Business Professors Using High-Quality Connections:

A Connection to Student Self-efficacy?

by

Timothy D. Hartge

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Education
(Curriculum and Practice)
at the University of Michigan-Dearborn
2016

Doctoral Committee:

      Associate Professor Christopher Burke, Chair
      Professor Aaron Ahuvia
      Associate Professor Yi Maggie Guo

Acknowledgements

I would never have been able to finish my dissertation without the guidance of my committee members, help from friends, and support from my wife and family. I would like to express my deepest gratitude to my advisor, Dr. Christopher Burke, for his excellent encouragement, guidance, caring, patience, and providing me with an exceptional atmosphere for doing research. I would like to thank Dr. Aaron Ahuvia, who let me experience the research as art and science as well as his practical approach to my dissertation topic. Also to him for reining in both my personality flaws and keeping me on track. He patiently guided, encouraged and supported me during the difficult period. I would also like to thank Dr. Yi Guo, who also stepped in at a critical time to join my committee without disturbing or upsetting the dissertation strategy. Lastly, despite our differences I would like to thank Dr. Bonnie Beyer for her guidance. My research would not have been possible without their help. I would also like to thank my family. They were always supporting me and encouraging me with their best wishes. Finally, and I cannot thank her enough, my wife, Gail Hartge. She was always there cheering me up and stood by me through the good times and bad.

Table of Contents

List of Appendices

ABSTRACT

This research examines the role the college professor plays in student self-efficacy by observing the communication patterns in the classroom. Professors' academic optimism is their sense and belief that they can teach effectively, that their students can learn, and that the system will support them as they press hard for learning. Students' self-efficacy is the belief that they can overcome difficulty and master the course material. This research utilizes a current business management theory of high-quality connections (HQCs) to attempt to unpack the professor's role in student self-efficacy. This research examines the professor's classroom use of high-quality connections (HQCs) characteristics, the words, the content and non-content teaching pedagogy, methods and materials, and the actions that may produce student self-efficacy. The unique contributions of this research are the use of business theory as applied to the college classroom and the development of theory about HQCs and student self-efficacy. The research uses a case study research design to examine the construct. The participants in this research are three of Michigan's best business professors according to The State of Michigan's President's Council: Distinguished Professor of the Year Award, at three colleges in the region of South and Southeastern Michigan. All three business schools are accredited AACSB colleges.

Keywords: Academic optimism, appreciative inquiry, positive organizational scholarship, high-quality connections, self-efficacy, content and non-content pedagogy.

Chapter 1: Introduction

Much of the narrative about today's business student on college campuses is negative (Keeling & Hersch, 2012). Similarly, the dominant discourse about today's educators paints a potentially bleak picture of the quality both of the professor and of the business college graduate. This discourse of negativism characterizes educators as disinterested, unavailable, or unable to reach students, particularly the next generation (Keeling & Hersch, 2012). And Millennials themselves may be widely perceived by business employers as disconnected and underprepared (Brown, 2013; Belkin, 2015, p. A3).

Is the U.S., as some researchers have suggested (Keeling & Hersch, 2012), failing to deliver true higher learning in its institutions of advanced education? Has academic rigor declined, as others opine (Brown, 2013), to the point where many college graduates lack the skills and knowledge they need to compete in a global workforce? While standards for K-12 educator evaluation have trended toward reliance on student test scores, metrics assessing learning outcomes among college and university graduates are paradoxically missing (Belkin, 2014). Obtaining a bachelor's degree no longer indicates with any certainty whether a graduate has any particular qualifications or possesses the basic skills to succeed in the workplace (Keeling & Hersch, 2012). Yet one of the primary missions of a business college education is to prepare the student for the workforce.

Business Students and the Workforce

Business employers maintain that college is an investment and that the only "worthy" business education programs are those with job-creating value (Bittar, 2012). Employers maintain that the greatest value of a business college education is employability and that universities with marketplace-friendly programs should be encouraged and rewarded (Hamilton, 2011). Employer philosophy regarding programs of worth invigorates the conversation shaping the professor quality discussion (Zusman, 2005). Rigorous colleges that have workforce-relevant programs with internships, or a case study approach, often advertise themselves as a potent weapon against industrial decline (Colvin & Jacobs, 2010). Therefore, workforce preparation, workforce relevance, and teacher quality are intertwined. Due to this increased pressure from employers, higher education is on a search for ways to improve student instruction and thereby career readiness upon graduation (Brown, 2013).

Current Discourse Suggests COB Instruction is Ineffective

There is ample evidence to warrant concern about the quality of student learning on American college campuses today (Belkin, 2015; Brown, 2013). The trouble is that public discourse about America's colleges and universities has become negatively skewed:

> "Instruction is mostly lecture-driven and learning, to the extent that it occurs, is mostly a passive, receptive enterprise. In other words, students should come to class, listen carefully, take good notes, and be thankful. Expectations and standards of excellence for students are also often quite low; meeting them requires minimal student and faculty effort" (Keeling & Hersch, 2012, p. 20).

Such negative discourse presents an obstacle for how colleges approach the issue of academic rigor. The danger is that negativism will create a self-fulfilling prophecy about student learning

that will become difficult to surmount (Harrison & Hasan, 2013). The premise behind the current study is that the responsibility and hope for transformation and revival of high-quality learning may rest with the college classroom professor.

Positive Psychology and the Award-winning Professor's Classroom

One of the most significant contributions educational researchers can make to the field is to illuminate the characteristics of educators that make a real difference in academic rigor and student achievement (Beard, Hoy, & Woolfolk-Hoy, 2010). Interactive, relational organizations, including college classrooms, thrive and succeed based on positive human connections. To begin addressing the growing concerns about the potential deterioration of higher education, this study draws primarily on theory from the field of positive psychology. It may be conjectured that business professors who win state-level awards for distinguished instruction are those whose students achieve at least some level of high-quality learning. In the classrooms of award-winning professors, the story examined here unfolds first with the professor's academic optimism. Academic optimism, rooted in Albert Bandura's social cognitive and self-efficacy theories (Bandura, 1977; 1994), represents a teacher's belief in his or her capacity to teach students, to form trusting relationships with students and parents, and to emphasize academic tasks (Beard, Hoy, & Woolfolk-Hoy, 2010). This construct is illustrated in part by dyadic and positive relationships between student and professor, building a sense of collective efficacy in the classroom.

This collective efficacy can be described as the power that professors have to affect student outcomes positively (Hoy, Tarter, & Woolfolk-Hoy, 2006). All organizations, including classrooms, depend on individuals and organizational actors to interact and form connections that enable them to accomplish tasks. As Bandura's (1977) self-efficacy theory postulates, self-

efficacy works as a cognitive process to mediate change. It is these cognitive processes and ends that are induced and altered most readily by the experience of mastery and effective performance (Cameron, Dutton, & Quinn, 2003, p. 10). Bandura's research indicates that positive processes play a prominent role in the acquisition and retention of new behavior patterns (Bandura, 1977). Bandura believes this acquisition of positive experiences has major impact on learning.

For this study, theories of self-efficacy and academic optimism are supported and supplemented by theories of positive organizational scholarship (POS) (Cameron et al., 2003, p. 19) and appreciative inquiry (AI) (Cooperrider, Sorensen, Whitney, & Yeager, 2000, p. 4; Cooperrider & McQuaid, 2012). POS is concerned primarily with the dynamics that produce positive outcomes, processes, and attributes in organizations (Cameron et al., 2003). Appreciative inquiry (AI) is a systematic study of the factors that make an organizational system most alive, most effective, and most constructively capable (Cooperrider, Whitney, & Stavros, 2008).

Also borrowing from a theory of management known as high-quality connections (HQCs), this research applies current management theory to the classroom (Dutton & Heaphy, 2003). The narrative of this research characterizes the professor as a leader, building high-quality connections and self-efficacy, thereby enhancing learning and potential workforce employability. This research uses the professor's academic optimism as the starting point. Academic optimism elaborates three main principles: 1) collective efficacy between professor and student, or cohesion between the professor and student which leads to a safe, orderly learning environment; 2) professor's trust in the students – that is, here's a collective trust; they can depend on each other; and 3) the professor's academic emphasis, building a structure wherein both parties focus on success (Hoy, Tarter, & Woolfolk-Hoy, 2006). The researcher examines what professors say,

their actions, feedback, course pedagogy and materials that lead to student self-efficacy in the business college classroom. The study specifically investigates the professor's role as a leader and as a catalyst for student self-efficacy. One way to examine this dyadic relationship between professor and student self-efficacy is through the theoretical lens of academic optimism. Investigating classroom learning through the professor's academic optimism and the student's self-efficacy is dynamic, because so much learning is dependent upon the teacher and student making connections (Kuh, Kenzie, Schuh, & Witt, 2010).

What Classroom Practices Help Engage Students?

Hoy, Tarter, and Woolfolk-Hoy (2006) were among the first to explore professor characteristics and to connect student and professor self-efficacy with classroom learning. What they produced was a combined theory of academic optimism, professor self-efficacy, trust between teacher and student, and pressing hard for learning. They contend that both professor academic optimism and student self-efficacy are critical to classroom learning. Both professor and student must be resilient and self-reliant and have a positive belief system to withstand the rigors of learning. Beard, Hoy, and Woolfolk-Hoy (2010) concluded that the academic optimism of the professor becomes a single most latent construct, reflexive of the students' psychological state. Through the formation of dyadic relationships, professors and students form lasting bonds of trust during this process. These relationships are closely linked to student learning, academic tasks, and professor academic optimism. Social cognitive theorists Usher and Pajares (2008) state further that, "Optimistic people are equipped with self-enhancing biases needed to sustain resilience. They also have strong belief in their efficacy, sustaining them in times of trouble" (p. 785). Professors' academic optimism and their drive towards student learning become the students' and professors' shared experiences that may improve learning outcomes and student

self-efficacy. The subject of this research is to examine the communication patterns of professors in the classroom and how these communication patterns shape the relationships that lead to students' engagement in the classroom setting.

Beard et al. (2010) question whether and how academic optimism promotes student learning. Perhaps they believe in part that this is accomplished through the professor's pedagogy and ability to build classroom social capital. These are the resources inherent in the relationship between professor and student. Social classroom capital is formed of such things as trust, norms, and networks of association gathered consistently for a common purpose (Dekker & Uslaner, 2001). Which of these factors, or what combination, trigger and encourage academic learning? In any case, it may be posited that instructional classroom leaders set the stage for positive learning experiences (Nichols, 2010; Pounder, 2006). If indeed the professor is the classroom leader, the vehicle or method for modeling and encouraging the transference of positivism and optimism are contained in the dominant characteristics or methods of that classroom professor. Classroom leadership is not simply inanimate speech. It is the leader's action(s) and professional pedagogy (content and non-content) and the traits that have the power to cause college students to desire to learn, or create a strong bias towards learning. Motivation, spurred by a professor's academic optimism, may produce the bias for student self-efficacy and learning. Some students marvel in the classroom, others march, and still others dwindle.

It is alleged that when Cicero spoke, people marveled, and when Caesar spoke, people marched. What makes some college students marvel, others march, and still others dwindle? Factors that may motivate students may include convincing students of the value of their learning, or agency, for self-improvement (Bandura, 1977). Do the leader's language, professional traits, and action cause the student to act, to have agency and to develop self-

efficacy? Certainly leader characteristics and language play an important role in student self-efficacy.

The Primacy Principle of Human Communications

The primacy principle of human communications is language. Language is the central principle surrounding organization and change. The constructivist principle postulates that reality is created by communication and that all meaning is made through conversation. The professor making meaning through words and actions, or communication, drives student learning and knowledge. Knowledge therefore is generated in part through the professor's language, communication skills, and actions (Whitney & Trosten-Bloom, 2002).

Classroom instruction through communication, words, and actions, creates the college student's world; it causes agency and transforms the student. Words and actions are the vehicles that create reality for the college student. Words manifest everything and express the individual's creative power (Harrison & Hasan, 2013). The professor in this sense is the orchestra conductor, the classroom leader, orchestrating student transformation and self-efficacy through language and action, through communication. Leading change is part language, and part action-based.

Leading change in the college classroom environment has to do with the leader and students entering into dyadic relationships, strengthening their collective bonds through language and actions. Creating and strengthening these bonds transform classroom learning, leading to academic optimism by filling the atmosphere with eager and optimistic professors and students (Whitney & Trosten-Bloom, 2002). People individually and collectively have unique skills, talents, and gifts to contribute in the classroom ecosystem. Classroom learning and change are best brought about when grounded in individual self-efficacy and in the collective group's strengths and successes (Bandura, 1977). Leadership and management author Peter Drucker once

stated that "The task of leadership is to create an alignment of strengths in ways to make the system's weaknesses irrelevant" (Drucker, 1974, p. 603; Kaplin & Trosten-Bloom, 2010, p. 12; Whitney & Trosten-Bloom, 2002, p. 11). What are the professor's language, actions, traits, or characteristics that help students cultivate self-efficacy?

The purpose of this study is to examine and parse communication patterns in the classroom. The study explores the professor's academic optimism and investigates student self-efficacy. The theories of academic press (Hoy, Tarter, & Woolfolk-Hoy, 2006; Phillips, 1997; Shouse, 1995), positive organizational scholarship (POS) (Dutton & Glynn, 2007), appreciative inquiry (Cooperrider, Whitney, & Stavros, 2008), and high-quality connections (Dutton & Heaphy, 2003) are the operational theories used to investigate student self-efficacy. The research explores whether high-quality connections (HQCs) are the important connections made between a college student and professor and the lynchpin for academic optimism, leading to or cultivating student self-efficacy.

This research, in case-study form, specifically investigates the characteristics of professors that cultivate and have a positive effect on students' self-efficacy. These case studies will investigate the qualities and characteristics of higher education professors at the college level in the state of Michigan. The colleges and professors were selected from a list of AACSB accredited colleges located in Southeastern Michigan (AACSB International Accredited Institutions 2013, n.d.). Specifically, this research asks the questions: Is there evidence of the cultivation of HQCs in the classrooms of award-winning professors? What are the practices that the faculty used to develop and cultivate HQCs in the classroom? How do these practices lead to cultivating students' sense of self-efficacy?

High-Quality Connections in the Business Classroom

The researcher is looking for the quality and structural components of HQCs. HQCs can be experienced in three primary ways: 1) through connections versus relationships, e.g. involved interaction and mutual awareness; 2) through subjective experiences, e.g. a sense of aliveness, positive regard, and felt mutuality; and 3) by greater emotional carrying capacity, e.g. the ability to carry more emotions and both positive and negative emotions – the ability to yield, adjust, bend, and withstand the strain of difficult learning. Finally, HQCs are connectedness and openness to new ideas (Cameron & Spreitzer, 2011; Dutton & Heaphy, 2003). Primarily these feelings and student beliefs are initiated by the professor, and the student must possess them to move toward greater self-efficacy, for deeper levels of learning.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to examine and look at communication patterns in the classroom.

Chapter 2: Literature Review

This study draws on the theoretical fields and perspectives of Bandura's Theory of Self-efficacy, positive psychology, Positive Organizational Scholarship (POS) theory, appreciative inquiry, and High-quality Connections (HQCs). This chapter describes the conceptual framework within which the research was conducted and reviews the literature upon which the study was based.

Understanding Self-efficacy in the University Context

Self-efficacy is essential for learning. Bandura (1977) defined self-efficacy as individuals' belief in their own capabilities which produces an individual performance that influences the individual's life events. Degree of self-efficacy influences a person's choice of activities, level of effort, and persistence and thus directly affects academic motivation (Schunk, 1991).

We can understand how a positive sense of self-efficacy is developed in a University context by looking at the things that work well in an organization to build self-efficacy among employees, such as positive organizational scholarship and appreciative inquiry. This study will focus on interactions in the classroom: specifically, how interactions support academic optimism, press, and task enabling. The study will use the theoretical framework of HQCs to organize and make sense of classroom interactions.

Bandura's Theory of Self-Efficacy

According to psychologist Albert Bandura self-efficacy determines how people think, feel, behave and how they motivate themselves. Four major human processes are affected by

self-efficacy: cognitive, motivational, effective, and selection processes. Therefore, a strong sense of efficacy enhances an individual's sense of accomplishment and well-being. People with high self-efficacy believe in their own capabilities and approach difficult tasks as challenges to be mastered rather than threats to be avoided (Bandura, 1994). Succinctly stated, self-efficacy is one's belief in one's own ability – the ability to, in a specific situation, attempt and succeed at accomplishing a task. How one approaches goals, tasks, and challenges are affected by one's sense of self-efficacy (Bandura, 1977).

Learning is Dependent on Self-efficacy

It is Bandura's belief that cognitive processes can mediate change in the individual. However, he believes that these cognitive events are self-induced and altered by one's experiences arising from mastery and effective performance. A rise in effective performance leads to mastery, which is the mechanism that induces change and alters the individual's experiences. Bandura's research indicates that cognitive processes play a prominent role in the acquisition and retention of new behavioral patterns and that this acquisition is a major aspect of learning. Often learning occurs through self-corrective adjustments or responses to the consequences or modeling (Bandura, 1977). Bandura also believes these cognitive functions have a predictive quality. Stimuli and events occur together; this predictive cognitive function influences the likelihood of the human behavior being performed (Bandura, 1977).

Conditions that Lead to Self-efficacy: Positive Feedback

Bandura (1977) theorizes that a strong sense of efficacy enhances human accomplishment and personal well-being. People with high assurance in their capabilities approach difficult tasks as challenges to be mastered rather than as threats to be avoided. Such an efficacious outlook fosters intrinsic interest and deep engrossment in activities. They set

themselves challenging goals and maintain strong commitment to achieving those goals. They heighten and sustain their efforts in the face of failure. They quickly recover their sense of efficacy after failures or setbacks. They attribute failure to insufficient effort or deficient knowledge and skills which are acquirable. They approach threatening situations with assurance that they can exercise control over them. Such an efficacious outlook produces personal accomplishments, reduces stress, and lowers vulnerability to depression.

In contrast, people who doubt their capabilities shy away from difficult tasks which they view as personal threats. They have low aspirations and weak commitment to the goals they choose to pursue. When faced with difficult tasks, they dwell on their personal deficiencies, on the obstacles they will encounter, and all kinds of adverse outcomes rather than concentrate on how to perform successfully. They slacken their efforts and give up quickly in the face of difficulties. They are slow to recover their sense of efficacy following failure or setbacks. Because they view insufficient performance as deficient aptitude, it does not require much failure for them to lose faith in their capabilities. They easily fall victim to stress and depression.

Over long intervals and situational circumstances, people process and synthesize feedback information from a sequence of events. Also, the incidence of repeat behavior must be positively reinforced. This self-efficacy feature is based on the person receiving information indicating that the same repeatable behavior either will or will not be paid back on future occasions. Through such reinforcement the incidence of repeat behavior may be increased or reduced. It is therefore Bandura's assumption that psychological procedures, whatever their form, serve as a means of creating and strengthening expectations of self-efficacy. This outcome-based expectancy is the individual belief that a certain behavior will lead to a certain outcome (Bandura, 1977).

Social Interaction Developed in Relationship to Others: Classroom Connection

For both professor and student, personal efficacy is a cornerstone cognitive process that may lead to academic optimism. Building upon the cognitive structures of personal efficacy, students and professors can enter into a bond. That bond is based on the trust that the professor will do no harm and that the student will master the subject matter, advancing the cause of higher education and learning for the student (Hoy et al., 2006). Self-efficacy is vital for a positive change in learning to occur. Implicitly contained within this bond is a belief (positive belief) that students will learn. Bandura believes the acquisition of positive experiences has a major impact on learning (Bandura, 1994).

Positive Organizational Scholarship (POS)

Positive organizational scholarship (POS) is a leadership theory used in business, originating with the positive psychology movement. Positive organizational scholarship links two veins of positive psychology. First, POS looks at how organizations in a macro-context shape positive states and outcomes for organizations, individuals and groups (Cameron, Dutton, & Quinn, 2003). Second, POS concentrates on the cultivation of individual and collective organizational strengths. Narrowly stated, the theory looks at how developing a positive psychological state enhances individual and group performance (Luthans, 2002).

Factors of POS: Developing Individuals' Positive State

By illustrating the critical contexts and positive dynamics that individuals perform in organizations, e.g. colleges, employment and community organizations, measuring positive collective strength is vital to understanding how organizations work (Fredrickson & Dutton, 2008). The organization flourishes through the interplay of positive cognitive, emotional, and relational mechanisms (Dutton & Glynn, 2007). Building these mechanisms serves to create new

individual and collective resources such as energy, respect, optimism, and insight. These factors in turn all contribute to the individual and collective flourishing of the organization.

Examining the Classroom as an Organization using POS

Positive meanings and emotions have an optimistic effect on relationships that can ripple through an entire organization or classroom and produce large effects on a collective scale (Fredrickson & Dutton, 2008). Positivism spirals, as these effects have been described, "spiraling upwards and springing outwards," serve to infuse, connect and energize whole networks of communities and organizations (Fredrickson & Dutton, 2008). The transference of positive organizational scholarship occurs through methods devised by leadership, most notably those methods set forth by the theory of appreciative inquiry.

Appreciative Inquiry

According to Whitney and Trosten-Bloom (2002), appreciative inquiry (AI) is the study and exploration of what gives life to human systems functioning at their best. Appreciative inquiry theory postulates that human organizing and change ultimately is a relational process of inquiry and appreciation, grounded in affirmation (Whitney & Trosten-Bloom, 2002). Whitney and Trosten–Bloom (2002) further state that appreciative inquiry theory is about the dynamic of 'the positive' in human systems change.

Focusing on Positive Outcomes

The positive strengths perspective of AI theory argues that human systems do not flourish under conditions of manufactured urgency, trauma or fear. Under these conditions human systems do not embrace change; in fact, the opposite may be true. Anger and fear tend to constrict cognition. Positivity, on the other hand, tends to open up thought-action repertoires whereby individuals see the best in the world. Human systems might well become more resilient

and capable of realizing their potential if they engage less with negative emotions and more with positive emotions. For example, resiliency may stem from intrinsic hope, inspiration, and joy. Positive emotions tend to broaden, build and open minds (Cooperrider & McQuaid, 2012).

Appreciative inquiry works on the principle of positivism and treats people as people rather than machines. Humans are social beings creating their identities and knowledge in relationship to one another. Humans are curious and like to tell and listen to stories. Commitment comes from human values and beliefs being communicated through the wisdom in the stories. Humans like to learn and practice what they have learned, to achieve their best. They delight in doing well in the eyes of others whom they care about and respect. Appreciative inquiry enables leaders to create humanitarian organizations that are naturally rich in knowledge, based on strength and adaptability; they become learning organizations (Senge, 1990; Whitney & Trosten-Bloom, 2002).

The theory of appreciative inquiry posits six working mechanisms: 1) building relationships, enabling people to be known in the relationship; 2) creating opportunities for people to be heard, recognized and mutually respected; 3) promoting opportunities for people to dream and to share their dreams; 4) creating environments where people may choose how they contribute; 5) providing people the discretion and support to act; and 6) encouraging and enabling people to be positive (Whitney & Trosten-Bloom, 2002).

Thus at its core, AI wants to be transformational. Whether the agenda is change or personal development, appreciative inquiry activates the human cognition to be creative and excel. Words create worlds, and the words applied by appreciative inquiry are no exception (Whitney & Trosten-Bloom, 2002). AI is a tool for college educators, forming a lens for recalibration and establishing a standard for learning. AI creates opportunities for future change

built upon past and present strengths, engaging the actors in a 'dance' of enacting change

(Whitney & Trosten-Bloom, 2002).

