Communication Administration that is committed to publishing invited and refereed manuscripts related to scholarship and research in the administration of communication units at all levels of the academic institution. The journal will consider for publication all scholarship in the broadly defined field of communication that makes a significant contribution to the knowledge of human communication, especially as it relates to the administration of the academic unit.

Guidelines for Submission
All types of manuscripts are considered for publication, including research reports, papers of topical interest, state-of-the-art reviews, and other manuscripts directly related to ACA concerns. Manuscripts may be philosophical, theoretical, methodological, critical, applied, pedagogical, or empirical in nature. Materials published are not restricted to any particular setting, approach, or methodology.

Review Process
JACA uses a blind review process. All manuscripts are initially screened by the editor, who will reject any manuscript without review if it is clearly outside the scope of the journal or fails to comply with the guidelines. Members of the editorial board review all other manuscripts. The final decision concerning publication is made by the editor after examining the recommendations obtained from the editorial board members. Authors normally will have an editorial decision within three months.

Submission of Manuscripts
A copy of the manuscript must be submitted via the Internet in English and must conform to APA (6th edition) guidelines. Manuscripts should not exceed 25 double-spaced typed 8½ x 11 inch pages, exclusive of tables and references, be in 12 point Times New Roman typeface, and submitted in Microsoft Word. Manuscripts must be original and not under review by other publishers. The manuscripts should be written in the active voice and employ nonsexist language.

Manuscript Format
The title page should include the title, author(s), corresponding address, telephone number, and Internet address. Because manuscripts are evaluated through a blind (or masked) review process, author identification should be on the title page only. Any references that might identify the author should be removed from the manuscript. The text of the manuscript (including its title) should begin on the next page, with the remaining pages numbered consecutively. Avoid self-identification in the text of the manuscript. Notes and references should be typed double-spaced on pages following the text of the manuscript. Tables and figures must be numbered, supplied with an identifying title, and placed on a separate page at the end of the manuscript. The proper location of each table or figure should be indicated after the paragraph in which it is referenced by the line "Insert Table [or Figure]" in the manuscript, separated by parallel lines above and below.

Book Reviews
JACA will publish reviews of books on topics related to communication, administration, and/or organizational processes. The reviews should be between 4-5 double-spaced 8 ½ x 11 pages and submitted electronically to the editor.

Manuscripts should be submitted via e-mail to the editor, Dr. Janie M. Harden Fritz, at harden@duq.edu.