Appreciative Inquiry in the Classroom

Although AI theory was initially applied to study business organizations, the theory also

may be readily adapted to the classroom. Appreciative inquiry is a wraparound for one

dimension of academic optimism: belief in the assumption that students are smart and capable of

being active participants in their own learning, rather than simply passive recipients of

knowledge. That notion is a positive, self-fulfilling prophecy – a phenomenon where one's

beliefs about the situation are not only reflected but created. The reality may be that active

participation in the learning process is possible and rewarded (Harrison & Hasan, 2013). High

expectations increase the likelihood that faculty will encourage active participation rather than

passive learning. AI can help shape experiences and focus student attention and reflection both

on the dynamic complexity of their world, and on the means available to create change. AI

essentially functions to reframe inquiry toward matters of importance. These efforts are

accomplished through words and actions.

Looking for Interactions in Award-winning Professors

Words create our worlds; words are transformational. Language shapes perceptions, and

what we see depends on what we are prepared to see (Anderson & Jamison, 2015, p. 6; Lahman

& Lietzenmayer, 2015; Padovani & Tuzzi, 2004, p. 366). Western language is linear, and our

thoughts are thoughts of a system-wide interrelationship, in this case between all classroom

actors (Linear Languages, 2015). It is the language that allows for this complex dynamic

relationship that helps us to understand complex systems or problems, and make strategic

choices. Peter Senge (1990) uses the illustration of filling a glass of water.

"I set the faucet position, which adjusts the water flow, which changes the water level… as the water levels change the perceived gap between the current and desired water level changes. As my hand's position on the faucet changes again, and so does the level" (Senge, 1990).

Most of our Western thoughts embed in linear ways of "seeing" (Linear Languages, 2015; Senge, 1990). Filling the glass of water suggests the world of human actors at the center of activity, operating on an inanimate object. From this linear systems perspective, the human actors are part of the feedback process, not standing apart from it. This process represents a profound shift of awareness, continually influencing people's reality, suggesting that everyone shares responsibility for the scheme. Everyone, professor and students, are required to exert equal leverage to change the system (Senge, 1990). Language develops in this metaphorical way, borrowing from what Kenneth Burke (1945) called the corporal, visible, tangible worlds. We apply words in the form of analogy and metaphor to the realm of the incorporeal, invisible, intangible (Burke, 1945). Human relations require actions that are dramatizations, placing the individual in the material scene. Words and actions are implicit, and humans decide or are persuaded to choose a particular course of action through enthymeme. Enthymeme is the persuasive process of convincing by demonstration or proof that something is fundamentally true. It is the function wherein symbols that adhere to certain innate or cultural attitudes and judgments lead the human to decide on a particular course of action (Burke, 1945; Sloane, 2001). It is through these human interactions that we form the bonds of trust (Hoy et al., 2006).

The bond of trust forms a linear evidentiary system leading to persuasion. The trust then forms into a dyadic relationship between professor and student. The use of words and language as action creates reality (Anderson & Jamison, 2015, p. 6; Lahman & Lietzenmayer, 2015;

Padovani & Tuzzi, 2004, p. 366). As the famous General Electric CEO Jack Welch said, "a good business leader creates a vision, articulates the vision, passionately owns the vision, and relentlessly drives it to completion" (Tichy & Charan, 1989, p. 3). They cast the vision, using words to describe that vision and what they believe to be the right course for the organization. This type of leader operates language with a skill that encourages listeners to envision a potent future (Luntz, 2007). It is only when the messenger, the message, and the recipient all are in alignment that effective communications occur, and therefore change and transformation takes place (Hartge, Callahan & King, 2015).

Language delivery, which can include words and body language, also is important (Mehrabian & Ferris, 1967, p. 249). Delivery and words are powerful, and no industry understands this better than Hollywood, creator of film and television series (McLuhan, 1994, p. 13). Ultimately it is not exactly what the professor may say, but also what people see (linear and systematic) (Luntz, 2007). Perhaps the single most important component of academic optimism is making these communicative connections between student and professor. And it is the leaders' words and actions and the students' responses that form the basis of high-quality connections.

The Classroom and Academic Rigor, Optimism and Press

Academic rigor today is far more than a buzzword or catchphrase used in higher education jargon. Academic rigor can be identified as similar to the effect of a production supervisor demanding more effectiveness and efficiencies in the production process, along with assurances of quality (Jackson, 2012; Hechinger Institute, 2010). However, because we lack a clear understanding of how academic rigor operates, it remains difficult to define (Blackburn, 2008; Bowers & Power, 2010). Therefore, unpacking the meaning of academic rigor into the

theoretical parts of academic optimism and academic press may reveal how student achievement is obtained in the modern-day college classroom.

Academic Optimism

Academic optimism may be defined in terms of the relationships between student and professor, college and student, parents and faculty. The composition of academic optimism has three working concepts: 1) collective efficacy of the faculty – that the professor can teach effectively; 2) faculty trust that students can learn and get support from parents and administration; and 3) that professors can set a "high bar" for learning and emphasize academics. Academic emphasis is also known as academic press (Hoy et al., 2006). Hoy et al. describe collective efficacy as the power professors have to affect student outcomes positively. The authors maintain that while focusing exclusively on professors, faculty trust is a contributor to academic rigor. Faculty trust includes reciprocal relationships in which each stakeholder believes that the others will continually act in each other's best interest. The theory of academic optimism emphasizes a cognitive and behavioral construct consisting of high academic goals for students and an orderly learning environment. The construct also includes motivated students, respect for all stakeholders and for academic achievement (Hoy et al., 2006). Both student and professor require a high quotient of self-efficacy to achieve academic optimism. Another theory thought to play a role in establishing academic rigor is academic press.

Academic Press

The academic press compact is between the academic college organization, the teaching culture, and a curriculum driven by academically-oriented beliefs, values, and norms. Some academic cultures may be oriented more toward other kinds of outcomes, such as student self-esteem, sense of belonging, or the establishment of supportive and caring social relationships.

Although the point has not been proven, Shouse (1995) posited that "academic press may exist as a 'statistically significant' predictor of academic achievement" (Shouse, 1995). Academic press theory emerged as early as the 1980s (Phillips, 1997). Shouse (1995) described academic press as an academic climate consisting of high-status courses and the assignment of meaningful homework. Shouse (1995) also concluded that relevance and earned grades in combination with disciplinary climate were part of the theory of academic press. Other components of academic press may be high rates of attendance, positive behavior, and professors' instructional practices, including setting high standards and providing meaningful feedback to students (Shouse, 1995; Spellings & Oldham, 2006,).

In the classroom academic press may be expressed as output-driven daily activities, practices, experiences, and understandings, complementing and reinforcing the importance of academic achievement (Shouse, 1995). However, to achieve this high standard of learning, the student and professor must form a bond of mutual trust and confidence. One of the first steps to academic optimism is that the student and professor must have self-efficacy. As explicated above, self–efficacy is the belief that one can be successful at the task or in the field; more than just a positive disposition about the task, it also involves an accurate assessment both of the task requirements and of one's own abilities. Both professors and students must possess a belief in their abilities to complete tasks and achieve goals. These beliefs and abilities are critical as both move forward to explore learning. Bandura's unifying theory of self-efficacy and behavior presents evidence from a theoretical perspective about how behavior is acquired and regulated through cognitive processes, and how self-efficacy is achieved (Bandura, 1977).

High-Quality Connections in the Business Classroom

Task-enabling

According to Dutton (2003) task-enabling is a mutual investment process where both people benefit by the relationship. It is being attentive to the other person's needs and alert to opportunities to help them improve and grow. It is the act of giving something of oneself to invest actively in another's success (Dutton, 2003).

Task-enabling behaviors are related to empowerment and self-efficacy. Task-enabling, empowerment and self-efficacy all are linked to a psychological sense of personal control, influence, and power (Bandura, 1977; Rappaport, 1987, p. 11). The concept of task-enabling and empowerment also is linked to faculty scaffolding learning for students, enabling and motivating students to appreciate learning.

Study Looking for Interactions that Promote Task-enabling

The concept of task-enabling is linked to student motivation (Brophy, 1999, p. 77). The pedagogy and curriculum of the classroom professor should be organized around concepts that students find valuable and recognize as important to them, thereby encouraging them to derive motivational benefits as well as knowledge and skills (Faircloth & Miller, 2011, p. 264). Faculty who seek to task-enable students are those who give honest feedback and encourage growth through interactions. Students learn to benefit from faculty and peer feedback and to value professional counsel (Espeland, 2001, p. 345).

High-quality Connections (HQCs)

Human connections are vital to organizational systems, and the quality of those connections in turn affects how organizations function (Dutton & Heaphy, 2002). Dutton and Heaphy (2002) characterize the quality of connections using a human tissue metaphor: high-quality connections are those that allow the transfer of vital nutrients and are flexible, strong, and

resilient; by contrast, in low-quality connections ties exist but the connection is damaged, and thus "there is a little death in every interaction" (Dutton, 2003).

High-quality connections are discrete positive social interactions between at least two people where both in the relationship are aware of the interaction (Dutton, 2003). The mutual experience of an interaction implies that individuals have affected one another in some way. Connections may occur as the result of a momentary encounter, and also may have cumulative effects over a longer time period (Dutton & Heaphy, 2002). The power of a high-quality connection forms the foundations of longer-term relationships; it has lasting implications for the individuals, and often for the organization (Dutton & Heaphy, 2002).

Explaining HQCs

There are two types of connections that define HQCs: those that build the relationship, and those that strengthen the relationship. Both types revolve around the interaction between two people and require both individuals to realize they are experiencing the interaction. Behind both types of connections are three foundational mechanisms: cognitive, emotional, and behavioral. Cognitive mechanisms denote both conscious and unconscious thoughts that predispose people to build HQCs. Emotional mechanisms represent the extent to which one's feelings are involved in shared connections with other people. Behavioral mechanisms highlight the role of actions that help define the quality of the connection being formed (Stephens, Heaphy, & Dutton, 2011).

Applying HQC Theory to the Classroom

Building on Dutton and Heaphy's (2003) research discussing business leaders' use of HQCs to create successful organizations, this study seeks to apply the model to the award-winning professor's classroom. Communication, interactions and connections between professors and students in the classroom are dynamic. To expand upon the tissue metaphor,

High-Quality Connections in the Business Classroom

HQCs are living tissue, muscle and tendon which require mutual awareness and inter-connection to sustain (Berscheid & Lopes, 1997, p. 136). The muscle provides the vigor to make the body move and function; the tendons or sinew connect to the structure (Stephens, Heaphy, & Dutton, 2011, p. 263). Often relationships refer to two people in association with one another (Reis, 2001, p. 60). For the purposes of this study, it is not assumed that students and professors have ongoing bonds or a prior history together. Further, people and connections are dynamic and feelings may change during any given interaction.

Connections are produced by changes in people's behavior, feelings, or thinking, or within the classroom ecosystem (Gable & La Guardia, 2007; Reis, 2007). Social processes and connections also are key elements of how work is performed and accomplished in both organizations and classrooms. The quality of the connection may vary with inputs and feedback (Hartge et.al, 2015). Differences in connection quality may reflect variations in the health and well-functioning of the living tissue or dyadic relationship. These variations may be filtered by internal or external noise or by life experience (Cardon et al., 2013).

Features of HQCs

High-quality connections share three subjective qualities: a sense of vitality, perceived positive regard, and a degree of felt mutuality. Students involved in a HQC are likely to feel positively aroused to a sense of heightened positive energy or vitality (Quinn & Dutton, 2005, p. 50). The second quality present in the interaction is a "felt sense" of positive regard, "a sense of feeling known, loved, respected and cared for in the connection" (Dutton, 2003, p. 6). The third connection quality is marked by the degree of felt mutuality, capturing the subjective feeling of potential movement in the connection (Stephens et al., 2011, p. 6). Potential movement represents "building and strengthening the initiation of a high-quality connection and the

movement toward a connection with greater quality" (Stephens et al., 2011, p. 7). Both people experience the moment with mutual vulnerability and responsiveness as they engage in the connection (Dutton, 2003, p. 36; Miller & Stiver, 1997). These subjective indicators help to explain why HQCs are attractive, pleasant, and at the same time life-giving. One has a sense of being more alive in a human-to-human HQC (Stephens et al., 2011, p. 5).

Some ways in which professors can increase quality of connections in the classroom include executing micro-communications that may be non-content or content-oriented pedagogical words, actions, or activities that students recognize cognitively, emotionally, or behaviorally. Such micro-interactions might include learning students' names, approaching students respectfully, providing time and space for students to fully respond to classroom questions or ideas, or avoiding embarrassing students in any way.

Impact of HQCs

The structural aspect of a HQC is measured by the degree to which the connection strengthens the relationship or bond. This aspect also is characterized by subjective cognitive, emotional, and behavioral experiences. The cognitive impact is evidenced by the tensile strength of the connection, that is, the capacity to bend and withstand the strain of learning in variety of circumstances (Dutton & Heaphy, 2003, p. 266; Stephens et al., 2011, p. 5). This feature builds resiliency and the capacity to bounce back from setbacks. The emotional impact implies that there is a greater emotional carrying capacity attached to the relationship. Finally, the behavioral component is experienced as connectivity, in this case defined as level of openness to new ideas and influences (Stephens et al., 2011, p. 5).

Relationships form bonds and focus on human growth and development that occurs while in connection or separation from others (Miller & Stiver, 1997). Exchange theory helps explain

the relational concepts relevant to organizational research. The key concepts of exchange theory include providing resources, trust, and social support; the theory emphasizes the instrumental exchange of resources between people (Gilley, McMillan, & Gilley, 2009, p. 40; Hartge et al., 2015). Another important aspect of strengthening connections involves trust. Stephens et al. (2011) theorize that whereas relational phenomena can be positive and lead to positive outcomes, understanding relations through HQCs emphasizes the mutually-developed positive experience of being in the connection. This approach better explains a HQC than does the simple exchange of resources or rewards. The structural qualities of the connection are associated with capacities that affect the individual in the dyadic relationship. Structural features illuminate performance and explain why HQCs are associated with positive outcomes (Stephens et al., 2011, p. 6).

Deepening or strengthening the connection may be achieved when professors encourage – or students choose of their own volition – to go deeper into the learning or step outside their comfort zones. Examples of such interactions might include professors requiring academic service learning (ASL) work outside of class, or when students feel comfortable presenting their ideas publicly in the classroom, such as writing on a whiteboard. Students become task-enabled, trust the professor, and become willing to step outside their comfort zones.

How HQCs Build Self-efficacy

HQC theory effectively describes how the student-professor communication connection develops in quality and strength of the bond leading to shared meaning (Cardon & Kirk, 2015). As the story of the award-winning professors' classrooms unfolds, the professors' actions are small-scale, short duration micro-interactions that connect student and professor. In a short period of time, these micro-interactions build student trust in the professor, leading to higher self-efficacy and thereby task-enabling the student to move on to more difficult learning.

This study examines interactions in the classroom using the theoretical lens of high-quality connections to assess the impact of student-faculty interactions on students' sense of self-efficacy. HQCs, then, provide the energy (emotions) and the behavioral characteristics that give life to the connections (Dutton, 2003, p. 176). Faculty and students in the classroom form vital relationships critical to self-efficacy. It is this connective tissue (Stephens et al., 2003, p. 237) that strikes at the core of creating self-efficacy.

This research specifically investigates the professor's role as leader and catalyst for student self-efficacy. Academic optimism adds further theoretical dimension from within which to examine this dyadic relationship of professor and student self-efficacy. The relation of professor's academic optimism to student self-efficacy is dynamic, because so much learning is dependent upon teachers and students forming connections (Kuh, Kenzie, Schuh, & Witt, 2010).

Hoy, Tarter, and Woolfolk-Hoy (2006) were among the first to explore professor characteristics and connect student and professor self-efficacy to classroom learning. They produced a combined theory of academic optimism, professor self-efficacy, trust between teacher and student, and pressing hard for learning. They contend that both professor academic optimism and student self-efficacy are critical to classroom learning. Both professor and student must be resilient and self-reliant and have a positive belief system to withstand the rigors of learning. Beard, Hoy and Woolfolk-Hoy (2010) concluded that the professor's academic optimism becomes a single latent construct, reflective of the students' psychological state. Through the formation of dyadic relationships, professors and students form lasting bonds of trust. These relationships are closely linked to student learning, academic tasks, and professor academic optimism. Social cognitive theorists Usher and Pajares (2008) further state, "Optimistic people are equipped with self-enhancing biases needed to sustain resilience. They also have strong

belief in their efficacy, sustaining them in the times of trouble" (p. 785). This research investigates the communications patterns in classrooms and how these patterns shape relationships and therefore student engagement. The classroom examination focuses on relationships between professors' academic optimism and drive toward student learning, the students' and professors' shared experiences to improve learning outcomes, and the students' self-efficacy.

Borrowing from theories of management, this research applies HQC theory to the classroom (Dutton & Heaphy, 2003). The narrative of this research characterizes the professor as a leader, building high-quality connections, enhancing learning, and thereby improving student workforce employability. This research uses the professor's academic optimism as the starting point. As explained above, academic optimism is defined by three principles: 1) collective efficacy between professor and student, or the power professors have to positively affect student outcomes; 2) professors' trust that students will be able to learn, and the degree to which they are supported by parents and school administration; and 3) the professor's academic emphasis, that is, the extent to which professors set challenging standards for learning and press hard for achievement (academic press).

Beard et al. (2010) question whether academic optimism promotes student learning through professor modeling and/or social classroom persuasion. That is, are students' thoughts and actions influenced passively, through observing the professor's behavior, or by actively complying with requests? Persuasion is a form of social influence whereby the audience is deliberately encouraged to adopt an idea, through linguistic devices, attitude, symbolic means, or perlocutionary effect such as persuading, convincing, scaring, enlightening, or inspiring. Which of these, or combination thereof, triggers and encourages academic learning? Regardless, it may

be posited that instructional classroom leaders set the stage for positive learning experiences (Nichols, 2010; Pounder, 2006). If indeed the professor is the classroom leader, the vehicle for modeling and transference of optimism is contained in the professor's dominant characteristics or methods. Classroom leadership is not simply inanimate speech. The classroom professor's action(s) and professional traits have power to cause college students to desire to learn, or create a strong predisposition toward learning. Motivation, in the form of professor's academic optimism, may provide the basis for student self-efficacy and learning (Bandura, 1977; Hoy et.al., 2006).

It as alleged that when Cicero spoke, people marveled; and when Caesar spoke, people marched. If the professor is a proxy for trait characteristics like those of Cicero or Caesar, what makes some college students marvel, others march, and yet others diminish? Students may move by virtue of their agency, choosing to learn for self-improvement (Bandura, 1977). Do leader language, professional traits and actions cause the student to act, have agency, and build self-efficacy?

Constructing the Classroom Conversation

The primary principle of human communications is language. Language is a central principle surrounding organizing and changing (Hartge et al., 2015). Language and words are a referential medium, symbolically tied to experiences (Arnheim, 1998; Aukerman & Pandya, 2013; Coffin & Donohue, 2014). The constructivist principle postulates that reality is created by communication and all meaning is made through conversation. Construction of meaning is produced through professorial communications. Therefore, knowledge can be imparted in part through the professor's language and other communicative actions (Whitney & Trosten-Bloom, 2002).

High-Quality Connections in the Business Classroom

The professor's words and actions are the vehicles that create knowledge for the college student. Words are thoughts which express meaning (Harrison & Hasan, 2013). The professor, then, is the orchestra conductor, orchestrating and manifesting student thought and knowledge. Following on deductively, the professor's words and actions then produce student agency and self-efficacy. Agency is the student's capacity to act independently and make their own free choices. Self-efficacy mechanism (SEM) in human agency influences thought patterns, actions, and emotional arousal (Bandura, 1977). The professor's communication, language, and actions lead to student change.

Leading change in the college classroom environment has to do with professor and students entering into dyadic relationships. These relationships strengthen the collective bonds, thereby cultivating student self-efficacy. These bonds are formed through classroom language and actions. Creating and strengthening these bonds transform classroom learning, leading to student self-efficacy and academic optimism by filling the classroom atmosphere with eager and optimistic professors and students (Whitney & Trosten-Bloom, 2002). People individually and collectively have unique skills, talents, and gifts that make unique contributions to the classroom. Classroom learning and change are best brought about when grounded in individual self-efficacy and the collective group's strengths and successes (Bandura, 1977). Leadership and management author Peter Drucker once stated, "The task of leadership is to create an alignment of strengths in ways to make the system's weaknesses irrelevant" (Drucker, 1974, p. 603). What are the language, actions, traits, or characteristics of professors that move students to self-efficacy?

This research seeks to identify and elaborate common communication patterns in the classrooms of highly-rated professors. Do award-winning professors in colleges of business use

interactions that promote high-quality connections? What do these interactions look like in the classroom?

The theories of academic press (Hoy, Tarter, & Woolfolk-Hoy, 2006; Phillips, 1997; Shouse, 1995), positive organizational scholarship (POS) (Dutton & Glynn, 2007), appreciative inquiry (Cooperrider, Whitney, & Stavros, 2008), and high-quality connections (Dutton & Heaphy, 2003) are the operational theories used to investigate student self-efficacy in this study. The research explores whether HQCs are the lynchpin for academic optimism, leading to student self-efficacy.

The purpose of this research is to develop a theory about how HQCs help students achieve self-efficacy. In case study form, the study specifically investigates characteristics of professors that have positive effect on student self-efficacy. The case studies investigate the qualities and characteristics of higher education professors at the college level in the state of Michigan. The colleges and professors are randomly selected from AACSB accredited colleges, found in Southeastern Michigan (AACSB International Accredited Institutions 2013, n.d.). The study examines the following research questions: 1) Is there evidence of the cultivation of HQCs in the classroom of award-winning professors? 2) What are the task-enabling practices that the faculty used to develop and cultivate self-efficacy in the classroom? 3) Are HQCs the link between the professor's behavior and student self-efficacy?

The researcher is looking for the quality and structural components of HQCs in the classroom, which may be experienced in three primary ways: 1) through connections versus relationships, e.g. involved interaction and mutual awareness; 2) through subjective experiences, e.g. a sense of aliveness, positive regard and felt mutuality; and 3) greater emotional carrying capacity, e.g. the ability to carry more emotions, both positive and negative emotions; the ability

to yield, adjust, bend, to withstand the strain of difficult learning. Finally, HQCs are represented by a connectedness, openness to new ideas (Cameron & Spreitzer, 2011; Dutton & Heaphy, 2003). The hypothesis is that these student beliefs are initiated primarily by the professor (Dutton & Heaphy, 2003).

Using academic optimism as the theoretical lens, it is expected that 1) the professor sets high expectations; 2) professors do not ignore students but exert effort toward them, and students towards professors; 3) both students and professors persist in the face of learning difficulties; 4) professors provide frequent, quality feedback; 5) professors ensure that students are engaged with and focused on their work; 6) professors often use collaborative and authentic tasks that place students at the center of the learning process; 7) professors arrange student seating so that they are clustered, varied and functional with multi-instructional areas; 8) professors are actively engaged with different groups, and students are anxious to approach their various tasks or assignments; and 9) both students and professors have a joyful feeling of purposeful movement and industrious thinking within a vital, vibrant atmosphere and environment (Hoy et al., 2006; Phillips, 1997; Shouse, 1995).

Professors may build HQCs and student self-efficacy through a variety of pedagogical techniques, some of which may involve content pedagogy and some of which do not. It is expected that both content pedagogy and non-content pedagogy will be observable in the case study professors' classrooms.

Content Pedagogy

Content pedagogy is unique to the professor and forms the basis for the manner in which professors relate their knowledge. Essentially content pedagogy is what they know about teaching and applying that knowledge to impart what they know about their subject (content

knowledge) to the students. Shulman (1986) argued that a teacher or professor knowing a subject requires more than memorizing facts and figures. Teachers must also understand organizing principles and structures in the classroom and comprehend the rules for establishing student learning (Ball, Thames, & Phelps, 2008).

Dewey (1916/1964) believed that good teachers were those who could recognize and create "genuine intellectual activity" in students, and he argued that methods of such activity were intimately tied to the professors. Subjects, he believed, were the embodiments of the mind, the product of human curiosity, inquiry, and the search for truth. Teachers would need to be able to study subject matter by delving back to its "psychical roots" (Dewey, 1964, p. 162).

Classroom professors must contemplate what tasks and subjects, in combination with the use of classroom devices, constitute intellectually stimulating content and whether that pedagogy will drive student learning. This contemplation may take the form of professors asking themselves if this content, device or method may be worthwhile in terms of what students might learn. At the very least, the professor must know, for instance, if the proper selection of a particular video content reinforces the point of the day's learning or lecture. Or is the use of classroom props important cognitively? Does it foster student cognitive activity and/or problem solving? What does it take to implement this content and delivery method, such as video, in a way that resonates with the students? This sort of analysis and preparation is essential for a classroom professor to choose and adapt content pedagogy for the unique classroom (Ball, 1995, p. 241).

Non-Content Pedagogy – Alternate Instructional and Motivational Strategies

The professor will often use alternative instructional and motivational strategies to deliver content pedagogy (Fernandez-Balboa & Stiehl, 1995). For the purposes of this study

these relational instructional strategies are referred to as non-content pedagogy (Bingham &

Sidorkin, 2001).

Teaching methods are different for different subjects and for different professors

(Schulman, 1986; 1987). Both Schulman (1986; 1987) and Dewey (1916/1964) argue that,

depending on the characteristics of the subject matter, teachers will often use different methods

to develop knowledge in learners. Expert teachers have the ability to recognize environmental,

personal, and instructional patterns both quickly and accurately. This helps professors recognize

the needs of the learning and the students (Fernandez-Balboa & Stiehl, 1995).

Recognizing that relationship connectedness is critical for a positive learning

environment, professors use a variety of instructional/motivational/non-content strategies.

Among those delivery strategies are using lectures, providing real-world examples, offering

metaphors and analogies, giving feedback and asking questions, modeling behavior, and role-

playing. Often professors attempt to establish a relationship between students' prior knowledge

and the information they're being presented to move classroom learning forward. Ball et al.

(2008) state what they mean by teaching, "everything that teachers must do to support the

learning of their students." They continue by stating that interactive work to teach lessons in the

classroom requires the professor to plan carefully when planning the lesson (Ball, Thames &

Phelps, 2008).

The current classroom is a complex environment requiring complex interactions between

content, teacher, and students that rely on the teacher's pedagogical content knowledge (Alonzo,

Mareike, & Seidel, 2012, Bingham & Sidorkin, 2001). Alonzo et al. also argue that there is a

relationship between pedagogical content knowledge and student motivation. Helping students

contextualize content in the light of their own experiences and knowledge of the professors'

teaching goals add to the learning experience and form one of the hallmarks of effective teaching.

The actions and the engagement that the professor employs in the classroom aid to form the student connection. An action by the professor such as addressing students by name, or smiling and engaging in student and professor conversation before the classroom lessons, may be part of the professor connecting content and non-content pedagogy to aid student learning. As Fernandez-Balboa & Stiehl (1995) said, professors often engage in alternative instructional and motivational strategies to deliver content pedagogy.

Research Questions

Three primary research questions are posed to guide the analyses explored in this study:

1. Is there evidence of the cultivation of HQCs in the classrooms of award-winning professors?

2. What are the task-enabling practices the faculty used to develop and cultivate self-efficacy in the classroom?

3. Are HQCs the link between professor behavior and student self-efficacy?

In sum, this chapter has sought to delineate the research questions explored in this study in context of the robust theoretical body of literature that was consulted. Drawing on the theories behind self-efficacy, positive organizational scholarship, appreciative inquiry, and high-quality connections, this research will explore the effects of HQCs on student self-efficacy and positive outcomes in the classrooms of award-winning professors.

Chapter 3 describes the methodologies used to conduct the research.

Chapter 3: Research Design and Methods

The context in a college classroom organization plays an important role in student development and comprehension (Harrison, 1987). High-quality connections (HQCs) theory posits behavioral mechanisms that allow for the development of high-quality connections (Cameron & Spreitzer, 2011). HQCs are task-enabling, interpersonal actions that help someone complete or perform a task (Dutton, 2003). "HQCs are important means by which individuals develop and grow" (Ragins & Verbos, 2007). Roberts (2007) says HQCs enhance and enrich identities and facilitate people to form attachments to work organizations or to communities (Cameron & Spreitzer, 2011). HQCs affect cognitive, physiological, and behavioral processes suggesting, for example, that these small brief, interactions with others can improve both persons' cognitive performance (Cameron & Spreitzer, 2011).

Principally this research into professors' college classroom techniques is governed by the researcher's acknowledgment of the theory of academic optimism. Academic optimism holds that there are three basic principles that contribute to an effective classroom. These principles are: 1) collective efficacy of the faculty – that the professor can teach effectively; 2) faculty trust that students can learn and get support from parents and administration; and 3) that professors can set a "high bar" for learning and emphasize academics. Academic emphasis is also known as academic press (Hoy et al., 2006). Academic optimism in combination with Harrison's theory of classroom rhetoric and social context helps to inform this research about productive and effective learning. Much of this thinking aligns with positive organizational scholarship which stipulates that words and action create the classroom world (Harrison & Hasan, 2013).

Effective professor characteristics and techniques in the classroom are best understood by interviewing students and professors, along with visiting and observing the classroom of effective professors, and combining these data in a case-study format. Therefore, the research design choice is a multiple case-study design using qualitative methods, due to the broad scope of the research questions and because of the fact that the data collected are primarily words and actions of the professor in the classroom (Creswell, 2012). The meaning of the study unfolds through thematic descriptions, the author's reflection on the meaning of the data, leading to a deeper understanding of the classroom professor's characteristics and student efficacy (Creswell, 2012; Gall, Borg, & Gall, 1996). The understanding or theme(s) expressed document the story of student self-efficacy initiated by the professor, a story that unfolds through the professors' and students' own language, words, and actions.

Case-study design allows for a methodological procedure, logical accuracy, and unbiased and unambiguous analysis of the preconditions and consequences leading to relative truth claims and empirical checks (Hickman & Neubert, 2009). This methodology recognizes the importance of the subjective human creation of meaning, but does not outright reject the idea of objectivity: "Pluralism, not relativism, is stressed with a focus on the circular dynamic tensions between the subject and object" (Crabtree & Miller, 2002). The case study design illuminates common views, values, beliefs, feelings, assumptions and ideologies of the individual (Creswell, 2012; Gall, Borg, & Gall, 1996).

The researcher is not looking to manipulate behaviors, but to uncover contextual conditions that are relevant to the phenomenon of student self-efficacy (Baxter & Jack, 2008). A multiple case-study design enables the researcher to explore differences within and between cases, with a goal to replicate findings across cases. The researcher carefully observes the

professor's attempts to build high-quality connections (HQCs). It is imperative that the subjects be chosen carefully so that the researcher can predict similar results across cases or predict contrasting results based on theory (Yin, 2003). The three universities selected were all regional master's granting institutions located in an industrial Midwestern state. Categorization of the emergent themes followed the researcher's strategy to look for the various portions of the HQC theory that apply to the professor building trust and task-enabling, leading to student self-efficacy.

Internal validity is the main concern for exploratory case study investigators trying to explain how and why one event led to another (Creswell, 2012; Gall, Borg, & Gall, 1996; Yin, 2003). If the investigator incorrectly concludes that there is a causal relationship between these two events without knowing another third factor that may have caused the event, then the research design has failed (Yin, 2003). The second content concern regarding internal validity is concern about making inferences. This research design anticipates rival questions, explanations, and possibilities that may occur, and therefore addresses the specific problem of internal validity (Yin, 2003).

The research design addresses reliability and operationalizes to minimize errors or biases in the study (Creswell, 2012; Gall, Borg, & Gall, 1996; Yin, 2003). The principal investigator documents all procedures and processes to allow future investigators to conduct similar case studies and arrived at the same or similar conclusions. Therefore, this research is replicable (Yin, 2003).

This study uses grounded theory as a basis for investigation. Grounded theory is a systematic process used to explore whether these award-winning professors' use of HQCs leads to student self-efficacy. If it does, the researcher will examine what interactions in the classroom

may cultivate these interactions (Creswell, 2012). Glaser and Strauss (1967) developed this theory. Grounded theory was used to link theory to the generated data (Glaser & Strauss, 1967; Charmaz, 2012). The logic of grounded theory is implied; therefore, this study uses grounded theory to link the data. Researcher preconceived ideas, theory or thought does not drive theory developments or the researcher's conclusions (Glaser & Strauss, 1967). The benefit of this methodological approach is that its primary aim is to interpret the research situation – the phenomenon – not to test a hypothesis (Strauss & Corbin, 1998). The researcher stands outside the studied phenomenon. The data collected are present, not constructed (Charmaz, 2012).

The researcher conducted professor and student interviews and classroom observations of the three professors who participated in this study. The researcher used current classroom artifacts, including course descriptions and course syllabi. A series of professor and student interviews took place between September and October 2014 on the three campuses of the classroom professors. All participants' identities are confidential. All the interviews were digitally recorded. Once the recordings were transcribed, the recordings were entered as separate case files into the qualitative research software Dedoose. The transcribed interviews and observations were then coded for recurring themes. These themes were analyzed, organized, and categorized for dissertation purposes.

Participant Professors

Each year, member institutions of the State of Michigan's President's Counsel nominate one faculty member for The State of Michigan Distinguished Professor of the Year Award. The President's Council of Michigan sets eligibility requirements for the annual award. This Council consists of the 15 public universities in the State of Michigan. The Provost of the School is the acting member of the awards council. The provosts of each university nominate and vote for the

yearly winners. The criteria for applications and selections must include the amount, quality, and impact of interaction with undergraduate students in the classroom. The evaluation is based on faculty advising, supporting undergraduate research and other experiential learning environments, and contributions to the scholarship of teaching and learning (Presidents Council, State Universities of Michigan, 2006). To be eligible for the award, the candidates must hold the rank of full professor and display a special commitment to undergraduate education.

The criteria for professor participation in this study are tenure-track faculty who have been nominated or received the Distinguished Professor of the Year Award from the Presidents Council for the State Universities of Michigan. This selection process was further limited to active faculty who were willing to participate in the study. The researcher selected professors based only on being a business professor who had recently won the award, and selecting winners between 2010 and 2014. Those parameters narrowed the available pool of professors to just six. After contacting all six, two were retiring and a third declined the invitation. This process then left three professors to participate in this study.

The researcher conducted one interview and one classroom observation with each of the three business professors. All of the professors and their respective colleges are from Michigan and members of the International Business College Accrediting Association (AACSB).

Participant Students

Students who participated in this study were urged to do so by their professors. Students were asked to volunteer and in some cases, but not all, they were incentivized by the classroom professor with extra credit points for participating. The participants also had to be available at certain times and dates; except for two students, all who agreed to participate were present on their scheduled dates, making themselves available for interview (Creswell, 2012). The setting is

the professor's classroom, and student participants were asked to complete an interview and/or a

survey, which asked questions about the classroom professor and their own self-efficacy.

Data Sources

Study data were collected from three sources: participant interviews with both professors

and students; classroom observations; and review of classroom artifacts, such as course syllabi

and classroom handouts.

Participant Interviews and Interview Techniques

The participant interviews sought to understand the context of each professor's actions

and the students' reactions to situations, attitudes, or efforts undertaken by the professor at a

particular point of time in the classroom or lecture to achieve academic optimism and student

self-efficacy. By probing for metaphors, stories and examples, this qualitative interview

technique allowed the researcher to probe for essentials or parts of the phenomenon. The

interviews were conducted on-site in the college classrooms or other convenient locations.

Interviewees were kept anonymous, identified only by general titles: student #1; student #2;

professor #1; professor #2; professor #3. The interviews contained open-ended questions in a

semi-structured format, following pre-established protocols (Creswell, 2012).

All interviews were conducted using the Critical Incident Technique (CIT). The

researcher asked the student or professor to describe a time or context while in the classroom

where they remember something they thought was effective or felt led them to a greater sense of

self-efficacy. The follow-up question(s) concerned why the student or professor thought that

qualified as a high-quality connection leading to students' self-efficacy (Dutton & Heaphy,

2003). Please see Appendix C for the interview protocol.

The Critical Incident Technique (CIT) is a set of procedures used for collecting direct observations of human behavior that have critical significance and meet methodologically defined criteria (Flanagan, 1954). In short, CIT is used as an interview technique where the informants are encouraged to relate classroom incidents (or tell key stories) instead of answering direct questions about more general topics, for example, information about what their college considers good classroom practices. The idea is that the strengths and weaknesses of the classroom performance are displayed during key events or critical incidents (Flanagan, 1954). These interactions occur in or during the particular professor's use of pedagogy or curriculum development. By probing for stories and examples, CIT helps avoid stereotyped opinions about student learning styles, a particular curriculum, or certain pedagogy, and instead asks participants to focus on key events from their lived classroom experience. From these experiences, data analysis can reveal key issues as themes that give insight into what was operating in the event. In our study, we are asking participants to reflect and share stories related both to efforts that were successful and those that were unsuccessful in making connections and teaching. This qualitative interview technique will allow us to examine themes across participants, as well as provide data for follow-up studies. Please see Appendix C.

Classroom Observation

The purpose of the classroom observations was to document faculty use of high-quality connections (HQCs) so those interactions may be analyzed. The researcher was looking at classroom practices to see whether or not the professors cultivated high-quality connections (Creswell, 2012; Harrison, 1987). Either collectively or individually, student self-efficacy may be present as a result of the professor using HQCs to cultivate the connection. The researcher looked for whether or not and how the student and professor connection is built with award-

winning professors (Dutton & Heaphy, 2003; Cameron & Spreitzer, 2011). The articulating mechanisms found in HQCs are in part the focus of this research, looking at the short interaction at work in the classroom. The investigator's role was as an observer. The observer role is to be neutral, but present as a participant, gathering information to analyze as the authoritative expert and active analyst (Creswell, 2012; Charmaz, 2012). Please see Appendix A for the Classroom Observation Protocol.

Review of Artifacts

In the review of artifacts, artifacts were classroom materials, including but not limited to syllabi, assignment feedback to students, course descriptions, tests, texts, or other materials. Artifacts were used to look at the professor's classroom practices to determine whether or not they cultivate high-quality connections (Creswell, 2012).

Potential Ethical Issues

Faculty and students only experienced interactions typical of normal classroom contexts. All responses were kept anonymous. As a result, participants in the study were not exposed to any undue risk. This research is governed by the University of Michigan Internal Review Board (IRB) guidelines. The researcher is PEERS Certified and adheres to all human subjects and ethical standards. All of the participants' names and identities were protected, and respondents are not personally named in the findings.

IRB Approval

This research passed IRB review and approval. The initial application was submitted on February 21, 2014; ID # HUM0086277; approved: April 24, 2014.

Data Analysis Methods and Coding Procedures

This section describes the coding system used to categorize and organize the data, and provides examples of how particular interactions in the classroom were coded for the qualitative analysis.

There were two rounds of coding represented in this research. The first round of coding was for the HQC clusters one and two interactions between professor and student. The second round of coding was for placing the first round of coding into pedagogical and curriculum framework.

Round One – HQC Cluster Coding

HQCs were applied as a theoretical lens to explore whether the classroom professor cultivates high-quality connections. What the researcher sought to uncover was whether the interactions that take place among faculty and students in award-winning classrooms aligned with HQC research, which emerged from research about effective business leadership. The data were analyzed for recurring or emergent themes concurrently with the data collection process. In an iterative process, emergent themes informed later observations and interview questions. The researcher used data triangulation to ensure the validity and reliability of the data.

During the coding process, the principal investigator analyzed the data for themes that answered the research questions. The investigator was looking for interactions that promoted high-quality connections, and the practices used by successful higher education professors in the classroom that lead to student self-efficacy.

During the coding process, all transcripts and field notes were read for general themes such as predictors of the professor's use of HQCs, to enable students' tasks and aid student self-efficacy. The researcher then compared notes between classroom observations to determine any

common themes or differences. The goal of this coding is to identify the interactions that took place in the classroom and how those interactions affected student self-efficacy.

When the initial coding or themes were finished, all of the transcripts and field notes were re-read to find additional supporting quotations and excerpts. Each file was read and re-read for themes and subthemes. Quotes and excerpts were categorized and put into subthemes for more detailed analysis. All of the transcripts and field notes were re-read in their entirety, looking for counterexamples. The transcripts contain as much accurate information about the conversation as possible. Care was taken with the transcript to most realistically represent the materials analyzed. Once again, the researcher re-read the files for verification of theme significance and authenticity. The coding was performed to identify the HQC communications techniques that award-winning professors used in the classroom.

Explanation of coding process. There are two dimensions to the theory of HQCs; these dimensions are placed into cluster one and cluster two interactions. Each of the clusters has three components driving that cluster. Those three components are cognitive, emotional and behavioral. The pattern that the researcher conceptualizes from the HQC theory is used to identify passages in the data that characterize the action that the participant is exhibiting or discussing. The researcher conceptualized that action using the verb or predicate indicating the participant's action. He then placed the verb phrase into three categories representing the three dimensions of the theory. For instance, using the participant's words, the verb phrase, the researcher categorized and coded each component of the cluster as either cluster, 1) cognitive – think, 2) emotional – feel, and, 3) behavioral – do. The think, feel, do pattern is the principle behind all of the coding. The researcher conceptualizes that the theory of HQCs moves within the confines and the pattern of these verbs and verb phrases, "think, feel, do," to ascribe

categories that fit within the theory of HQC interactions. Conceptually the researcher codes and uses the "think, feel, do" pattern for both clusters one and two.

Cluster one example. As an example of cluster one coding, the professor may be presenting an idea or discipline topic or theory in their lecture from their respective discipline (corporate responsibility, ethics or accounting). In keeping with the HQC theory and the pattern, if the professor is attempting to connect the student with the materials and exerts a positive arousal the researcher coded this activity as "think," cluster one, cognitive. Also, if, as an example, the professor brings a sense of energy to the classroom or topic, and the students feel the energy, the researcher coded this as "feel," cluster one, emotional. Likewise, if the professor has the students engaged in collaborative or authentic tasks, such as service learning or writing on the whiteboard to demonstrate knowledge or a classroom concept, the researcher coded these activities as "do," cluster one, behavioral.

Cluster two examples. To code cluster two, conceptually the researcher applied the same "think, feel, do" pattern as the professor attempts to strengthen the connection with the student. For example, if the professor is involved in a one-on-one discussion either in the classroom or outside, the professor and student are attempting to shape one another's thinking; these interactions are conceptualized and coded as "think," cluster two – cognitive, building and sharing information with one another. Also, conceptually, "feel,: as a dimension of cluster two, emotional, is coded for example when a student expresses a need, or is placed on an equal footing, decreasing status differences; these are conceptualized and coded as cluster two, "feel" behaviors. Cluster two, behavioral, or "do," is conceptualized as the professor and student taking turns, acknowledging each other in respectful engagement, decreasing the status differences between one another.

Coding key. The researcher key to coding is taken from the participant's word choice, verb or verb phrase in response to the researcher's questions. When the participants say that they think or believe, the researcher coded that as a cognitive behavior (Johnson, 2015). When a participant says that he "feels" something, that item was coded as an emotional response or behavior. When a participant said that he "did" or wanted the student to "do" something, that interaction was coded as a behavioral response. Hence, the coding is:

- Think/Believe = cognitive dimension

- Feel = emotional dimension

- Do = behavioral dimension

In this study, the dependent variable is the students' reporting of self-efficacy. The independent variables are the dimension or activities that the professors do to engender self-efficacy. The components of HQCs are:

Cluster one mechanisms – behaviors or interactions that initiate cognitive, behavioral or emotional experiences and connections.

Cognitive: Cognitive mechanisms cared for in the connection – Positive arousal: professors do not ignore, discount or overlook students, but exert effort toward students. In response, the students move toward or change their thinking or perceptions toward the professor; this aspect may also be characterized by:

- Cognitive-other awareness

- Cognitive-impressions of others

- Cognitive-perspective-taking

Emotional: a positive sense of energy – participants have a joyful feeling of purposefulness, industrious thinking and a vital and vibrant atmosphere and environment (also

described as academic press). Professors ensure that students are engaged with and focused on their work (also academic press). May be characterized collectively by:

- Emotional-positive emotions

- Emotional-emotional contagion - two individuals emotionally converging

- Emotional-empathy

Behavioral: Positive regard – professors often use collaborative and authentic tasks (task enabling) that place students at the center of the learning process. May be characterized by:

- Behavioral-respective engagement

- Behavioral-task enabling

- Behavioral-play, and relating with others

Cluster two mechanisms – organizational mechanism/practices/structural features of the connection that enhance the potential response of the connection.

Cognitive: Bends to withstand the strain of learning. Shapes what people know about one another. Promotes mutual and collective engagement between professor and student. The professors provide frequent, quality feedback; Group Connection – professors are actively engaged with different groups and students in and outside the classroom. May be characterized by:

- The sharing the sharing and building of information between people

- Perspective taking through demonstrated skills

- Doing group work or tasks together

Emotional: Resilient – bounces back from setbacks – both students and professors persist in the face of learning difficulties; both students and professors can express their concerns, advice and offer assistance. May be characterized by meetings where:

- Students express needs

- Concerns

- Gratitude

- Admiration for others in public, in groups

- Being on an equal footing/decreasing status differences

Behavioral: Open to new ideas. Turn-taking; professor acknowledges contributions and students acknowledge professor's contributions. Also, they are put on an equal footing. Decreased status differences. May be characterized by:

- Respectful communication-acknowledging others' contributions

- Turn-taking and collective engagement

Round Two Coding – Professor's Classroom Pedagogy and Curriculum

Using Dedoose, the qualitative software, the researcher coded for pedagogy and curriculum methods of the three award-winning professors. This round of coding drew from the professor's interviews and classroom observation data. The second round of coding examined professor's pedagogy, non-content and content instruction, and also the professor's curriculum. This coding was intended to reveal the professor's organizing principles and their practices that promote HQCs. Principally, where the professor used cluster one interactions to establish or enhance the quality of the connection and in cluster two, deepened or strengthened the connection through their classroom pedagogy and curriculum. During the second round of coding, the researcher categorized the classroom interactions pedagogy and curriculum into the HQCs' two clusters.

During the second round of coding, the researcher also coded for content and non-content pedagogy. The content and non-content coding was used to help identify the classroom practices of these award-winning professors.

When coding content pedagogy, the researcher looked for ways in which professors delivered their unique knowledge and how these paths intersected with or promoted HQCs. Content pedagogy coding included the use of classroom devices that constitute stimulating content. What was the professor's selection of method or device, and did it help promote and did they practice HQCs? For example, the content or selection of a particular video helps build a connection. The researcher coded for the professor's use of a particular delivery system and the student response to that delivery system. This coding of a classroom professor's evolving content pedagogy was a way to inform the researcher about the classroom professor promoting the use of HQCs (Cameron & Spreitzer, 2011; Dutton & Heaphy, 2003; Ball, 1995).

The non-content pedagogy was coded in a similar fashion. The coding in this second round was to see how the professor used alternative instructional and motivational strategies to deliver content pedagogy that promotes the practices of HCQs (Cameron & Spreitzer, 2011; Dutton & Heaphy, 2003; Fernandez-Balboa & Stiehl, 1995). These included any relational instructional strategies representing non-content pedagogy (Bingham & Sidorkin, 2001).

The researcher coded for delivery relational practices that are attempts by the professor to establish rapport with students, brief interactions such as using the students' names, or starting a brief conversation with a student before class. Also coded were body language and the use of conversational comfort zones, i.e. proximity to the student when he speaks to them (comfort zones). The researcher coded for the professor using real-world examples, metaphors and analogies, giving feedback and asking questions. The researcher coded whether the professor

used modeling behavior and role-playing. Often professors attempt to establish a relationship with students' prior knowledge and the information they're being presented as professors move learning classroom forward (Ball et al., 2008). Non-content pedagogy was coded, that is, everything the professor does to support the learning of their students (Ball et al., 2008). Non-content coding included any professorial engagement in alternative instructional and motivational strategies to deliver content pedagogy.

Chapter 4: Findings and Analysis

Case Study #1 - Professor Tom

Classroom and University Setting

Professor Tom's University is situated in West Michigan near a metropolis with a population of about 250,000 people. The campus is 115 years old and was chartered and organized by an act of the Michigan state legislature. The campus enrolls about 24,000 students annually. Forty-nine percent of those enrollments are male and 51% female. According to data furnished by the College of Business, 85 percent of all students enrolled in the COB/BSBA degree program also work full-time or on a part-time basis.

Professor Tom's classroom is a lecture format with a stated capacity of 100 students. The space is rectangular in shape with the long side of the rectangle sloping downward to the lectern area in front. There's an aisle down the middle, which divides five seats on each side of the aisle and extends ten rows back. There are whiteboards on the wall behind the lectern. There is a screen in the front of the room as well as the computer and an LCD projector on which the professor may project his PowerPoint slides.

Professor Tom teaches Business in Society, a business ethics course. He is the Michigan Distinguished Professor of the Year for 2014 according to the Presidents Council State Universities of Michigan. This upper-level Business in Society class is filled with business students who are completing a BSBA degree (Bachelors of Science in Business Administration). The research data reveals that the student majors range from accounting (58%), general business (25%), to the remainder, one each in health, economics and behavioral science (17%).

The graduating seniors in this class are varying types of business majors. Of the 26

students present for the classroom observation, eight were student participants in this study.

Among the eight in the data set, three are finance majors, three in marketing, one in general

business, and one accounting major. The average grade point average of the student participants

is 3.15. There are two males and six females with an average age near 23 in this data set. This

college has many commuter students; seven of the study participants are part-time work/full-time

students, and one does not work but is strictly a full-time student.

The course meets every Tuesday and Thursday in the mornings for approximately one

hour and 30 minutes from 9:30 AM until 11:00 AM. Professor Tom explained that he teaches this

class to seniors and the business college requires the course for graduation.

Professor's Instructional Goals (Interview)

During the one-on-one interview conducted with Professor Tom, the professor expresses

multiple goals for his instructional strategy including building relationships with students,

showing respect, honesty, expressing regard, and being passionate about his material.

Building relationships. Of the three professors interviewed Professor Tom stands out

because he talks more about himself and the role he plays in the classroom relationship. Often

the language Professor Tom uses is value-laden language, as if he is passing moral judgment

about himself as a professor. During our conversation, Professor Tom shares and establishes his

beliefs about the importance of building relationships with students. "It is all about the

relationship and building trust," says Professor Tom. It is not the kind of relationship, he

explains, where "Kids line up outside my door to shoot the breeze," but rather "one of building

trust." Professor Tom's objective is to help students feel positive about their abilities and come to

trust him as a professor. Professor Tom believes there is a connection between building this personal trust with students and building the relationship wherein students may learn.

Thus trust-building and learning are connected for Professor Tom. The relationship he attempts to build with students is one where the student feels comfortable with him. "If they [the students] trust me they are more comfortable with me, and they are more likely to ask me questions in class or come by during my office hours to get their questions answered," says Professor Tom. He is not necessarily concerned about the nature of the interaction; it is more important that the interaction with him simply take place: "It has to be comfortable for the student, and I have to be approachable," he adds. A student being comfortable enough to approach him – this is an integral part of building the relationship. "Being approachable, I feel like if the student has learning issues, they would feel comfortable enough to contact me." Making a student comfortable talking with him makes him more approachable, he says. Even though he does not have a great deal of one-on-one contact outside the classroom, he expresses, "I think they know that I care."

Professor Tom also says he cares about the Millennial students, the subject, and the environment of the classroom. In our conversations Professor Tom frequently and regularly refers to his students as Millennials. His intent, he says, is to promote this idea of caring so the students understand that their opinions are valued. In the classroom he takes the attitude, "Let's discuss it. I am passionate about the student, the subject and the environment of the classroom; I've thought it all through," he says. His relationship of caring extends to thinking about how students will approach the classroom materials and considering – as most of his students are Millennials – their learning styles and learning preferences.

Professor Tom also states that caring about the student, the subject, and learning to approach Millennials in their preferred style is "really important." Often his colleagues will default to discussing Millennial students in terms of how they need to be entertained. "Having to entertain the Millennial, this is always on his mind," Professor Tom claims. Part of him thinks it is true about Millennials; they grew up in a world of rapidly changing technology and social media fostering the need to be constantly entertained. "I've heard some professors get criticized because all they do is show videos; I am really sensitive to this point," he says. He, however, is sometimes apologetic about showing too many video clips. Yet his point about caring is born from his empathy with the audience.

Despite potential criticisms for using too much technology in the classroom, Professor Tom makes deliberate choices about using video clips. These video clips are aids to learning as he says that he carefully selects each video clip to support the day's learning. He cares about his teaching and what goes into the lecture for his students. Professor Tom carefully selects just the right video clips, a demonstration of respect and caring for the students. He believes video helps the student to experience the concepts of his teaching and aids the learning process. "Yes," he says, "It's a bit of entertainment to break up the monotony of pure lecture, but it's valuable to me and for the student." It is his caring that manifests as mutual respect and regard for the student.

Professor Tom says that when he builds a relationship with students, they feel comfortable and he gains credibility with them. "I care about them. I care about the class and the environment. I am trying to promote this," he says. "I want the students to know that their opinions are valued. I think they know that I care about them, that I care about this class and the classroom environment."

Respect for the students. Professor Tom confirms at least eight times during his interview that he invokes and evokes the ideas of respect and caring: "I respect and care for the student." He states further, "I am committed to knowing people and treating them with care and respect." The mutual respect and regard Professor Tom holds for students is the culmination of making caring personal connections. Professor Tom says, "I think respect says something about all of us in this relationship." Respect is important to Professor Tom because it gives students lasting impressions of him. In the interview he said that respect affects him, the student, and the college. He illustrates the point by bringing up the final student classroom evaluation. "I think when they evaluate me on 'treats me with respect' it is important, because respect is tied to caring." Caring and respect, he explains, includes caring about his students and respecting them as people in his classroom. In our interview, Professor Tom seemed to use caring and respect interchangeably as he discussed his classroom, the Millennial student, and the subject he teaches; his objective is that the students will care and respect those things as well.

However, "respect," is also demonstrated and measured, Professor Tom says, "It is [measured] when they [the students] evaluate me on 'he treats me with respect.'" Professor Tom is particularly sensitive and caring. Respect is demonstrated as he empathizes with the student's situation in the classroom. He expressed what he means by empathy for each student, "that they are not just another face in a crowded classroom." He shared that he believes students care whether they are recognized and respected as persons. He related a personal point, "I know what it is like to be in the classroom where you have not been respected or regarded as a person. [In my classroom] students are not just another face in the crowd and treated indifferently," he said. Professor Tom mentions one–on–one connections as a way to address students' need to be recognized, respected, and regarded in the classroom and at the University:

"I have a son who's going to DePaul and part of the reason he is going down there

is the small class sizes. All that DePaul University promotes is the one-to-one

connection between professor and student. I would say you do not have to be a

small school to make connections with your students. I usually get graduating

seniors, and I feel committed to them. I know you who you are, [you're not] just a

number; I know them by their names."

During the interviews Professor Tom speaks respectfully and positively about the

students in his class. "I know them, I know who they are; they are not just a number," he says. "It

is a class of 48; I am trying to respect and be more intimate with them, one-on-one. I am

physically going right there to have this conversation, and they can see that it is safe for them to

express their ideas." Professor Tom says. He concludes that he "…builds relationships with these

students so they can trust me."

Honesty. Professor Tom uses value-laden language, almost a moral judgment about

himself, to express his feelings and beliefs about creating relationships. Honesty came up in

conversations as perhaps a synonym for trustworthiness and an authenticity about himself.

Building trust between himself and the student is important, he says. Trust-building involves the

professor being honest with students when he does not have the answer. When teaching business

ethics, such honesty takes on primary importance to the professor gaining respect and credibility

with students. Professor Tom told me that he struggles with expert authority – even his own –

because of what he is presenting to the students. During his interview he says, "I am trying to

resolve it myself, that even I, the supposed expert, don't trust some of the thinking, the corporate

social responsibility direction corporations take." He comments that he uses certain phrases in

class to achieve his goal of 'being real' with students: "I do not make it sound like I have all the

answers here because I do not. I use these phrases or devices to make student connections."

Another method Professor Tom espouses to express such honesty is to self-deprecate. In that

instance Professor Tom poked fun at himself by wearing an Enron shirt to class. "I think they

laughed; they get a kick out of me wearing the Enron golf shirt. [They ask themselves] Why am I

making fun of myself with this shirt?" he comments. Professor Tom tells me he wanted students

to ask about his shirt. However, the students were not yet prepared to respond: "They are not yet

at that point. I walk in, I am wearing a shirt, they do not say, what the heck is that? They are not

there yet." As he comments, "I knew that at the end, I was going to sort of make fun of myself. I

was not doing it to manipulate students." According to Professor Tom, playing a role does not

equate to manipulation.

     Expressing high regard for students. Professor Tom also hones in on regard as an

instructor goal. He claims regard is sometimes expressed in the little things he does and he has

observed the students take note. For instance, he strives to carry a positive attitude. "I have this

attitude about coming early to class and setting up," he said.

> "I get there early, set up, and I just starting walking the aisles saying hello to
>
> people. Or at times I ask what's going on in their lives. Sometimes it's just to
>
> touch base with a student that I want to touch base with. I'll do that, and so right
>
> off the bat it's starting to take away barriers, showing regard."

Professor Tom said in his interview that he believes the classroom by nature is an

unnatural setting to build regard with students. "I'm up front and they're back there," he said.

Being physically distanced from the student feels unnatural and interferes with showing personal

regard for students. "I'm trying to gain their regard," Professor Tom said. In a class of 48, being

one-on-one provides dignity to students and exhibits personal regard. Personal regard is tied to

caring, Professor Tom states, because, "There's a dignity of walking up and physically having a conversation. The student can see that it is safe to approach me."

The positive attitude he shows students has become ingrained in him, he says. "Whether it's a class of 48, like this current class, or a class in the big lecture hall with 300 students, I do the same thing." He makes an effort to walk up and down the aisles, mingling with the students. Professor Tom says he's committed to knowing the students' names and addressing them personally. He sees his teaching efforts as natural, paying regard to the student. That's why he says in his interviews, "I do a lot of that up the aisle, talking directly to somebody in the back row. I like to do that; I feel comfortable doing that, getting everyone to feel a sense of personal regard." "Knowing their names sometimes freaks students out," he concluded. "Even a student way up in the far back corner of the room – I am likely to acknowledge him and say, Sam, how are you today?"

Exhibiting passion Once again Professor Tom expresses through value-laden language his beliefs about himself and his classroom. These ideas of respect and caring are intermingled and he delivers his lectures in an emotional way. He describes his passion. "I am passionate about my subject and my students and have thought it all through," Professor Tom says. Therefore, Professor Tom does not attempt to hide his emotions during class. He intentionally allows his voice volume to increase and students are able to observe his physical responses to the emotions he feels about teaching his subject. I noticed during his interview that Professor Tom does show emotion in his voice and his complexion becomes somewhat flushed when he is discussing something about which he feels passionate.

Avoiding conflict. Despite his belief in expressing passion, Professor Tom tries not to manipulate or intimidate students in his classroom. "I was not going to manipulate them with

intimidating body language or harsh language. I do not rant and rave; this is not the right thing to do. Ranting and raving about something is the wrong thing do in front of students. That is not my style," he says in his interview. In a follow-up email to Professor Tom, I asked him to describe a difficult classroom situation he had encountered. He replied that he avoids conflict with students: "I do not tend to have disagreements in the classroom because I am very conflict-avoiding." Continuing the discussion, he said that the only possible areas of conflict may be "philosophical differences." Professor Tom explained, "This is especially true in the sustainability class. White males do not like it when I talk about their white privilege. Some people do not think climate change is real. It is pointless to argue with a student about that. Instead, I just remind the student that theirs is one of many viewpoints. I'll then often continue the conversation after class (one-on-one)."

Technological devices. Professor Tom devotes only about 30 percent of his classroom time to PowerPoint slides; he prefers a pedagogical method using YouTube video. Professor Tom believes that video is really important in his classroom. Using video, the professor says, is designed to make students aware of companies like Tom's Shoes, "who make a meaningful tribute to corporate social responsibility." Initially, Professor Tom said in his interview, "I rely on lots of video clips because I do not know the subject so well myself. I love the videos; they help to make my points." He chooses topical videos that are "carefully chosen to illustrate the day's learning."

Professor Tom is cautious of overusing videos exclusively due to the criticism regarding other professors' overuse of the video medium for Millennial students. Professor Tom's sensitivity to this issue comes from "shop talk" in faculty discussions, he claimed during our interview. "I think this issue is really important, people will talk about the Millennial student and

using too much video. I've heard some people get criticized because all they do is show videos in the classroom," he said. "I am sensitive to perceived or real video overuse." Professor Tom says that it may be unprofessional or awkward at worst if he uses too many videos or supplementary technology to tell his story during a class lecture. Because he is sensitive to the claim, he says, "It is simply too easy to use video to entertain Millennials rather than aid in the learning of the material." Professor Tom adds, "I want to show this stuff, which it does break up what you are doing. It does not stop the flow, but it breaks up an hour and 55-minute sermon."

Professor Tom uses media, including video and audio, to put learning and concepts into perspective for students. The classroom material comes first, he says, and then the content pedagogy of technology. The technology is there to aid the curriculum, gain positive attention and make the lecture points, he claims. "I use technology to engage the students with the topic." He continues, "I think the video clips are suited to helping students become more involved with the topic and the learning because they can relate to the videos, the imagery that's in there. [The video] is connecting, and making connections in the brain." Professor Tom states that he did not learn the use of technology from any particular theory. It simply makes sense to him to engage this generation of students using media with which they are familiar and comfortable.

Professor Tom estimates that when he uses a multitude of personal and technological devices, he may attain some student attention and gain legitimacy. "Through multiple examples and videos and audio clips, they [the students] can tell I am legitimate. That it is not just some professor covering stuff in a book; that I am committed to exposing them to the subject," he said.

Learning outside the classroom. "I believe passionately about this topic of corporate sustainability," Professor Tom says, "And I want students to care by doing." For that reason, he includes a service learning component to his required coursework. Professor Tom states that

service learning is a natural pedagogical choice for his course. This part of the class, he says, "…provides the student with the opportunity to experience how organizational decisions impact stakeholders beyond those within traditional organizational boundaries." He bases this component on positive reinforcement learning theory: "I am trying to use positive reinforcement learning theory, to bring on the behavior that I want to bring," he adds. Beyond service learning, using and bringing real-world learning tools and guest speakers into the classroom also form components of Professor Tom's curriculum arsenal.

Non-content Pedagogy Interactions (Classroom Observation)

Today it is 9:15 AM and Professor Tom is in the front of the classroom leaning one elbow on the raised computer desk and speaking to a student. Prior to class I observe that he sets up his materials very quickly, allowing him to spend several minutes mingling with the students.

He is dressed in khaki pants and a red polo shirt with an Enron logo emblazed upon the right breast pocket area. Professor Tom is now engaged in a conversation, but I cannot hear the conversation. Both Professor Tom and a student appear highly engaged in the discussion. Around the classroom the students are animated, making eye contact and focusing on one another, taking turns chatting. Professor Tom breaks away from his conversation to finish setting up for the day's lecture. The remainder of the classroom is filled or filling up as the 48 students arrange themselves amongst the tiered seats.

Building connections between students and professor. As Professor Tom's classroom fills up with students and he acknowledges many students entering and taking their seats while he prepares for class, he makes eye contact with them and calls them by their first names. When his preparations and student greetings are complete, Professor Tom begins the lecture.

As Professor Tom lectures he speaks softly, yet his volume is audible in the classroom. As I look around the classroom, I see many students nodding to the measures of the professor's words. Professor Tom's body language is open-stance, arms and legs open, looking at and addressing the class. When Professor Tom sees a student beginning to speak, he goes to them and stands within a four- to six-foot distance, close enough to hear but not so close as to encroach on the student's personal zone or space. I observe that the professor walks out into and among the audience of students consistently during the one hour and 55 minutes of lecture. Observably, Professor Tom listens to each student, allowing them time to talk, not interrupting the flow of conversation. As the professor walks, he nods to acknowledge the student's contribution to the classroom discussion. I note that Professor Tom walks toward the students and away from the podium a dozen or more times during the lecture period. He employs many different regulating hand gestures as he walks in and among the students. At several points during the lecture he would stop, gesture outward with his hands toward the students, and say, "What I am trying to do," summarizing, "I am trying to get a sense of where you are." Professor Tom's efforts seem to match what he described in our interview. His passion, respect, building trust, and his open inviting body language with students in the classroom are his ways of building the relationship.

I also note in the classroom observation that Professor Tom shows emotion in his voice. He has an impassioned response to students during classroom interactions. Professor Tom's voice volume goes up a bit, and he has a bit of a flushed look to his complexion. He displays highly animated body language and uses inflection and the tone of his voice strengthens as if to say, "Yes, that is it!" In Professor Tom's own words during the lecture, "I am sorry," he says, "I do not mean to get too worked up about this topic."

Being real. I observe that when Professor Tom speaks in the classroom and during exchanges with students, he frequently uses self-deprecating words and phrases and body language. "I do not have all of the answers," he says to the students. Notably, Professor Tom uses these types of rhetorical phrases coupled with accepting, open body language during classroom discussions. For example, he often uses the phrase, "I do not have all of the answers," to start a conversation. Another example of his rhetoric is, "My thinking continues to evolve on this." I observed that these phrases were signals to students for open classroom discussion to ensue. This phrase occurs during the classroom conversation about Tom's Shoes (described below): he says, "My thinking continues to evolve." I observed several times in the classroom that Professor Tom would make credibility-related statements. He apologizes ahead of time for what he is about to present, say, or show. He says to the class, "I have to go back and say why I feel that way."

During the classroom observation, I did not see Professor Tom manage a difficult student, or witness a student openly disagreeing with his comments or position. It was for that reason that I followed up the observation with an email regarding his methods of handling difficult classroom situations.

Content Pedagogy Interactions

By design, Professor Tom uses a variety of rhetorical and pedagogical props in the classroom. His pedagogical style includes a varied classroom palette of both non-content and content pedagogical props to direct his classroom learning. A note here about content versus non-content pedagogy: I am defining pedagogical content knowledge as the unique knowledge a teacher possesses. Teachers relate their pedagogical knowledge (what they know about teaching) to their subject matter. Thus pedagogical content knowledge (PCK) represents the integration or

synthesis of teachers' pedagogical knowledge with their subject matter knowledge. I am defining non-content pedagogy as a prop or device the professor uses, such as the podium, classroom design or decorum, voice or inflection, humor, or a prop like the Enron shirt to make his pedagogical content knowledge clear. (See Chapter 2.)

An example of Professor Tom's non-content pedagogy can be observed in the Enron shirt he is wearing. Teaching sustainability and corporate responsibility while wearing a shirt representing Enron – one of the largest violators of public trust in US history – offers a paradox designed to attract student notice and evoke a response. Professor Tom uses his personal collection of what he calls "offender of the first order" golf shirts, particularly the Enron golf shirt, as an object lesson example for his classroom. Professor Tom uses the Enron shirt as non-content pedagogy humor to make his point; turning this example into content pedagogy. However, I note that no one in the class asks about the shirt.

During the observation Professor Tom uses props, but never employs intimidating body language or rhetorical devices to make his points. He lets students reach their own conclusions; he does not disagree or argue with them in the classroom. I observed that Professor Tom uses video and other technologies for his content pedagogy to help students gain perspective. The video helps students gain perspective because the video topic serves as an object lesson, i.e. content pedagogical knowledge that reinforces the point or concept Professor Tom is making. Professor Tom devotes only about 30 percent of observed classroom time to PowerPoint slides while another 40 percent is spent in classroom discussion, question and answer periods. Several of the slides include embedded video. These are topical videos drawn from YouTube banks. During the classroom observation, Professor Tom uses the video as a content pedagogical tool, saying, "I have a video clip embedded in here [into the PowerPoint slides], but I want to make

sure I get the material across." During the one hour and 55-minute class, he uses video eight times to illustrate points. The company Tom's Shoes receives particular emphasis during the classroom observation. The video used is *TOM'S Shoes: Don't Cry for Me Argentina* (Unknown, 2010). The clip is two minutes and 19 seconds long and takes place in an Argentinian village, with dirt roads and wooden houses. The scene in the video is set with a group of aid workers gathered together in various states of dress, including some who are wearing no shoes. There are many close-ups showing children sitting and putting on their new shoes. About midway through the clip a woman who presumably works with Tom's Shoes or is an aid-worker says, "… and people just want to be involved with the company like this." Being involved and aware about what the company is doing is the ethos statement contained within Professor Tom's lecture that day, he says. "Giving back to society, even in the form of giving shoes to the unfortunate in Argentina, this is the right thing for corporations to do," Professor Tom comments.

Immediately following the video, Professor Tom turns from viewing the screen to the classroom of students and says, "Most companies do what the law says they have to do. Often that is maximizing stockholder returns. However, Tom's Shoes give away shoes. So, you give away a pair or two to a child in need, what's the point?" he asked.

Professor Tom also uses audio technology in the classroom today. "I want to share an audio clip of that in just a second," he says to the class. Professor Tom is conscientious, I observe, to "walk the line between student passivity, technology overload, and positive interest." His various modes of delivery are well-balanced across the class period.

Curriculum Interactions (Syllabus Review)

Professor Tom uses a mixture of his unique knowledge for his content pedagogy. He uses rhetorical devices and props like the Enron shirt, and he also relies upon curriculum-based tools

such as service work to reinforce learning. He strives to deepen connections between himself and the students outside the classroom, enabling trust and confidence to develop. Review of Professor Tom's class syllabus reveals that class contribution and academic service learning (ASL) are student requirements.

Academic service learning. In his syllabus Professor Tom states that "Contribution is essential in this class." He quantifies contribution by stating that 20 percent of the student's grade is devoted to "Contribution/Professionalism and Service Learning." Professor Tom encourages students to be volunteers. His syllabus states that he requires students to work in a community shelter, for Habitat for Humanity, or for some other corporate-sponsored social outreach program to aid the poor. To back up this requirement his syllabus uses this quote from Margaret Mead: "Never doubt that a small group of thoughtful, committed citizens can change the world. Indeed, it is the only thing that ever has!"

In addition, the curriculum elements of ASL work point the student in the direction of real-world application and experience. Professor Tom describes in his syllabus that "experience is a key to understanding the classroom material, organizational decisions and impact on stakeholders." From Professor Tom's syllabus:

> "Service-learning is an academically rigorous instructional method that incorporates a meaningful community service into the curriculum. Service learning is active learning and is embraced by the University's strategic plan. We ask students to see their world through a different lens."

Professor Tom combines the ASL learning components with real-world examples. Professor Tom's classroom also incorporates guests and professional speakers. Bringing guest

speakers into the classroom or using video clips of actual service learning situations, Professor

Tom attempts to communicate and relate all of the classroom learning to the real world.

Student Perceptions (Student Interviews)

Student perception interviews were conducted with 11 of the 48 students in Professor

Tom's classroom. The average age of the students interviewed is 22, and they have an average

GPA of 3.5. Six of them are accounting majors, three major in general business, and one each in

health and behavioral sciences. Six of these students are full-time students/part-time work and

one is part-time student/part-time work. Ten of the students are graduating seniors and one is a

junior.

Respect. The student interviews reveal many illustrations of mutual respect between

Professor Tom and students. One student comments, "I think he is one person that is well

respected and trustworthy because he genuinely cares about me." Students commented that

"Professor Tom is not like other professors just randomly calling on them and putting them on

the spot." I am told by students in the interviews that putting a student on the spot is a sign of

disrespect, in their opinion; it is putting them down. Some students consider "putting someone

down" in this fashion as a sign of lack of respect and professionalism.

During the interview data collection, 58 percent of the students said or commented that

Professor Tom shows respect for them in his classroom by his passion for teaching and the topic

and his interactions with them. Half of the students in the data set made a distinct comment and

said that Professor Tom exhibits professionalism, respect, caring, enthusiasm and positive regard

in their interactions. "He presents himself in a professional manner. He always makes sure that

the whole class understands everything that he is talking about and how important it is to him

that the subject gets addressed," this student said. As the students noted in their interviews, they

link respect to caring. Several students comment that "he just accepts what you say if you have a question about something in a class; he is not rude or anything." This student goes on to explain what is meant by 'rude': it means "short with your words, or just a bad tone of voice." Students also comment on Professor Tom's fairness: "He is fair and gives everybody an equal opportunity, or a chance to speak in class. He does not shoot down what you say, not shooting down anything, just not being disrespectful to me." Furthermore, "He knows us by our names," students claim. Students appear to be surprised by this professor's behavior and his acknowledgment of them by name.

A student says, "I'd call him genuine. I think his teaching style is different from a lot of other professors." Another student comments, "He is very genuine the way he teaches. He cares too, I mean, he cares about me and all of the students."

Showing passion. Another aspect the students noted was that Professor Tom shows respect for them by becoming positively aroused by his enthusiasm for teaching and the topic. Students observe that the volume and tone of his voice increase and he sometimes becomes flushed. "He gets worked up," says one student. Another student comments, "He just seems to go to passionate." "He earns my respect because he shows his passion and positive regard for me and his subject. By him showing this passion for these things, he earns my respect for him as a teacher," says another student. Students express pleasure about being positively aroused. "I would rather learn from someone who seems passionate and is professional about what they are doing, than someone who is just kind of up there and going through the motions," a student says. Students see this passionate caring approach as credible.

Some students comment on Professor Tom's credibility. "I believe he has credibility and legitimacy because of all the things that he presents and how he presents himself, and how he talks in class," one student says.

Disagreement. As stated previously, Professor Tom claims that conflict in his classroom rarely occurs. However, during the student interviews, students comment that they perhaps disagree in their heads but don't openly confront the professor. One student says, "I hardly ever agree or disagree with Professor Tom. It is more or less he'll say something, and it might make me think, or think about it in a different way. I mean sometimes I might completely disagree with him." However, I note that I did not find significant disagreement with Professor Tom's content pedagogy or curriculum. Most students felt that Professor Tom was a very good professor.

Content pedagogy. Professor Tom, the students believe, thinks carefully about his content pedagogy and the use of tools or non-content pedagogy to drive his points. As noted, the students did not question Professor Tom about the Enron shirt during the observed class. However, later they comment and wonder about the shirt, which they perceive as an oxymoron. Several students comment in the interviews, "Yes, I thought about that shirt and wondered why he was wearing the Enron shirt." One student notes, "How can the professor teaching sustainability whose career is centered on trust and credibility wear a shirt representing the opposite of public trust and credibility?" He makes his content pedagogical point using the Enron shirt, and the students compare Professor Tom's content pedagogy to that of other professors.

In this study, students make distinctions when speaking about their professors. They base these distinctions upon a variety of things from the use of the books to a variety of pedagogical classroom devices. The students repeatedly say in their interviews that most of the professors they have during their college years do not include real-world examples using video or audio to

facilitate discussion and work connections. "Most professors do not devote time for classroom discussion, and video/audio clips and devices help facilitate discussion," one student says. "They use slides from the book and base a lot of the classroom lectures on the book," says another student. Another student comments on book-driven slides and lectures; "I just find that boring!" Most students interviewed support the use of video. As one student says, "I think he does a good job of breaking up lectures using video and audio clips and specific examples. I think it is mixed very well, and nothing ever seems to drag on."

Students like what they see in his class, and the video and audio clips add to their understanding of the materials. As one student comments, "I like the audio and videos. I feel they put everything into perspective, helping me to understand." Another student says, "Yeah, he runs many examples also, he will find some videos on YouTube, and that is related to the class material. These devices help us to understand what he is talking about." To state it differently, another student claims, "I think there is a learning reason for doing it [classroom video and discussions]." "I think the video truly gets me more involved because I can relate to the videos, the imagery that's in there. I think it is connected, making connections in the brain," says a further student. The students' reflections of Professor Tom match his instructional goals as noted earlier.

Real-world connections. Students appreciate Professor Tom's attempts to illustrate class content with real-world examples. "He shows us companies that we are relating to in class. It just makes you excited to see that things are happening in just real-life examples, so you get excited," comments a student. Students like the fact that Professor Tom does not base everything strictly on the book; he puts it into realistic perspective, students say. In his class "… he does not base everything on the book, and he puts it in a real, real-life perspective. Most average teachers do

not do that," the students say. "They base a lot on the book, and I just find that boring," comments a student.

Curriculum. Students comprehend the value of service learning and other connections outside the classroom. "Professor Tom does many interesting things in this class, like the required service learning project," comments one student. "I am taking something [important] away from the experience," claims another student. "I am planning to do Habitat for Humanity, and I have always wanted to do a build and help people."

The students also appreciate that Professor Tom uses a variety of learning curriculum, guest speakers, and service work to help them make connections. "We had a really good guest speaker the other day; he is an architect. He creates sustainable buildings," a student comments. "I like a real-world example; it is good to see how people are changing things," says another. "Professor Tom is a very good professor," commented this student. "I like him; there's a connection there for me."

Case Study #2: Professor Mike

Classroom and University Setting

Professor Mike is also a Michigan Distinguished Professor of the Year according to the Presidents Council, and an award winner for the year 2014. His University building at the College of Business and Informational Technology School is in a northern suburb of Southeastern Michigan. The building, a four-story brick structure, was built in 2000. It has a cafeteria and offices for faculty, staff and administration as well as a combination of lecture halls and classrooms.

The graduating seniors in this class are varying types of business majors. Of the 26 students present for the classroom observation, eight were student participants in this study.

Among the eight in the data set, three are finance majors, three in marketing, one in general

business, and one accounting major. The average grade point average of the student participants

is 3.15. There are two males and six females with an average age near 23 in this data set. This

college has many commuter students; seven of the study participants are part-time work/full-time

students, and one does not work but is strictly a full-time student.

The course meets every Tuesday and Thursday in the afternoon for approximately one

hour and 45 minutes from 3 PM until 4:50 PM. Professor Mike explained that he taught this

course at this time – between 3 and 5 PM – due to the large population of commuter students in

the college. The college requires this course for graduation.

Professor's Instructional Goals (Interview)

During in-person interviews Professor Mike outlines his instructional goals, which

involve building relationships in various ways, using humor, exhibiting positive energy, real-

world examples, and technological devices.

Building relationships. Professor Mike uses several techniques to build relationships

with his students. In his interview he says he does not always know the short- or long-term

outcome of his relationship-building efforts. "I do not know if I will impact anybody's life," he

says. "There are always these incredibly impressive individuals [students], and I just want them

in my life." Likewise, he may encounter a situation where he has an unimpressive student. I

asked Professor Mike when he has a student who does not, for instance, get the concepts, or

apply the concepts; how do you rewind? What do you do then? I asked in our interview.

Professor Mike responded, "I usually start out with something positive. I'll usually say

something like, 'You need to work on this or that.' Hopefully, it is the type of atmosphere where

they'll come to me to talk about it." He is cognizant of relationships in context of the pedagogy, and understands that not all students will appreciate his teaching.

Professor Mike reaffirms that he is very impressed with most of his students. "I just want them to be successful in life, and I want to keep up with them over the years after they leave school," he added. He sees this relationship or bond as a celebration. "It is almost like a celebration of what we did together, way back when," Professor Mike said. He also sees these student relationships as long-term. He explains, "Literally, I bring them back as speakers." Thus Professor Mike sees this act of student relationship-building in terms of two separate aspects of his job: the classroom relationship, and the lasting long-term bond.

These bonds broaden outside the classroom as well. "If my only interaction is in the classroom, it has to extend to the outside of the classroom too," Professor Mike explains. "My whole career has been working outside of the class on extracurricular stuff with students." In our interview, Professor Mike said that he spent the entire last year working with a group of four students in Panama to help a village. "I got very close to them [the students]." These are "lifelong bonds…I would not be at all surprised if ten years from now, 20 years from now, [we will be] having a get-together again," he comments. Professor Mike believes deeply in forming these relationships inside and outside the classroom. "It can be huge…the students I have worked with often even years, decades afterward we are, and they are friends. There is bonding." Finally, Professor Mike said, "Certainly, validating answers and always be willing to talk to them outside the class, these are the main things [that build bonds]."

Knowing students' names. During his interview, I asked Professor Mike why he strives to know each student's name. He explains that it is related to caring. "It is more personable to use their names. I feel like [if I didn't know their names] they would get the impression that I do

not care about them," he said. Respectful engagement, he explains, is how he believes he would feel about himself and his professionalism if he did not learn and acknowledge students by name. "What type of teacher would I be, if I did not know them at least by their first names? Besides, the students would probably be bored," he said.

Using humor. Professor Mike begins to talk about his humor in the classroom: "I like positive kind of humorous things." During the interview I asked why he uses humor and laughter. He said, "It probably makes them feel that this is the real me. That I am genuine to them," he said. To paraphrase Professor Mike's words, "Humor is something I cannot cover up; it is the 'real me,' and the fact is that I am interested in them as individuals. It is a way to connect," he said. "Positive humor, it is a way you get noticed," he adds.

Professor Mike's humor sometimes becomes a little sardonic. "I say things like, gosh, I felt so good about you guys up until now," he comments in our interview. For example, he says, "I try to pay them backhanded compliments. I say things like, "'You guys are real sharp,' when they mess something up." Later Professor Mike confesses to me that he considers himself an introvert, although he appears to be extroverted. "I am interested in them as individuals, but I am a natural introvert," he claims.

Energy and engagement. Professor Mike tries to let his natural enthusiasm show during class. "I will try to show extra enthusiasm," he says. "I automatically – no matter what they are doing – [try to] perk them up…I think it is just an energy thing for them and me." He adds, "I know from the limited research I have done [that] when students are showing energy, they are engaged, even when they are laughing or having fun. And [when they're engaged] they will learn better." However, Professor Mike sometimes wonders if he is pushing it too far to an energetic extreme. He talks further about energy and the learning attributes of energy: "My style of energy

gets the course concepts into them dramatically." To assess the impact of his high energy, in the interview I asked him to assign a Fahrenheit degree, with heat representing an indication of his energy level. He places the 'heat' in his class – on a scale of 65 to 80 degrees – at about 75. "I think it is not far off from 75 degrees!" he says. Being at the high end of that given scale, this offers an illustration of Professor Mike's energy as he lectures. "Keeping students engaged, and not bored, is a key strategy for imparting knowledge," he claims. Professor Mike always tries to bring the situation in the classroom back to a positive, engaged atmosphere. "I do and say things like this. My teaching in this manner has a purpose. Engagement is the key, and I strive for a positive classroom atmosphere," he concluded.

Real-world examples. When asked about his use of real-world examples in class, Professor Mike says, "I think it helps a lot when there are examples from my life, which connects students with the concepts we are learning." He explains that real-world examples are quick and can explain much information and many of the chapter concepts. He also sees real-world examples as a way to keep students engaged. "Taking 30 seconds to tell this story relates well and engages them [students]. Stories relay the course concepts well. Real-world examples are one way to relate concepts more dramatically.

"At times," he adds, "The students may see my real-world example as confusing, drawn out or irrelevant because they lack the business background or knowledge necessary to interpret the story." However, recognizing the generational differences and diverse backgrounds of the students in his classroom, Professor Mike also draws upon his knowledge of popular culture as a real-world example for the class. He says he knows these examples, "I can go into depth and probably get more excited about them because some of them affected my whole life." At times, he explains, "It is a scary thing too, especially if I do not have an example which comes

immediately to my mind." Sometimes he pauses during his lecture while he tries to call an example to mind. "Obviously, you want that pause to be as short as possible because five seconds feel like three hours," he said. However, he says regarding the real-world examples, "I try to use them without confusing the issue, while still keeping a positive environment."

Technological devices. During our interview I asked Professor Mike about his use of acetate overheads in his lectures. He explains that he prefers those to PowerPoint slides because he can write on them during the discussion. Professor Mike also makes self-deprecating reference to his handwriting and artwork, saying, "God, I mean you saw my handwriting and my drawing ability. I'll draw something [and] you do not know what it is."

When asked about the roll-around chairs in the lecture room, Professor Mike explains that they are good for graduate students and their small group exercises. Although Professor Mike says he occasionally has students in groups, which makes the chairs useful, he adds that he does not use them often.

Non-Content Pedagogy Interactions (Classroom Observation)

Professor Mike's lecture is on the fourth floor of the College of Business and Technology building, in a classroom laid out in a square. The seating capacity in the classroom is difficult to determine due to a number of "roll-around" chairs in the room. However, the fire plaque by the door says room capacity is 60. Many of the chairs move about from classroom to classroom; seating capacity therefore varies. I do not observe any use of the rolling chairs during the classroom observation. Today the room has 45 chairs and as the class fills, 26 students occupy these chairs. I am located against the wall, on the west wall to the right of the professor as he faces the students. I am approximately 10 feet from the professor's lecture podium.

High-Quality Connections in the Business Classroom

The professor's podium is a small computer desk in the left front as you walk into the classroom. There is a whiteboard and an LCD projector in the room and also an overhead document projector and its accompanying screen in the front of the class. Professor Mike teaches a strategic management course; it is an upper-level, seniors only course in the College of Business and Technology. Professor Mike refers to the course as a capstone course for seniors earning a Bachelor's of Business Administration degree. The course syllabus states that this class is senior standing for students of the College of Business Administration majors only. From Professor Mike's syllabus, today's lecture is on Chapter 6: Strategy Formulation: Situation analysis and business strategy. There are five 300-level courses that are prerequisites for this course.

Professor Mike's stature is approximately 5' 7" tall, and he has a deep, raspy voice. When he speaks, he speaks loudly, and I observe that students quiet down when he begins talking. He is very quiet as the students begin to filter into the class, but then he erupts with a loud voice. Professor Mike becomes more lively as he begins the class. With the cup of coffee in his hand, which he often sips during the classroom observation, he lubricates his raspy, loud voice.

Professor Mike starts the class with a big, loud "Welcome!" His voice is very audible in the classroom of 26 students. Professor Mike removes a stack of 30 acetate overhead slides from his briefcase. Immediately following his welcome salutation, I observe that the classroom takes on an attentive demeanor; everyone has his or her eyes focused on Professor Mike. The students are smiling in response to Professor Mike's greeting. One student shouts out, "After the quiz, are you going to let us out early?" Professor Mike loudly proclaims, "NO!" This interchange is the first indication that Professor Mike has prepared a five-question quiz for the class today. Among the five questions on the quiz, two are true and false, two are multiple-choice, and the fifth

question seems to appear to be a bit of a joke: it reads, "Pig farmers are more likely to castrate a male pig because…?"

As Professor Mike stated in his instructional goals he does pay students backhanded compliments in the classroom. I observe an exchange with a student in the front of the class. Professor Mike starts to joke with her as he responds to her question. They seem to disagree about the answer. To this student, Professor Mike's concluding response is, "Well, you know, it is okay. I see it this way, you guys could be right, I do not know. That is why it is your opinion." Humor is part of Professor Mike's non-content pedagogy.

Professor Mike does not walk about the class very much; he walks within approximately a 10-foot lateral line in the front of the class. This does not affect his ability to be relational, which in Professor Mike's class seems less about walking into the classroom among the students and more about the non-content type interactions of voice, body language, and classroom decorum. I observe that Professor Mike's classroom can also be a bit raucous and loose as the professor takes no objections to students shouting out questions, answers, or comments before and during his lecture. Indeed, I observe, he encourages this type of behavior. I also note that when students are answering Professor Mike's questions, he smiles and reaffirms the answer back to the student. As I observe, he appears to experience a joy about the student's participation.

In Professor Mike's class respectful engagement extends to getting to know students by their names. He is on a first-name basis with all the students in the class. He uses name cards which the students place on their desks at the beginning of each class.

Classroom energy appears high and present in Professor Mike's class. I observe that Professor Mike is quite animated most of the time he is teaching. He uses a good deal of body

language and gestures. His gestures include waving his arms to make a point. When he hears a student make a comment with which he does not agree, he puts his hands on his head and contorts his face a bit. I observe that he flips his arms upwards and out, and exclaims, "I do not care," using body language to emphasize his point. Professor Mike's classroom energy and style also seem to add to the student interest and attention levels.

Content Pedagogy Interactions

Moving in and out of various storytelling devices, Professor Mike uses both non-content and content in his pedagogy. These devices include the pig question on the quiz mentioned under non-content pedagogy, and jokes. The joke becomes content pedagogy when the professor uses the device to make a point in the learning. After the quiz, Professor Mike explains the "pig" question. Reviewing the classroom quiz artifact, Quiz Chapter 6, the answer is "C," Professor Mike says. He explains, "The farmers castrate the hogs, so as to be fair to the dogs. Otherwise, the guilt will be overwhelming," he says. He is making a point related to today's lecture – how "humans think and make a strategy," he said. This is an example of a joke, non-content pedagogy, leading to a content pedagogical point. That is, the professor transfers the relationship from his personal style to the content. I observe that the device seems to serve as parody for the students and the day's lecture. Despite the quiz and the seemingly "trick pig question" (which carried no grade weight), the classroom energy continues to be high, I note. A further example of taking something relatable from popular culture and bringing it into the content pedagogy context can be found in a lesson tool the students told me Professor Mike used in a previous lecture. He used acetate overheads to conduct a SWOT analysis (strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats) on the television show "Buffy, the Vampire Slayer." Professor Mike

often relies upon such examples from pop culture to make a classroom point and further illustrate

a concept being taught.

He does not use PowerPoint slides at all for his lectures, relying strictly on these acetate

overheads that he writes on as he instructs and solicits participation from the class. He distributes

the overheads to students prior to class. I observe that his handwriting is not very legible, nor are

the pictures he draws particularly expert. He jokes about his lack of artistic ability: regarding his

poor handwriting, Professor Mike refers to me during the classroom observation and says

jokingly, "Observer, if you can make a note, 'excellent artist!'" The slides, along with the self-

deprecation about his artistry and handwriting, appear to make a connection with the students. I

also observe that his "artistry" and handwriting may have a connection to his humor, being

positive and getting noticed.

Curriculum Interactions (Classroom Observation and Syllabus Review)

In Professor Mike's syllabus, he clearly states that he wants students to master the

materials. Quoting from the syllabus: "To promote excellence, I will help students outside the

class. See me if there is anything I can do to help you master the materials!"

Professor Mike, I observe in the classroom, uses many real-world examples primarily

from his personal background. It becomes evident from the lecture that Professor Mike is or was

an entrepreneur. As the classroom conversations develop, they all seem to revolve around

examples and experiences from Professor Mike's real-world background. I observe that

Professor Mike draws from his experience in running small companies. Some of these examples

are fairly esoteric, as when he owned a camp counseling business in Canada. Professor Mike is

talking about low capital investment today in class. He relates a story in class about how he

bought used canoes for the camp that year. He uses multiple examples from the work context or

real world as examples for students. Another example is offered when Professor Mike begins to discuss differentiation in the marketplace. He uses an example from Wendy's: "What Wendy's did," he said, "Was to focus on demographic differentiation. They went after the young adults and made bigger burgers." Professor Mike appears sensitive to considering the relatability for students to his stories and experiences.

Sometimes Professor Mike takes a pause while using real-world examples. As I witness during the classroom observation, he takes a long pause, as if he is letting his thoughts catch up, and allowing the students to catch up with him.

Student Perceptions (Student Interviews)

Students interviewed for this research reflect back many of the instructional goals Professor Mike espouses, including humor and positivity, relationship-building, and real-world stories.

Using humor and positivity. Students in the class say that Professor Mike is funny, that he frequently uses (non-content pedagogical) devices like the pig joke. "It is enjoyable humor, in a very playful way," a student said." "He says humorous sorts of stuff all the time," commented another. "He'll use people as examples, but he always has the class laughing over something and makes jokes." One student explained that Professor Mike has a "thing for pigs."

Some students say his humor and affect command their attention. As one student states, "He is very enthusiastic, goofy, he is funny, but he is very personable, and sometimes loud." Moreover, another student comments, "His class is different from any other class I have ever taken; he is gregarious." Another student comments, "He speaks loudly, sometimes very deeply, and sometimes he talks to himself. He makes me more interested." Professor Mike "gives students positive feedback, answering the questions," added this student. Other student's quotes

included, "He has a positive face. A kind of reinforcement of what you are saying," and "He enjoys us participating whether we know what you are talking about or not."

Building relationships. For students, Professor Mike's relationship-building efforts seem to be effective. During the interview I asked students, does he care for and about the relationship between you? In one student's mind, relationship-building hinges around caring issues. "He values our opinions, and he will give his opinions, and he should say like this is my opinion, but that does not mean he's right," this student said. "Respecting our opinion is part of being cared for," said another.

The students also view Professor Mike's efforts to get to know their names as respectful and professional, but among the students this translation perhaps carries an even deeper meaning than it does for the professor. I observed in my student interviews that they may view his efforts to know them as caring and enjoyment, leading them to feel successful in his classroom. "He cares about us and wants to know our names. He wants to help us succeed in the class and then it makes it easier to enjoy the class," this student said.

A student comments, "He makes many gestures, and I always look forward to going to his class, mostly because he gives off positive energy. People (students) are always engaged," the student continues. "They always want to participate and you know he makes jokes with them, and we make jokes with him, he is just very relational with us." Moreover, as another student commented, "I do not ever feel like he is ever uptight. We feel like we can approach him," she said. "He is just like a normal person," another student said. A further felt that Professor Mike's classroom atmosphere improves her learning: "I think that is another important aspect of improved learning. So that has been helpful," she says.

Conflicts of opinion. During the interviews, I probed further about conflicts of opinion. What happens, I asked a student, when there's a conflict of opinion between professor and student? The student replied, "We were talking about target audiences, and he [Professor Mike] felt like the target audience for a certain company was this, I do not think it is that. I think it is more like a mix of this." "He does not want to make us feel like we are wrong. He wants us to believe what we believe," comments another student.

Real-world stories. "He is very big on stories, like his purchasing canoes for his summer camp story and relating these stories to the class. The class is not boring," comments a student. Professor Mike's class is different from other classes, students agree. The real stories Professor Mike tells lend an authentic air to the content pedagogy. "This class is different from any other class I have ever taken; he does not read straight from PowerPoint, and he is not monotone and boring." For instance, the student says, he told a story about "Buffy, the Vampire Slayer." "We did a SWOT analysis on Buffy the Vampire Slayer today. He and the class explained and examined Buffy's strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats. We did it together on the acetate overheads. It is very entertaining, and I enjoy it, and it is not a like a class that I am bored out of my mind on." "He drew a picture on the board, and we had no idea what he was doing,"she continued. "'What are the strengths, what are the weaknesses, opportunities, and threats against this vampire?' he said. Without me even realizing that he was doing, he is performing a SWOT analysis," she says. "I'll never forget it because it made me understand the concept," another student added. Finally, the student said, "I've 'learned' SWOT! I've gone over this four or five times in my school career and never understood it. The way he related it and applied it to business, wow, I got it!" she exclaimed. Most students seem to see the value in Professor Mike's content pedagogy, including how he uses the acetate overhead slides.

Students commented that the acetate slides helped to keep their attention during the lectures. "With Professor Mike, he is very hands-on. He gives you xerox copies of his overheads before the class starts." Another student said that what he likes about Professor Mike is that you do not teach yourself. "He does give you overheads that are fill-in-the-blank. Then as he goes along in the lecture, he tells you what you need to write down." Students explain that Professor Mike includes the overheads as part of his course pack at the beginning of the term. Students mention that other professors rely too much on PowerPoint. "I do not, I do not like PowerPoint slides at all," said one student. Another adds, "In my experience PowerPoint slides are just two or three lines about the topic and on to the next chart or slide," the student said. However, not all students feel the same about Professor Mike's overheads. "His overheads, they are okay, they are not my favorite. They are a little bit overwhelming to me because there's a huge stack, and it is just a lot of information," this student said. However, students see Professor Mike's use of acetate overheads as intentional. "I think his intent is so he can take the time to explain the concepts to us," the student added. Some students see Professor Mike's handwriting as a downside to the acetate slides. Professor Mike's has "horrible" handwriting," this student said. "I do not know if you noticed his handwriting. It is horrible," another student said.

Students appreciate his examples from the real world, as one student explains, "He gives us real-world examples of concepts we are learning." "Because he has real-world examples that pertain to work and business in the classroom, it makes us accountable for learning the material," said another. "Whatever you say," a student comments, "He is going to turn that into something you know that relates to the material." However, there are a few students who take exception, or see the technique as just another way to communicate with no special emphasis.

Take for example a student who comments on a professor's use of real-world examples: "I think they [the professors] are there to get the material out, it is their job, and the real world is just another way," she said. The professor can be "only so relatable because a lot of it, this real-world experience, you need an understanding. I struggled with some of those examples," another student said. A further student said, "He [Professor Mike] kind of skips through some of the important stuff to get to a certain answer or end of the process." He said he feels like Professor Mike thinks the students should just know it. "Who needs to see everything so drawn out with real-world examples?" said another. This student almost seems bored by the examples. Again, much the same as in Professor Tom's case, this comment came from one student who seemed to want to be interviewed because he had a grudge or a personal problem with Professor Mike. Negative comments were not widespread among this data set. Most students believed Professor Mike to be an excellent or very good teacher.

Case Study #3 – Professor Bruce

Classroom and University Setting

Professor Bruce was his University's nominee for the State of Michigan, President's Council Distinguished Professor for 2011. He did not win the award that year; however, he is the 2009 Michigan Association of CPAs Distinguished Achievement in Accounting Education award recipient. Previously, he was named Accounting Educator of the Year by Michigan Associate of CPAs in 2003.

Professor Bruce is a full professor of accounting who teaches at a University in Southeastern Michigan. Facilities at his University campus building, the College of Business, include classrooms, updated technologies, and computer labs for student learning and research. This building was built in the late 1980s by a Fortune 500 company as an educational training

center. In 2008-2009 the building was sold to the University and became the new location for

the College of Business (COB) and the College of Health and Human Services (CEHHS).

Professor Bruce's classroom is room 173B. It is a rectangular-shaped classroom. An LCD

projector is overhead and its screen is on the wall in the front of the room. Along the long side of

the rectangle is a whiteboard that runs nearly the full length of the room. The room has tables and

chairs arranged in rows; there are no individual desks. There are eight rows of tables with

between six and eight chairs in each row. A unique feature of this classroom is that to view the

whiteboard – which Professor Bruce frequently uses – students must turn sideways in their seats.

Professor Bruce teaches a managerial accounting course, Accounting 299. It meets at 8

AM to 9:15 AM on Tuesday and Thursday mornings. This accounting course is a core class for

all students entering the BBA program at the University's College of Business. Of the 22

students in the course, 10 are participants in this study. Seven of the participants are pre-business

majors and three intend to be accounting majors. The average grade point average for those in

the data set is 3.10. The average age of the students is 21 years. Like the other universities in this

study, this university is considered a commuter campus. Therefore, there are eight full-time

students and two part-time workers/full-time students in the data set.

Professor's Instructional Goals (Interview)

The researcher interview with Professor Bruce covered his instructional goals, which

include building relationships with students, creating a safe space, being straightforward, having

students come to the whiteboard, and using real-world examples.

Building relationships. Professor Bruce builds relationships with students in several

ways. For example, he pokes fun at himself in a self-deprecating way when he makes a mistake

in class. "Occasionally, I'll mess up," says Professor Bruce. When this happens, he'll make a

joke. "How we react to a screw-up, we make a joke about it, it is funny." he explains (referring to himself using the royal 'we'). However, Professor Bruce says he tries to be cautious with his jokes to avoid going too far in attempting to make a joke and inadvertently offending a student. If he perceives that a student takes offense, "When we break into a group for the next five minutes, I'll approach that student, and I'll say, it is okay. I meant that as a joke. If I say something inappropriate, I apologize," he says. He considers embarrassing a student a breach of his classroom rules. "I do apologize to the person because I broke the rules, the rule of my class." Then he starts the rebuilding process to mend his relationship with that person. Professor Bruce states, "Words are big, and words are powerful." He continues, "If you screw up, you say 'Oops, I am wrong,' and I tell the class if I do something wrong, I will fix it. If you do something wrong, you lose points," he laughs. However, he notes, "If I do something wrong on an exam, or a quiz or anything, I go, those are your points; you've earned them." He says that he tells the class up front: "If it is my mess-up, I'll fix it. If it is your mess-up, you have to fix it." As a college professor, being wise is one thing, Professor Bruce says; however, "Keeping students interested and engaged throughout the lesson, is quite another."

Positivity is another relationship-building tool Professor Bruce employs. He expresses in our interview the belief that, "Successful people are positive, happy people who are confident. Smiling is part of that positive attitude." Professor Bruce says that he uses the whiteboard in his classroom almost exclusively during his lecture and for having students come up and answer questions he designs. However, as part of building trust and showing regard, he is very sensitive to student shyness and whether they are willing volunteers. He describes, "Not everybody is ready to come to the boards. I watch them [the students] to see that they are ready to come to the board." He adds, "I watch the classroom for student signals; I'll look for a student who raises

their head when I ask a question and those who look down." He chooses willing students by reading their body language and posture. "It is eye contact and posture that I look for," he says. Professor Bruce also looks to see whether students are leaning forward, eyes focused downward, or their shoulders slanted inward. He also recalls whether they have usually been open to talking and volunteering. "I do not call out that person who looked down for at least the first couple of weeks of class," he says. Professor Bruce says that he calls on the people who have raised their heads and wanted to answer or go to the board. He expresses that he is "a bit surprised" by the number of students who like to be called to the board. According to Professor Bruce, "Being in front of the room – they [many students] tend to want to be up there." He positively reinforces students when they go up to the board, "Even if the student does not have the 'right answer,'" he explains.

Professor Bruce uses a reward system where students earn success points for contributing in class. He also rewards students in the moment by throwing them small pieces of candy, such as Snickers bars or lollipops, when they volunteer to write ideas on the whiteboard. "I build success points, trust, and self-confidence," he says. "There is a little success at a time, which builds their confidence." Confidence, Professor Bruce believes, means that the students will try other things. "I am building them up slowly so they can try more and new things and be able to say something in front of the class," he says. He builds on little student successes: "So if they are successful, they will try other things, or they will try something new. That is how I build engagement, excitement, and success."

Creating a safe environment. Because of his approach to student shyness, Professor Bruce views his classroom as a safe place for interaction. "I am trying to get them to realize that my classroom is a safe place for interaction," he says. One of his goals is to "eliminate the

negativism in the classroom, thereby hoping to foster interaction and confidence." Professor

Bruce describes his classroom as, "This place [where there are] no negative reactions to a

behavior, or a negative reaction to being wrong, or a negative reaction to trying. They might do

that in other classes." He adds, "Hopefully their [the students'] reaction is to know there is no

negative to making an attempt."

Being straightforward. Professor Bruce's content pedagogy teaching style is to be

straightforward and organized with the content and with his explanations, illustrations, and

student feedback. Students "look forward to coming to my class because I am straightforward,

and the classroom is a kind of sanctuary," he says. Professor Bruce sees his class as a break from

the craziness he sees in other classrooms, where instructors do not know how to control the class

discussion and focus on learning. He believes this is one of the keys to his success, when

students look forward to coming to his class, "I am trying to be organized and straightforward

enough for them to actually look forward to coming to my class," he claims.

Technological devices. Professor Bruce uses the whiteboard as the primary mode of

communication in class. He also uses the whiteboard for teaching students about body language

for forensic accounting procedures and purposes. Forensic accounting is Professor Bruce's

particular area of expertise. "I use and teach my class to instruct on the principles and concepts. I

also use the whiteboard to teach the students how to read body language and behavior for

interrogation interviews – forensic accounting," he explains. The whiteboard also allows

Professor Bruce to keep the conversation going. "I never want a student to anchor on something

that stops them from moving forward," he says.

Professor Bruce says that knowing what they are doing on the whiteboard comes more or

less quickly for students. He believes that by students volunteering to answer the board

questions, they become more confident. "I'll do this one or two classes and then by the third

class they are a little more comfortable," he says. Comfortable, he says, is when he can throw

them the marker and the student immediately gets up and goes to the board. Professor Bruce

adds, "I simply point, hand them the marker to the board, and say, 'It is your classroom; tell me

what you know,' I'll throw it [the marker] to the student; the student responds."

   Just as the whiteboard is his classroom tool of choice, Professor Bruce shuns PowerPoint

lecture slides in his lectures. "I was using the PowerPoint, and my students did not do well.

They did not like the class; they did not know why they did not like the class; I could not figure

it out," he muses. He does not use technology in the classroom. He indicates that PowerPoint

slides cause him to worry about students being confident enough to be successful. "I know why

they learn," he says. "Kids are coming to college today; it has not changed, they come to learn

from me." He believes that one-page crib notes are the most useful thing he can provide students.

"It is a little scribbled page of one page of notes I use to teach," Professor Bruce describes. He

believes he should be able to reduce any lecture to one page of "scribble notes," as he calls these

working tools. "If I can explain my one page to other people, that means I know it [the

material]," he says. "I can walk in front of a group, look at the page, and then I would do

everything on the board to explain it." As he adds, "I always start out knowing where I want to

end up. If it is an example, I tell them, this is how you use this in a business situation."

   Real-world examples. During his interview, Professor Bruce contrasts book learning with

real-world application. "For how it is done today, the book just goes from an academic

viewpoint. That is not what necessarily happens in the business world today," he says. He

concludes that he uses the book to convey basic ideas and concepts, and supplements with real-

world examples of how it is done. He feels his students already know the material; he is just

helping them translate the knowledge into action. "They are just putting things together. They already know."

Non-Content Pedagogy Interactions (Classroom Observation)

During the visit to Professor Bruce's accounting classroom there are 22 students present. Of those 22, eight are females and 14 are males.

I observe that there is little or no downtime during the one hour and 15-minute class. Professor Bruce is energetic and always moving about the classroom. The professor keeps his class moving along at a brisk pace, sometimes using humor to keep the engagement levels high. That is, sometimes he tells a joke as a means to get and keep student engagement. During my classroom observation, Professor Bruce is smiling, and his affect appears to be happy most often during the classroom lecture. Because of this energy there is a sense of excitement in Professor Bruce's class, I observe. I also observe that when Professor Bruce is most excited is when he is mapping out on the whiteboard a new concept to be learned. In this case, he is explaining "Contribution Margin." As Professor Bruce turns to the board, drawing a line indicating the further development of the idea leading to the explanation of Contribution Margin, his enthusiasm is evident. His voice raises and he speaks a little louder and more forcefully. Professor Bruce now toggles between drawing on the whiteboard and turning back to the class to address the students.

Content Pedagogy Interactions

The classroom whiteboard is Professor Bruce's primary non-content-pedagogical teaching tool, and a tool he uses to illustrate his content pedagogy. Professor Bruce uses the whiteboard often in his classroom, calling individual students and/or teams of students to the whiteboard a total of six times during the 75-minute classroom period. Professor Bruce's non-

content pedagogical use of the whiteboard is the basis of building knowledge, learning and success points for students. Professor Bruce uses positive group reinforcement to minimize student fear and build confidence. His definition of positive group reinforcement is having some students model behavior he's looking for, to illustrate that going to the board is a positive action and not be feared, he believes. The whiteboard is a "communal tool" that both students and professor use. During the classroom observation, again at the whiteboard with marker in hand, Professor Bruce discusses the break-even point. "So, that is our total cost, now the question here is, where is the break-even point?" he asks students. He continues, "We do break even because that tells us at what point we had enough demand in the market to sell the product." After offering a brief example of a startup business selling products, a student responds to Professor Bruce's explanation on the whiteboard.

Using the board as a classroom instructional tool, Professor Bruce asks questions and gives student feedback. Throughout the 75-minute class, I observe that Professor Bruce frequently refers back to and points at the whiteboard examples he draws. I observe that he keeps the class moving forward, but stops frequently to answer student questions by adding a line, a dot emphasis, or something else on the whiteboard, which serves always as his backdrop. He is moving towards his classroom goal and learning for the day. "Competition tells you how much competition is out there. So far we have got a couple of really good ideas. Yeah, demand. Anything else?" Professor Bruce asks the class, and a student responds. "Yes, the amount of money the company reinvests in itself," she says. The professor turns from the student back to the whiteboard to point out elements on his drawn graph. "So there is demand, these two elements drawing on the whiteboard, could indicate a supply – how much profit is out there and how many people are out there, these two elements," he explains. This conversation continues

for three minutes as Professor Bruce toggles between the whiteboard drawing and student responses. Once again turning to the whiteboard to conclude explanation of this concept, Professor Bruce says, "Now simplify this. Okay, so we have a price per unit [marking the whiteboard with the tip of his marker] equals this cost [pointing to the whiteboard again with his marker] plus variable cost. Okay, well, what we have is income equals zero, so we can bring the entire operating statement over to this side. Yet our price, minus variable cost – what does the price minus variable cost equal?" A student responds, "Contribution margin." "Yes!" exclaims Professor Bruce.

I observe that Professor Bruce often points to students and throws them the marker when they appear willing to contribute to the conversation. The student then goes to the whiteboard and adds to the drawing. When they are finished, Professor Bruce throws them a small piece of candy. Such a volley takes place six times during the classroom observation.

Curriculum Interactions (Classroom Observation and Artifacts)

It is observed that Professor Bruce's curriculum pedagogy relies heavily upon his prior experience in the business world and draws upon real-world corporate illustrations.

Real-world examples. Relying on his background as a businessperson, Professor Bruce often brings a personal example of his business experience into the classroom. Professor Bruce uses real-world examples to update students on how business is done today.

During the classroom observation I often hear Professor Bruce refer to business with the phrase, "You might want to understand, that is just how it is done." He seems to believe that the students already have a base of knowledge. They have an understanding of the real world and can often draw upon what they've learned in other classes and from their limited exposure to business, and relate that knowledge to his real-world stories. For example, in the classroom

observation, I hear him say, "You've already learned this in prior classes." He adds, "You already know all this, we are just going one more step. We are putting this into practice." Professor Bruce uses real-world examples, such as the latest news about Tesla Motor Cars Inc., to relate and be relevant. Financial statements are real and relevant to his class. Tying the real-world relationship and relevance together, Professor Bruce says, "We are just rearranging the financial statement." He stays relevant by offering examples and calling on students to recall them. The classroom artifacts also attest to his one page of scribble, as he calls the crib notes he distributes.

Student Perceptions (Student Interviews)

Students in the data set discuss several of the instructional tools Professor Bruce expresses as goals and also that have been observed during the classroom session, including positive energy, humor, straightforwardness, the positive reinforcement system, trust and relevance of the material.

Positive energy. There is an energy about Professor Bruce that students notice and say engages them. "He kept the class engaged and energized, especially for a very early class," commented a student in the interviews. This student says Professor Bruce has a "positive energy." Another student does not know if he felt more energetic, but he says, "I feel – at 8 o'clock in the morning – I feel Professor Bruce's energy." The same student felt that Professor Bruce is, "Probably channeling his energy into us. I guess maybe halfway through the class like we are more awake and alert and maybe more energetic."

The students believe that he is happy too. "He always seems to be happy," comments this student. Another student contrasts Professor Bruce and his smile to a professor who is less 'smiley.' "I do not like professors who never crack a smile and just talk and write on the board.

All you do is zone out," she said. Students verify that "There's a sense of excitement about the learning in his class." They express that they sense the excitement and engagement when they are in Professor Bruce's classroom. "When I know that I can apply what I am learning, it is like a, 'Wow this is cool,' I am excited," she comments. As another student explains, "I find ways to apply what I learned in class; I feel more engaged."

Humor. Humor is one of the non-content type tools Professor uses to get students engaged. The students do describe Professor Bruce's use of humor in class. However, Professor Bruce is not always on target with his jokes or his examples. As one student comments, "He seems to think that they [his jokes] are funny, so I laugh because I have to. He feels like he has a lock on funny." Most students, though, felt that his humor was appropriate and welcomed.

Being straightforward. Students comment on Professor Bruce's pedagogy of getting straight to the point. During our conversations Professor Bruce indicated often that he believes in a one-page outline for the classroom session. This one-page outline keeps him focused and straightforward, he believes. Students point out that in Bruce's classroom, he does not read from a script or slides; he just has his 'one-pager.' "He just gets straight to the point as opposed to just reading a script or PowerPoint slides; he uses his one-pager to guide the classroom discussion," the student says. Moreover, students like the fact that he uses examples. "He makes up his problems as he goes along on the board," says a student. Professor Bruce's straightforwardness stands out in students' minds. "He is straightforward, giving us simple ways that are easy to remember," says this student. Moreover, another student said, "I appreciate that he is straightforward."

Positive reinforcement. "If you attempt something and don't succeed, he still rewards us," says one student. Another student comments that if students, "Give it your best, go up to the

board, try to answer the question, he throws you a lollipop or a Snickers just for trying." "He will never tell you that you are wrong, he will never flat-out say 'that is wrong,'" adds this student.

"The whiteboard makes quite an impression on the students in the class," explains one student. A majority of the students interviewed talked about how Professor Bruce uses the whiteboard to communicate. "He makes up his problems as he goes along. He then creates hypothetical situations and asks lots of like critical thinking questions in the class, and puts this on the whiteboard," adds this student.

Some students seem to take issue with the whiteboard, which is the only approach used in Professor Bruce's classroom. "I do not have the slides and notes and the stuff that he writes on the board. That is not sustainable for helping us," expresses a student. Also, at times students do not like his feedback if it takes the form of opinions. "I do not like some other things he says, especially his opinion on something," a student explains. "It is his opinion; I figure, it is not always my opinion," he continues. However, the student adds, "For the most part, though, I think he knows a lot about what he is talking about." A further student comments that he is annoyed about where the whiteboard is located. "It drives me crazy. I would rather be in a room where the board is at the front of the room," he says.

Trust and relevance. Students believe that Professor Bruce is real-world based, and that both the professor and his stories are trustworthy. His classroom examples and student attestations lend credence to that claim. "I do think he is a very trustworthy professor. I think he knows a lot about the real world, and what he is talking about," says a student. As another student assimilates Professor Bruce's lectures regarding real-world examples, he says, "Money, the real world, and accounting are inextricably tied. Accounting is based on real-world money. I have to know its importance and application in the real world."

A student says of Professor Bruce and his classroom examples that these make him relevant. "He is relevant," this student explains. "I remember the first day in class he told us that we are going to use many real-world examples in class." Another student adds, "Professor Bruce brings in real-world company examples, and we find out what was going on with them and the reasons why they make their decisions." Another continues, "We have many discussions based on Tesla. For the first two or three days in class, we found the Tesla example to be very interesting because we read about them daily." "Real-world examples, it just makes it a little bit easier to understand and remember," a further student adds. To this point, other students comment on how his real-world examples help them to understand the classroom learning. "He gives me real-world examples. I can relate to this. I can think of something in my life and try to relate even though I have not had many business experiences," says this student. When he is talking about real-world situations, students often relate in different ways, as a student explains, "I can imagine my uncle at work, because he is an accountant. So I can think about it through his stories; that helps a lot."

Chapter 5: Discussion

This study explores new terrain in which HQC business theory is applied to the award-winning professor's classroom. The conceptual framework for this research was coalesced from the theories of self-efficacy, positive psychology, positive organizational scholarship (POS), appreciative inquiry (AI), and high-quality connections (HQCs). This chapter discusses the results presented in Chapter 4 through the lens of this conceptual frame, exploring the extent to which the three central research questions were answered by the qualitative case study analyses of instructional practices employed by three award-winning business professors. The primary goal of the research was to identify those characteristics of successful professors that have positive effects on student self-efficacy, and to determine whether HQCs form the link between professor behavior and student self-efficacy. Specifically, the research examined how the professors' non-content and content pedagogy and selected curriculum are presented through micro-interactions and HQCs.

Research Question #1: Is there evidence of the cultivation of HQCs in the classrooms of award-winning professors?

HQCs strengthen people and make them more resourceful, while at the same time affirming in them a sense of value and worth – both in themselves and in what they're doing. Dutton (2014) suggests that professors build HQCs by believing it's possible to do so; taking small actions to encourage all participants in the interaction to be psychologically present therein; and cultivating cultures, reward systems, and reporting structures that encourage respectful engagement, trust, and mutual help. The analyses presented here offer three sources of

evidence of the outcome that HQCs are being cultivated in award-winning professors'

classrooms: 1) both professors and students report feeling good during classroom sessions; 2)

both professors and students express high levels of mutual regard; and 3) both professors and

students communicate the belief that they are learning in the classrooms.

Professors and Students Report Feeling Good in the Classroom

High-quality connections theory describes HQCs as positive, mutually developmental

experiences that in turn are associated with capacities that affect individual and dyadic

performance (Stephens et al., 2011). HQCs in the classroom may be developed and supported by

the professor's sense of academic optimism, which builds a trusting connection in which both

professor and students have feelings of benevolence, reliability, competence, honesty, and

openness (Beard et al., 2010). In all of the case studies, such positive feelings in the classroom

were both reported and exhibited. All three professors cite building a positive atmosphere in the

classroom as an important instructional goal, and strive to create positivity in various ways.

Dutton (2014) offers examples of small actions professors might take to foster HQCs as

more one-on-one time with students or interacting with students on a personal level for 10

minutes before class. Among these case studies, Professor Tom encourages positivity by arriving

early to class, mingling and talking with students prior to the lecture. His students reflect this

engagement by greeting each other and talking amongst themselves prior to class. During class,

Professor Tom fosters a positive environment using body language, active listening,

inclusiveness, and by allowing his emotion and passion for the topic to be readily observable.

Students indicate positivity by nodding and being willing to speak out during the class session. In

their interviews, students agree that Professor Tom's classroom engenders positive feelings,

citing his fairness in student interactions and passionate enthusiasm for the subject matter as reasons.

Similar positivity is observed in Professor Mike's classroom, first evidenced by the students smiling and becoming attentive immediately after his greeting. Mike encourages and permits student responses to a degree that makes the classroom almost rowdy, and the joy he experiences when students become highly engaged can be clearly observed. Professor Mike's high energy, animation, body language and gestures also contribute to the positive atmosphere, a point which students support in their interviews. They cite his positive energy and approachability, stating that the classroom atmosphere Professor Mike creates sparks their enthusiasm to participate and helps them learn.

Professor Bruce also exhibits high energy, moving briskly, smiling and maintaining a happy affect during his class sessions. There is a discernible feeling of excitement in his classroom. Professor Bruce builds a positive class environment using body language and rewards for student engagement. Student perceptions uphold this observation; students specifically refer to Bruce's "positive energy," saying he seems "happy," and that his affect engages and energizes students, leaving them more alert and awake at the end of the (early morning) class.

Dutton and Heaphy (2002) suggest that HQCs are experienced subjectively as feelings of vitality and aliveness, positive regard, and mutuality; HQCs literally and figuratively enliven people. The positivity of HQCs is based in part on how they feel for both parties involved, and the foundations of these connections encompass both individual and collective flourishing and thriving (Stephens et al., 2011). Thus the positive atmospheres, vital and energetic environments created in these case study classrooms provide evidence that HQCs are being constructed and fostered in those settings.

Professors and Students Express High Levels of Mutual Regard

HQCs help students develop toward their individual potentialities through mutually empathic interactions where both parties engage with authentic thoughts, feelings, and responses (Dutton & Heaphy, 2002). HQCs also are characterized by their emotional carrying capacity; ability to withstand strain and function in a variety of circumstances; and a high degree of being generative and open to new ideas and influences (Dutton & Heaphy, 2002; Stephens et al., 2011). Respectful engagement is an important characteristic of HQCs because it provides affirmation and fosters motivation to help others (Stephens et al., 2011). The case studies for this research indicate that a professor's caring for student well-being and learning achievement begins with establishing mutual respect and regard. These three award-winning professors strive to build mutual respect with students and show regard in multiple ways.

Professor Tom stands out among the three professors as the most concerned about and committed to exhibiting care for his students. As expressed by Professor Tom, regard is closely linked to – and illustrated by – having a positive attitude. Professor Tom's practice of arriving early, mingling and conversing with students prior to class both builds positivity and serves an additional purpose of showing regard. Knowing students by name is a further indication of respect and regard. Professor Tom also exhibits regard by proximally approaching students while they are speaking during class. "There's a dignity of walking up and physically having a conversation," as Tom explains in his interview. The students too feel a sense of Professor Tom's regard and respect, elaborating that he is professional, caring, respectful, and enthusiastic in his interactions with them.

Professor Mike uses validating techniques and affirmations to show regard and build bonds during class. He also strives to know students' names beginning with name cards placed

on their desks. Professor Mike's students value his positive feedback when they speak out in class and believe he respects their opinions: "Respecting our opinions is part of being cared for," says one student.

Professor Bruce's caring and regard for students is expressed best in his efforts to minimize their fears about contributing in class and help them build confidence. He does not pressure students but gently encourages them to move outside their comfort zones. These efforts are reinforced by his class point and candy reward systems. Students appreciate the reward systems as part of Bruce's caring for them, stating that he rewards them for trying their best, regardless of whether they have the right answer.

HQCs are small, short-term interactions that do not require a prior history or bond between parties; they are micro-bits of interrelations that can contribute to a relationship over time, but are important in and of themselves (Stephens et al., 2011). Teaching bears an inherent power imbalance which could easily degenerate into domination; however, education is only meaningful and successful when students and teachers are in a mutual relation within which each retains autonomy. Thus a professor may employ a specific form of authority that leads to the affirmation of students as self-realized (Bingham & Sidorkin, 2001). The data presented here suggest that professors who show caring and regard for students during the brief interactions that take place during a class period are likely to receive longer-term regard from students in return. This mutuality of caring is indicative of the cultivation of HQCs in the classroom.

Participants Believe they are Learning in the Classroom

Successful learning environments have been described by prior research as having elements of fun, excitement, comfort and safety, active engagement, and thought stimulation (Fernández-Balboa & Stiehl, 1995). HQCs create micro-contexts for knowing because

knowledge is absorbed faster and more completely when delivered in the framework of an HQC (Dutton & Heaphy, 2002). All case study professors in this research believe that creating a practicable learning environment is crucial to their pedagogical success.

In all three classrooms in this study, feelings of fun and excitement were observed during the class interaction. The professors variously use story-telling, jokes, sarcasm, body language, and extrinsic rewards to enhance these sensations. Active engagement and interaction between students is strongly encouraged in all three classrooms. Professor approachability and helping students feel comfortable talking one-on-one with the professor is another goal underscored by participants and exhibited in the classes. These professors stimulate student engagement and thought in creative ways, such as posing hypothetical situations and relating real-world examples.

Students in all three cases report successful learning in the classrooms. Professor Tom's students explain that his pedagogical tools enhance their understanding of the material. In the case of Professor Mike, some students reflect on finally learning the concept of a SWOT analysis through the pop culture example of "Buffy, the Vampire Slayer." Students in Professor Bruce's class perceive practical applicability of his teaching to their own lives, which improves their learning experience.

HQCs contribute to learning by imparting resources that individuals find valuable and useful; and by co-creating the meaning students make of themselves (building identity) and of the group (deriving positive meaning for what they're doing) (Dutton & Heaphy, 2002). The fact that, in all three case studies, both professors and students express a sense that they are learning from one another offers further evidence that HQCs are being created in these classrooms.

Research Question #2: What are the task-enabling practices the faculty used to develop and cultivate self-efficacy in the classroom?

It has been established that HQCs foster task-enabling, defined as the interpersonal actions that help someone complete or perform a task (Stephens et al., 2011). Task-enabling can be achieved in part by assisting students to appreciate the value of learning the content, particularly by demonstrating its potential applications to their lives outside of the classroom. Professors can stimulate and support students to perceive content as valuable by modeling and communicating attitudes, beliefs, values, expectations, and dispositions to action (Brophy, 1999). Task-enabling also is enhanced when instructional methods reflect the principle of involvement, that is, students spend most of their time engaged in active learning and application activities rather than passively watching and listening. Therefore effective scaffolding for task-enabling develops learners' capacities for deriving value and satisfaction from the learning.

Brophy (1999) posits four ways to build this type of scaffolding: (a) framing curricula around important ideas; (b) employing authentic activities; (c) crafting relevant learning experiences; and (d) tying learning to students' identities. Faircloth and Miller (2011) build on this framework by suggesting that professors set high-challenge tasks and encourage collaboration between students. By polling student opinions, they found that authenticity would be strengthened by (a) allowing as much choice as possible; (b) selecting literature reflecting students' diversity and lives; (c) relating schoolwork to topics that students found relevant; and (d) allowing as much self-expression as possible. Task enabling leads to self-efficacy when presented in a supportive social context, where students embrace learning goals rather than performance goals (Brophy, 1999).

Several themes were identified in this research data set to indicate that the case study professors conduct task-enabling practices collectively through non-content interactions, content pedagogy, and curriculum development/selection, thus promoting the development of self-efficacy among students. The themes uncovered during the qualitative analysis of the data are discussed below.

Non-content Interactions

The emergent themes that illustrate non-content interactions in these three professors' classrooms include classroom props; getting to know students personally; creating a safe and comfortable classroom space; being authentic or "real"; and introducing humor, in particular self-deprecating humor.

Classroom props. In each case the professor employs one or more "prop" to spark student interest, relate the content to student values and understanding, and engage them in discussion. Professor Tom wears the Enron shirt to provoke students to recognize and consider its paradoxical contrast with the content. Professor Mike introduces the trick "pig question" onto the five-question quiz as a prop. Professor Bruce uses the whiteboard and marker, plus extrinsic rewards of candy to engage students in interaction.

Knowing student names. Brophy (1999) has clarified that motivationally optimal learning situations are those where the content and activities are matched to the learners' characteristics, readiness to learn, personal identities and agendas. Clearly this type of motivational matching requires the professor to make concerted efforts to get to know his students beyond the superficial level. Similar to the findings of Fernández-Balboa and Stiehl (1995), it became apparent that the case study professors in this research place high importance on the value of knowing their students, both as people and as learners.

During the 10 minutes prior to each class session, Professor Tom makes a point of calling his students by name, personally connecting with them and asking questions about their lives. He expresses in his interview the importance of students being "not just another face in a crowded classroom" – he believes students need to be recognized as individuals and not treated indifferently. As discussed above, knowing students' names is part of expressing regard and respect. Professor Tom understands the generational gap between himself and his Millennial students and works to bridge that gap by getting to know their learning styles and preferences and showing empathy during class. In the classroom context, Professor Tom attempts to draw students out, observably trying to discover their predispositions and readiness to learn a given concept: "What I am trying to do is get a sense of where you are," he tells them. He then adapts or reviews the topic to match their understanding and motivation levels. The students recognize and applaud these efforts: "He always makes sure that the whole class understands everything," students comment.

Professor Mike employs name cards in his classroom to get to know students' names. Professor Mike links knowing students by name with caring, respectful engagement, and professionalism. He also recognizes a connection between knowing students and their motivation, suggesting that if he did not call them by name students would likely become bored. Professor Mike's emphasis on calling students by name seems appreciated even more by his students. Many of Mike's students say the fact that he knows their names makes his classes more enjoyable and contributes to their learning success.

Professor Bruce's class is small relative to the others, and during the session he frequently calls students by name – either individually or in small groups – to approach the whiteboard to answer a question. Professor Bruce places particular emphasis on determining a

student's willingness to be called upon to go to the whiteboard. He reads body language and recalls whether a given student has been willing to approach the whiteboard in the past. This professor clearly makes judgments about student motivation during class and adapts his methods based on what he knows about individuals. This approach is closely tied to creating a safe environment for students – a "sanctuary" as Professor Bruce calls it.

Creating a safe, comfortable space. HQCs succeed when – or perhaps because – both parties feel safe and comfortable in the connection. Professors can help create safe environments for student interaction by processing small pieces of information to read and maintaining sensitivity to the openness and willingness of individual students to engage in a connection (Stephens et al., 2011). The case study professors offer several examples of ways they help students feel safe and at ease in the classroom environment.

Professor Tom strives to make students feel comfortable approaching him, both in class and in his office outside of class. One method he uses is to walk up and down the aisles, coming close to students while they are speaking. Open body language, nodding as students speak, paraphrasing their answers back to them, and rewarding answers with "Yes, that is it!" illustrate Professor Tom's approachability. Rhetorical choices such as "I do not have all the answers," and "My thinking continues to evolve on that," also serve to increase students' comfort and safety in expressing their opinions.

Professor Mike creates a class environment where students feel safe and comfortable to shout out questions, answers, and comments at any juncture. He fosters high levels of engagement by reaffirming students' answers back to them. He encourages students to see him outside of class if there is anything he can do to help them master the material. Students say Mike is "never uptight," "we can approach him," and "just like a normal person."

Of the three case study professors, Bruce is probably the most sensitive to his students' safety and comfort in the class environs. In fact, Professor Bruce refers to his classroom as "a kind of sanctuary." He carefully assesses students' shyness, attending to their body language – "eye contact and posture" – to ascertain whether they are willing volunteers. He reinforces every small success. Professor Bruce uses students as models to indicate to other students that going to the whiteboard is not to be feared, that his class is a safe space in which to speak up. Watching peers model success at solving a problem has been shown to increase self-efficacy beliefs among fellow students (Usher & Pajares, 2008).

Authenticity. Purposeful, goal-driven instruction features activities and delivery that students appreciate as authentic (Brophy, 1999). The professors studied here place emphasis on honesty, genuineness, authenticity or "being real" as techniques for establishing their trustworthiness and credibility with students. Professor Tom uses a good deal of value-laden language in his personal interview, seeming almost to pass moral judgment on himself as a professor; he holds himself to a high standard of authenticity. Being honest with students when they don't know an answer is stated as important by both Professors Tom and Mike. All three professors see value in showing students the professor's authentic personality, the "real me" as Professor Mike expresses it. Tying instruction to real-world examples also builds perceptions of authenticity. For example, Professor Bruce's students point out that he is relevant, which increases their trust and engagement.

Humor. Introducing humor into the classroom context is a non-content pedagogical method employed by all three case study professors. Most particularly, professor self-deprecating humor appears to be a preferred component of their teaching styles. Joking expresses positivity; self-deprecating humor helps place the professor on equal footing with students (Kuh

et al., 2005). Professor Mike claims humor is one way of establishing his authenticity with students, of showing them "the real me." Professor Mike takes self-deprecating a step further by occasionally poking fun at the students themselves, making sarcastic statements like "You guys are real sharp." Professor Tom's Enron shirt is a way of making fun of himself by introducing a humorous bit of irony into a business ethics class. Humor also is a way of claiming or reviving students' attention, as best exemplified by Professor Bruce's classroom. Although some of Bruce's students feel his humor was off-target, Bruce perceives when a joke has caused offense and makes a special effort to apologize. These examples are consistent with Fernández-Balboa and Stiehl's (1995) findings, where professors advocated telling jokes as a way to give students a mental break and help restore motivation.

Professor Mike's pig joke offers a good example of how his non-content pedagogy connects with the material. In all cases, these professors employ non-content pedagogy tools to help their students draw connections with the content they are learning in relatable ways.

Content Interactions

Expert teachers are those who possess Pedagogical Content Knowledge (PCK), a complex skill which involves the ability to recognize and adapt to environmental, personal, and instructional patterns quickly and accurately (Fernández-Balboa & Stiehl, 1995). PCK encompasses comprehensive knowledge about the subject matter, the students, instructional strategies, the learning context, and one's teaching purposes. However, taken separately these components have little value; superior teachers are able to integrate and apply them all at the right time, for the right students, under the right circumstances.

In this study, content-specific interactions employed by the professors are evidenced in the use of varying modes of delivery and by encouraging students' self-directed thought.

Varying delivery modes. Choosing appropriate and diverse instructional strategies is one element of successful PCK (Alonzo et al., 2012; Fernández-Balboa & Stiehl, 1995). The case study professors are alike in employing a variety of delivery methods, including lecture; metaphors and analogies; asking questions; modeling problem-solving and asking students to model problem-solving; multimedia; and bringing in guest speakers. Some excellent examples of variant delivery methods include Professor Tom's carefully-selected video clips; Professor Mike's use of overhead slides and a popular television show ("Buffy, the Vampire Slayer") to illustrate a concept; and Professor Bruce's "one-pagers" and reference to news about the Tesla company. Varying modes of delivery exhibits professor flexibility to implement alternative strategies to enhance student motivation and understanding; and helps create a sense of connectedness between the students, the subject, and the "real world."

Encouraging self-direction. Allowing students to have input into and "control" of some class events is a further PCK instructional strategy. The notion of transforming pedagogy to relinquish teacher control and free students to direct their own content, explore, critique, and remake their own worlds in ways that have value and meaning to them was introduced by John Dewey a century ago (Dewey, 1916/1964). But generating such freedom by opening the class to examples from the outside world risks possibilities for exclusion and disrespect based on students' diverse backgrounds (Ball, 1995). Ball advocates rather for teaching a sense of community – collective engagement, interdependence, and respect among a diverse classroom – because "knowledge is the product of communities, and communication about knowledge draws on the representations and modes of discourse of different communities" (Ball, 1995, p. 676).

A sense of community and student self-directed thought is evident in all three of these award-winning professors' classrooms, but probably most remarkably in Professor Bruce's.

Professor Bruce calls upon students individually and in small groups to come to the whiteboard and effectively teach a "micro-segment" of the class. Student teaching not only helps engage students with the content, but aids the learning process because in preparing to teach a concept, the person doing the teaching learns it better (Fernández-Balboa & Stiehl, 1995).

As posited by appreciative inquiry theory, organizations excel only by amplifying strengths, never by simply fixing weaknesses (Cooperrider & McQuaid, 2012). Convening capacities and leadership tools to align strengths, interests, and priorities in all levels of a system – in this case, the classroom teaching environment – is a key strategy for innovation. This strategy can be complemented and enhanced with the appropriate selection and application of curriculum tools.

Curriculum Interactions

Brophy (1999) states that the best curricula are developed in a goal-oriented fashion where everything is included because it is worth learning and for reasons learners can understand. Curriculum thus consists of coherent networks of connected content structured around powerful ideas. Learning occurs through engaging in authentic activities that require application of what's learned to life tasks, justifying why this learning is included in the curriculum in the first place (Brophy, 1999). Thus theories of curriculum development indicate that curricula should be evaluated not only by how well they impart the desired knowledge base, but also by the degree to which they instill in both teacher and student the reasons why they want to learn the material (Reynolds & Webber, 2004). The latter can be achieved by including examples taken from the real world to illustrate the practical applicability of the content to real-life situations the students are likely to encounter. Not only is practical application important, but

curriculum should add to learners' repertoires of insights and appreciations, and/or enhance their inner lives (Brophy, 1999).

The case studies for this research all adopt curriculum themes designed to connect learning with the real world. Professor Tom selects video clips that present real-life business situations as well as service learning examples. Professor Mike has an extensive personal background as an entrepreneur and incorporates examples from his own experience into his curriculum; he also brings examples from popular culture to boost student relatability. Professor Bruce uses current news reports – for example, about Tesla Motors – and real corporate financial statements to illustrate his material. All three professors invite guest speakers from the business world to speak to their classes; Professor Mike stands out among the three for inviting his former students back to discuss their experiences in the corporate world.

Two of these award-winning professors enhance their practical illustrations with academic service learning (ASL) components and all of them encourage student interaction with the professor outside of class time. Professor Tom's students are required to conduct volunteer work such as in a community shelter or Habitat for Humanity. Professor Mike works with students and former students to conduct humanitarian work outside of the university, for example, helping a village in Panama.

Following the valuing paradigm set forth by Brophy (1999), professors have the chance to enable students to perceive the value of the content they are meant to learn; enrich their motivation; and empower their self-sustaining determination toward completing the tasks at hand (Faircloth & Miller, 2011). The qualitative analyses presented here offer evidence that the award-winning professors apply several task-enabling practices that have high potential to build and support student self-efficacy.

Research Question # 3: Are HQCs the link between professor behavior and student self-efficacy?

Applying grounded theory to qualitative inquiry involves developing analytic codes and theories from the data, rather than testing preconceived hypotheses (Smith, 2015). Dutton and Heaphy (2002) posit four lenses through which to view one's research data to unpack whether and how HQCs build self-efficacy among individuals in a work context: exchange, identity, growth, and knowledge. The current study explored observational, interview, and secondary data through these lenses to analyze the ways in which HQCs form links between professors' behavioral choices and the development of student self-efficacy in the classroom setting.

Exchange

"The exchange lens argues that HQCs matter by endowing individuals with resources that are useful and valuable" (Dutton & Heaphy, 2002, p. 268). There is ample evidence that the three case study professors provide their students with resources to which they can relate and which have practical applicability to their real-life situations. The professors use HQCs to enter and exit many various points in the material during the classroom lectures and discussion. In their interviews professors state that they are "following their instincts" and classroom experience to guide their efforts to communicate learning and knowledge to the students. The students reinforce the notion that they are gaining valuable knowledge and skills that have practical applicability. For example, "I think there is a learning reason for doing it [classroom video and discussions]. I think the video truly gets me more involved because I can relate to the videos, the imagery that's in there. I think it is connected, making connections in the brain," Professor Tom's students elaborate. "I've 'learned' SWOT!" says one of Professor Mike's students. "I've gone over this four or five times in my school career and never understood it. The way he related it

and applied it to business, wow, I got it!" And, "When I know that I can apply what I am learning, it is like a, 'Wow this is cool,' I am excited," a student in Professor Bruce's class comments, and another adds, "I find ways to apply what I learned in class; I feel more engaged." These interactions confirm a connection between what the professors say they're doing and how the students perceive that interaction, and underscore the relationships between HQCs and student gains in practicable knowledge and skill. HQCs are vehicles for exchange of resources and reward (Dutton & Heaphy, 2002).

Identity

According to the identity perspective, other people (in this case, professors) become active players in the co-creation of who we (in this case, the students) are (identities) (Dutton & Heaphy, 2002). Therefore, in this research the data were examined for evidence that HQCs create opportunities and afford the psychological safety for students to explore alternative identities, make claims, and craft identities that they feel are worthwhile and that fit what they want to become. Building safe environments within which students feel comfortable to air their own ideas and explore various identities was expressed as important by all three case study professors. HQC interactions form points on a continuum in these professors' classrooms; both professor and student are other-aware and perspective-taking as they get to know one another through the HQC (Dutton & Heaphy, 2002). "I am trying to get them to realize that my classroom is a safe place for interaction," says Professor Bruce, who has a stated goal to "eliminate …negativism in the classroom…to foster interaction and confidence." "I am trying to respect and be more intimate with them," Professor Tom explains, so "they can see that it is safe for them to express their ideas." HQCs help students convert ambivalence into meaning that

helps them make positive sense of who they are and what they are doing in the classroom (Dutton & Heaphy, 2002).

Growth and Development

Through the growth and development lens, human growth is either fostered or stunted according to the quality of their connections with others. HQCs therefore help people activate positive developmental trajectories (Dutton & Heaphy, 2002). The data analyzed here indicate that the professors rely upon HQCs to infuse mutual respect, caring, and energy into relationships with students. All of the professors spent a good deal of time explicitly employing interactions that were focused on cultivating non-content relationships between themselves and the students. These HQCs become a communications tool that helps form the building blocks leading and moving students toward self-efficacy.

The professors studied here primarily use and initiate cluster one factors, e.g. the cognitive, emotional and behavioral dimensions of HQC theory, to build relationships and a sense of community in the classroom. "When one or more caregiving behaviors are part of a connection, they can become the basis for personal growth and development" (Dutton & Heaphy, 2002, p. 273). Building respect, caring, and energy into the relationship, HQCs become micro-contexts that cumulatively build relationships of trust, task-enabling and self-efficacy. The professor exhibits a behavior and the students register the act cognitively by his thoughtful approach. These micro-behaviors may be as simple as learning students' names and respecting their "personhood." As Professor Tom said, "I know them, I know who they are, and they are not just a number." The students respond by stating that by knowing their names, the professor "genuinely cares about me." The professor respectfully engages with the student to show that he cares and is building trust. Professor Tom concludes that he "… builds relationships with the

students so they can trust me." Students respond, "I think he is one person that is well-respected and trustworthy because he cares about me." Students in Professor Mike's class view his efforts to know them as caring and enjoyment, leading them to feel successful in his classroom. "He cares about us and wants to know our names. He wants to help us succeed in the class and then it makes it easier to enjoy the class," they remark. This evidence suggests that HQCs form a link between professor caregiving behaviors and student growth and development trajectories.

Learning

According to the learning lens HQCs allow knowledge to be absorbed faster, more completely, and with an enhanced quality of connection between the two parties (Dutton & Heaphy, 2002). In this study, connections between faculty and student are essential for helping build the capacity and the resilience to learn. In the HQC context the professor begins with non-content pedagogy and builds linear connections to content pedagogy. The development of connections between the professor and the students makes space to create a relationship between the student and the content. The integration of the professors' pedagogical content knowledge with props, media, humorous rhetoric, vocal inflection, and other non-content pedagogical tools aids students to learn the material successfully. HQCs are micro-contexts in which people acquire, develop, and experiment with new knowledge (Dutton & Heaphy, 2002). This research suggests that HQCs facilitate learning, and form links between the class experience and student task-enabling and self-efficacy, in the classrooms of award-winning professors.

Limits of HQCs in the Classroom

This research has sought to explore HQC theory as related to faculty-student interactions; however, business and classroom are two very different settings. Unlike the business environment for which HQC theory was developed, the college business classroom is

structurally limited by resources, time, and professor availability; whereas in the work environment leaders and followers likely have many hours and days to work together and build relationships. The need to gain and maintain student engagement within a limited time frame may explain why professors use cluster one HQC interactions most frequently with the aim to show caring and build trust.

A further potential limitation of this research is that it does not address differences in subject matter across classrooms. Subject matter may affect student trust, and this research has suggested that trust is a key component of self-efficacy – a tenet upheld by academic optimism theory. Degree of trust in the classroom may be a factor of the subject matter being studied. For instance, accounting actually may require less trust-building than does a course such as CSR – ethics and morality.

It is also worth noting that the structure and length of a single class session provides few opportunities to explore the cluster 2 impacts of HQCs. Deepening relationships between student and faculty, and between student and content, beyond the micro-context of the HQC will require longer-term interactions. Such long-term relationships, for example, may be built during ASL opportunities and travel abroad.

Implications and Conclusions

This research undertook to identify the practices of successful professors that have positive effects on student task-enabling; and to explore links between HQCs, professor behavior, and student self-efficacy. The results imply that there is a connection between self-efficacy and a professor's liberal application of HQCs in the classroom setting. Students of professors who use HQCs self-report experiencing a greater sense of self-confidence, relatability of the content, enjoyment, and a strengthened sense that the knowledge they gain is practically

applicable to their future lives. These findings point to a need to help professors learn how to develop personal HQCs within the classroom environment. Further, teaching evaluations administered to students in college business classes should include questions aimed at assessing the quality of personal relationships professors succeed to develop with students. For creating such measures, the work of Beard et al. (2010) – who developed constructs to assess academic optimism – may be a useful starting point.

Most current college curriculum is focused on content and measurable outcomes, that is, the professor's primary goal is to improve student test scores. This research offers reason to suspect that harder-to-measure soft skills, such as relationship- and trust-building, are equally important. Creating spaces to promote relationships and connections both within and outside the curriculum would be valuable.

The HQC framework helps to describe actions of faculty in the classroom that may increase student success. Many of these actions may be the product of professor personality traits such as being funny, charming, or charismatic – traits which are not teachable. However, we can teach professors to employ actions that help students feel respected and cared for in their connections. Simply learning students' names, talking to them ahead of class, or being approachable and available outside of class are teachable characteristics which may improve learning outcomes.

An ancillary goal of this research was to find a link between the academic rigor of a college professor – expressed through actions, words and behaviors – and student workforce readiness. While these findings may bring the field a small step closer to linking professor behavior with workforce readiness, much more work needs to be done. The effects of classroom

HQCs may ultimately produce greater academic rigor, and students may learn more or more

efficiently, but definitively drawing these conclusions will require further research.

Two more substantial questions arise from this study: should the hiring managers for

colleges of business make concerted efforts to hire professors with a track record of developing

HQCs? And perhaps more importantly, can professors be taught how to develop HQCs? These

questions are perhaps the most salient conclusions of the study, and indicate an important

direction for future research.

REFERENCES

AACSB International Accredited Institutions 2013. (n.d.) Retrieved from:

    http://www.aacsb.edu/accreditation/docs/accredited-schools-032013.pdf

Alonzo, A. C., Mareike, K., & Seidel., T. (2012). Pedagogical content knowledge as reflected in

    teacher-student interactions: analysis of two video cases. *Journal of Research in Science*

    Teaching, 49(10) 1211-1239.

Anderson, S. E., & Jamison, B. (2015). Do top U.S. corporations often use the same words in

    their vision, mission and value statements. *Journal of Marketing and* Management, *6,* 1-

    15.

Arnheim, R. (1998). Words are needed. *The Journal of Aesthetic Education*, *32*, 21-25.

Aukerman, M., & Pandya, J. Z. (2013, September). Rethinking common answers to critical

    questions about classroom discourse. *Language Arts*, *91*, 41-47.

Ball, D. L. (1995). Transforming pedagogy: Classrooms as mathematical communities. A

    response to Timothy Lensmire and John Pryor. Harvard Educational Review, 65, 670-

    677. Ball, D. L., & Bass

Ball, D.L., Thames. M. H. & Phelps, G (2008). Content knowledge for teaching – what makes it

    special. *Journal of Teacher Education, 59(5),389-407*

Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological*

    Review, *84*, 191-225.

Bandura, A. (1994). Self-efficacy. In V. S. Ramachaudran (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of human behavior* (Vol. 4, pp. 71–81). New York: Academic Press.

Baxter, P., & Jack, S. (2008). Qualitative case study methodology: Study design and implementation for novice researchers. *The Qualitative Report, 13*, 544-559.

Beard, K. S., Hoy, W. K., & Woolfolk-Hoy, A. (2010). Academic optimism of individual teachers: Confirming a new construct. *Teacher in Teacher Education, 26*, 1136-1144.

Belkin, D. (2014, February 20). College uses test data to show value. *The Wall Street Journal*. Retrieved from http://www.wsj.com/articles/SB10001424052702304899704579391513428597546

Belkin, D. (2015, September 29). Recent grads doubt college's worth. *The Wall Street Journal*. Retrieved from http://www.wsj.com/articles/recent-grads-doubt-colleges-worth-1443499440?mg=id-wsj

Berscheid, E., & Lopes, J. (1997). A temporal model of relationship satisfaction and stability. In R. J. Sternberg & M. Hojjat (Eds.) *Satisfaction in close relationships*. New York: Guilford.

Bingham, C., & Sidorkin. A. (2001) Aesthetics and the paradox of educational relations. *Journal of Philosophy of Education, 35(1), 21-30.*

Bittar, C. (2012). The economics of higher education: Why college is a worthwhile investment. *The Huffington Post.* Retrieved from http://www.huffingtonpost.com/catherine-bittar/college-investment_b_1989876.html

Blackburn, B. R. (2008). *Rigor is NOT a four-letter word* (1st Ed.). Larchmont, New York: Routledge.

Bowers, H. A., & Power, J. D. (2010). What is rigor? A qualitative analysis of one school's definition. *Academic Leadership.* Retrieved from: http://www.academicleadership.org/empirical_research/What_is_Rigor_A_Qualitative_A nalysis_of_One_School_s_definitions.shtml.

Brophy, J. (1999). Toward a model of value aspects of motivation in education: developing appreciation for particular learning domains and activities. *Educational Psychologist*, *34*, 75-86.

Brown, H. (2013, January 14). The rise of the accreditor as a big man on campus. *The Wall Street Journal*. Retrieved from http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424127887323442804578232232920012910.html? KEYWORDS=The+Rise+of+the+Accreditor+as+Big+Man+on+Campus&_nocache=135

Burke, K. (1945). *A grammar of motives*. New York: Prentice-Hall.

Cameron, K. S., Dutton, J., & Quinn, R. (2003). *Positive organizational scholarship*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.

Cameron, K. S., & Spreitzer, G. M. (2011). High-quality connections. In J. P. Stephens, E. D. Heaphy, & J. E. Dutton, *The Oxford handbook of positive organizational scholarship*. New York: Oxford.

Cardon, M. S., Gregoire, D. A., Stevens, C. E., & Patel, P. C. (2013). Measuring entrepreneurial

passion: Conceptual foundations and scale validation. *Journal of Business Venturing*,

28(3), 373–396.

Cardon, M. S., & Kirk, C. P. (2015). Entrepreneurial passion as mediator of the self-efficacy to

persistence relationship. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice, 39*(5), 1027–1050.

Charmaz, K. (2012). *Constructing grounded theory*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Coffin, C., & Donohue, J. (2014, June). A language as social semiotic-based approach to

teaching and learning in Higher Education. *Language Learning*, *64*(1), 1-212.

Colvin, R. L., & Jacobs, J. (2010). Rigor: It's all the rage, but what does it mean? *The Hechinger

Report*. Retrieved from http://hechingerreport.org/content/rigor-its-all-the-rage-but-what-

does-it-mean_2222/

Cooperrider, D. L., Whitney, D., & Stavros, J. M. (2008). *Appreciative inquiry handbook: For

leaders of change* (2nd Ed.). Brunswick, OH: Crown.

Cooperrider, D. L., & McQuaid, M. (2012). The positive arc of systemic strengths: How

appreciative inquiry and sustainable designing can bring out the best in human systems.

The Journal of Corporate Citizenship, *46*, 71-102.

Cooperrider, D. L., Sorensen, Jr., P. F., Whitney, D., & Yeager, T. F. (2000). *Appreciative inquiry:

Rethinking human organization towards a positive theory of change. Champaign, IL:

Stipes Publishing LLC.

Crabtree, B., & Miller, W. (2002). *Doing qualitative research* (2nd Ed.). London: Sage.

Creswell, J. W. (2012). *Educational research: planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research* (4th Ed.). Boston, MA. Pearson Education, Inc.

Dekker, P., & Uslaner, E. M. (2001). *Social capital and participation in everyday life*. London: Routledge.

Dewey, J. (1964). John Dewey on education (R. Archambault, Ed.). Chicago: University of Chicago Press. (Original work published 1916).

Drucker, P. F. (1974). *Management: Tasks, responsibilities and practices*. New York, NY: Harper & Row.

Dutton, J.E., (2003). Task enabling at a glance. Center for Positive Organizations, http://positiveorgs.bus.umich.edu/wp-content/uploads/Glance-Task-Enable.pdf

Dutton, J. E. (2014). Creating high quality connections as a pathway for cultivating purpose. *People & Strategy*, *37*(2), 9.

Dutton, J. E., & Glynn, M. (2007). Positive organizational scholarship. In C. Cooper & J. Barling (Eds.)*, Handbook of organizational behavior*. London: Sage.

Dutton, J. E., & Heaphy, E. D. (2002). The power of high-quality connections. In J. E. Dutton & E. D. Heaphy (Eds.), *High quality connections*. New York: Oxford Press.

Dutton, J. E. & Heaphy, E.D. (2003). The power of high-quality connections. In Cameron, K., J.E. Dutton and R.E. Quinn (Eds.), *Positive organizational scholarship*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler, 263-278.

Espeland, K. (2001, November). Empowering versus enabling in academia. *Nursing Education*, *40*, 342-346.

Faircloth, B. S., & Miller, S. D. (2011). Enabling enriched, empowered education: insights from Jere Brophy's legacy. *Theory into Practice*, *50*, 262-268.

Fernandez-Balboa, J & Stiehl, J. (1995) The generic nature of pedagogical content knowledge among college professors, *Teaching and Teacher Education, 2(3),293-306.*

Flanagan, J. C. (1954). The critical incident technique. *Psychological Bulletin*, *51* (4), 327-358

Fredrickson, B. L., & Dutton, J. E. (2008). Unpacking positive organizing: Organizations as sites of individual and group flourishing. *The Journal of Positive Psychology*, *3* (1), 1-3.

Gable, S., & La Guardia, J. G. (2007). Positive processes in close relationships across time, partners and context: A multi-level approach. In A. D. Ong & M. H. M. van Dulman (Eds.), *Oxford handbook of methods in positive psychology*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Gall, M. D., Borg, W. R., & Gall, J. P. (1996). *Educational research: An introduction* (6th Ed.). White Plains: Longman.

Gilley, A., McMillan, H. S., & Gilley, J. W. (2009). Organizational change and characteristics of leadership effectiveness. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, *16*(1), 38–47.

Glazer, B., & Strauss, A. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory*. Chicago, IL: Aldine.

Hamilton, W. (2011). College is still worthwhile, study finds. *The Los Angeles Times*. Retrieved from: http://articles.latimes.com/2011/dec/29/business/la-fi-college-worthwhile-20111229

Harkins, P. (1999). *How High Impact Leaders Communicate*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Harrison, L. M., & Hasan, S. (2013). New directions for student services. *Wiley Periodicals, Inc.*, *143* (65), 1-175. http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/ss.20061

Harrison, T. M. (1987). Framework for the study of writing in organizational contexts. *Written Communication*, *4* (3), 1-23.

Hartge, T. D., Callahan, T., & King, C. (2015). Leaders' behaviors during radical change processes: Subordinates' perceptions of how well leader behaviors communicate change. *International Journal of Business Communication*, Epub ahead of print.

Hechinger Institute. (2010). *Understanding and reporting on academic rigor*. *Pittsburgh University*. Retrieved from http://www.lrdc.pitt.edu/pubs/Abstracts/FiezRigorous.pdf

Hickman, L. A., & Neubert, S. (Eds.). (2009). Constructivism: diversity of approaches connections with pragmatism. *John Dewey between pragmatism and constructivism* (pp. 39-63). Bronx, NY: Fordham University Press.

Hoy, W. K., Tarter, C. J., & Woolfolk-Hoy, A. (2006, Fall). Academic optimism of schools: a force for student achievement. *American Educational Research Journal*, *43*, 425-446.

Irwin, T. (Ed.). (1999). *Aristotle: Nicomachean Ethics*. Indianapolis: Hackett.

Jackson, R. (2012). Supporting struggling students with academic rigor. *Education Update, ASCD*, *54* (8), 3-5. Retrieved from

http://www.ascd.org/publications/newsletters/education-

update/aug12/vol54/num08/Support-Struggling-Students-with-Academic-Rigor.aspx

Johnson, G. (2015). Theories of emotions. *Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Retrieved from

http://www.iep.utm.edu/emotion/#SH4a

Kaplin, D., & Trosten-Bloom, A. (2010). *The power of appreciative inquiry* (2nd Ed.). San

Francisco, CA. Berrett-Koehler Publishers, Inc.

Keeling, R., & Hersch, R. (2012). *We're losing our minds: Rethinking American higher

education*. New York: McMillan.

Kuh, G., Kenzie, J., Schuh, J. H., & Witt, E. J. (2010). *Student success in college: Creating

conditions that matter* (2nd Ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Lahman, M. P., & Lietzenmayer, A. (2015). Work-life & the popular press: How words create

worlds. *Et Cetera* 72(2):127-48.

Linear Languages (2015). Retrieved from

https://view.officeapps.live.com/op/view.aspx?src=http%3A%2F%2Fpeople.eecs.ku.edu

%2F~kinners%2F510web%2Freadings%2FLinear_languages.doc

Luntz, F. (2007). *Words that work: It is not what you say, it is what people hear*. New York:

Hyperion.

Luthans, F. (2002). The need for and meaning of positive organizational behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *26*, 695-706.

McLuhan, M. (1994). *Understanding media: The extensions of man*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.

Mehrabian, A., & Ferris, S. R. (1967). Inference of attitudes from non-verbal communication in two channels. *Journal of Consulting Psychology*, *31*, 248–52.

Miller, J. B., & Stiver, I. P. (1997). *The healing connection*. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.

Nichols, J. D. (2010). *Teachers as servant leaders*. Blue Ridge Summit, PA.: Rowman & Littlefield.

Padovani, C., & Tuzzi, A. (2004). The WSIS as a world of words: Building a common vision of the information society. *Continuum: Journal of Media & Cultural Studies*, *18*, 360-379.

Phillips, M. (1997). What makes schools effective? A comparison of the relationships of communitarian climate and academic climate to: Mathematics achievement and attendance during middle school. *American Educational Research Journal*, *34* (4), 633-662.

Pounder, J. S. (2006). Transformational classroom leadership: The fourth wave of teacher leadership? *Educational management administration & leadership*, *34*, 533-545.

Presidents Council, State Universities of Michigan. (2006). *Michigan Distinguished Professor of the Year Recognition Program*. Michigan: State Universities of Michigan.

Quinn, R. W., & Dutton, J. E. (2005). Coordination as energy-in-conversation. *Academy of Management Review*, *30*(1), 36–57.

Ragins, B. R., & Verbos, A. K. (2007). Positive relationships in action: Relational mentoring and mentoring schemas in the workplace. In J. E. Dutton & B. R. Ragins (Eds.), *Exploring positive relationships at work: Building a theoretical and research foundation* (pp. 91–116). Matwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Rappaport, J. (1987). In praise of paradox: social policy of empowerment over prevention. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, *9* (1), 1-21.

Reis, H. (2001). Relationship experiences and emotional well-being. In C. Ryff & B. Singer (Eds.), *Emotion, social relationships, and health* (pp. 57–86). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Reis, H. T. (2007). Steps toward the ripening of relationship science. *Personal Relationships*, *14*, 1–23.

Reynolds, W. M., & Webber, J. A. (2004). *Expanding curriculum theory: dis/positions and lines of flight*. Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, publishers.

Roberts, L. M. (2007). From proving to becoming: How positive relationships create a context for self-discovery and self-actualization. In J. E. Dutton & B. R. Ragins (Eds.), *Exploring positive relationships at work: Building a theoretical and research foundation* (pp. 29–46). Matwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Schulman, L. S. (1986). Those who understand: knowledge growth in teaching. *Educational Researcher,15(2), 4-14.*

Schulman, L. S. (1987). Knowledge in teaching: Foundations of the new reform. *Harvard Educational Review, 57(1), 1-22.*

Schunk, D. H. (1991). Self-efficacy and academic motivation. *Educational Psychologist*, *26*, 207-31.

Senge, P. M. (1990). A shift of mind. In *The fifth discipline: The art and practice of the learning organization* (p. 68-92). New York: Bantam Doubleday Dell.

Shouse, R. C. (1995). Academic press and sense of community: conflict, congruence, and implications for student achievement. *Social Psychology of Education*, *1*, 47-68.

Sloane, T. O. (Ed.). (2001). *Encyclopedia of rhetoric*. New York: Oxford.

Smith, J. A. (2015). *Qualitative psychology: A practical guide to research methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Spellings, M., & Oldham, C. (2006). U.S. Department of Education – A test of leadership: Charting the future of U.S. higher education. *A report of the commission on higher education: Appointed by Secretary of Education Margaret Spellings*, 1-76.

Stephens, J. P., Heaphy, E., & Dutton, J. E. (2011). High-quality connections. In G. Spreitzer & K. S. Cameron (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of positive organizational scholarship*. New York: Oxford.

Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1998). *Basics of qualitative research: Techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

The 300 best professors in the country, Princeton Review and RateMyProfessors.com list.

    (2012). *Huffington Post.* Retrieved from:

    http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2012/04/06/princeton-review-ratemyprofessor-

    profs_n_1408972.html#s846697&title=Douglas_Gentile

Tichy, N., & Charan, R. (1989). Speed, simplicity, self-confidence: an interview with Jack

    Welch. *Harvard Business Review*. Retrieved from http://hbr.org/1989/09/speed-

    simplicity-self-confidence-an-interview-with-jack-welch/

Usher, E. L., & Pajares, F. (2008). Sources of self-efficacy in school: Critical review of the

    literature and future directions. *Review of Educational Research*, *78*, 751-796.

Whitney, D., & Trosten-Bloom, A. (2002). *The power of appreciative inquiry: A practical guide*

    to positive change. San Francisco: Berrett- Koehler.

Wooffitt, R. (2010). Conversation analysis and discourse analysis. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Yin, R. K. (2003). Designing case studies. In Yin, R.K. (Ed.), *Case study research: Design and*

    methods (pp. 25-66). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Zusman, A. (2005). Challenges facing higher education in the twenty first century. In P. G.

    Altbach, R. O. Berdahl, & P. J. Gumport (Eds.), *American higher education in the twenty-*

    first century (2nd Ed., pp. 115-160). Retrieved from:

    www.educationanddemocracy.org/Resources/Zusman.pdf

Appendix A: Classroom Observation Protocol

Classroom Observation

The focus is on concluding whether classroom observations can be made of the professor regarding the use of academic optimism and making high quality connections (HQCs) to induce or foster student self-efficacy. This technique may confirm notions of the phenomenon of academic optimism and the connection to student self-efficacy via HQCs communications techniques by the professor.

The storyline is the professor, the professor as leader, the professor/student interaction, and the college classroom. Quite possibly, either collectively or individually, academic optimism and student self-efficacy will be present. I will be analyzing the data in an effort to develop definitions and labels for professor and student self-efficacy and professorial academic optimism. What the participant does or how they talk about, make, and build HQCs.

I am observing for the effects or connections professors with academic optimism have with students. Professors with academic optimism set high expectations, exert great effort, and persist in the face of difficulties in the relationship to student self-efficacy. I plan to compare notes between classroom, observations or groups to determine how professors with academic optimism use high-quality connections to achieve student self-efficacy. The investigator's role is observer. My role will be neutral and a detached observer, gathering information to analyze as the authoritative expert and active analyst.

As a detached observer in the college classroom, I will take observational field notes – both descriptive and reflective – to analyze for teacher academic optimism using high-quality connections to achieve student self-efficacy.

High-Quality Connections in the Business Classroom

       Protocol for Classroom Observation

I. Background Information

University_____ Date of observation_____

Subject Observed/Course Title and Number_____

Observer_____

Student Audience: ☐ Freshman ☐ Sophomore ☐ Junior ☐ Senior

Scheduled length of class_____

Length of observation _____

II. Classroom Demographics

A.   What is the total number of students in the class at the time of the   observation?

☐   15 or fewer   ☐   26 to 30   ☐   61 or more

☐   16-20   ☐   30 to 40

☐   21 to 25   ☐   41 to 60

B.   Indicate the teacher's/instructors:

    1.   Gender:

    ☐ Male   ☐ Female

    2.   Position

☐ Non-tenured ☐ Tenured

III. Rate the adequacy of the physical environment for facilitating student learning.

	1	2	3
1. Classroom resources: (from "sparsely equipped" to "rich in resources")	O	O	O
2. Room arrangement: (from "inhibited interactions among students" to "facilitated interactions among students")	O	O	O

IV.   Description of classroom and layout:

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

V.   Class Description and Purpose

A. Classroom Checklist:

Please fill in the professor's instructional activities and strategies observed

Instructional Strategies or Activities

P	Presentation/lecture	PM	Problem modeling
PBL	Practice–based Learning		
PWD	Presentation with discussion	RSW	Reading seat work (if in groups, add SGD)
CD	Class discussion	D	Demonstration
HOA	Hands-on activity/materials	CL	Co-op learning (roles)
SGD	Small group discussion	TIS	Teacher/instructor interacting w/ student
AD	Administrative tasks	LC	Learning center/station
UT	Utilizing digital educational media and technology	OOC	Out-of-class experience
A	Assessment	I	Interruption
WW	Writing work (if in groups, add SGD)	SP	Student presentation
Other			

Time in minutes:

	0-5	5-10	10-15	15-20	20-25	25-30	30-35	35-40	40-45	45-50	50-55	55-60
Instructor												
Student												

	60-65	65-70	70-75	75-80	80-85	85-90	90-95	95-100	100-105	105-110	110-115	115-120
Instructor												

High-Quality Connections in the Business Classroom

Student												

VI.   **In a few sentences, describe the professor and the lesson observed and its purpose.**

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

VII.   **Rubric for Summarizing Classroom Observations**

Each of the following eight indicators are scored for:

Academic optimism

T = Taught effectively, collective efficacy

Tr = Earned student trust

P = Pressed hard for learning

Frequency of the trait

0 = Don't Know or N/A

1 = This seldom or never occurred

2 = This sometimes occurred

3 = This frequently occurred

<u>Example</u>

T-0, T1, T2, or T3

Tr-0, Tr1, Tr 2, or Tr3

P-0, P1, P2, or P3

High-Quality Connections in the Business Classroom

1. **Indicate the professor's setting high expectations (circle all that apply)**

   Academic Optimism Trait

T-0	T1	T2	T3
Tr-0	Tr1	Tr2	Tr3
P-0	P-1	P-2	P-3

What HQC was achieved?

Cluster One

    PEM - Positive Emotion   GC- group connection

    PAE- positive arousal or energy   PR - Positive Regard or one another

    CF- respect or cared for in the connection

    GM- Group mutuality, vulnerability, engagement

Cluster Two

    GEC – greater emotional carrying capacity

    BWS- Bend or withstand the strain of learning OI- Open to new ideas

Classroom Time in minutes:

	0-5	5-10	10-15	15-20	20-25	25-30	30-35	35-40	40-45	45-50	50-55	55-60
Instructor												
Student												

	60-65	65-70	70-75	75-80	80-85	85-90	90-95	95-100	100-105	105-110	110-115	115-120
Instructor												
Student												

Describe what you saw. Please indicate how the professor made an HQC in the classroom, e.g.

trust was earned, a heightened state of awareness etc., describe:

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

2. Indicate how the professor faced learning difficulties.

Academic Optimism Trait

T-0	T1	T2	T3
Tr-0	Tr1	Tr2	Tr3
P-0	P-1	P-2	P-3

What HQC was achieved?

Cluster One

PEM - Positive Emotion   GC- group connection

PAE- positive arousal or energy   PR - Positive Regard or one another

CF- respect or cared for in the connection

GM- Group mutuality, vulnerability, engagement

Cluster Two

GEC – greater emotional carrying capacity

BWS- Bend or withstand the strain of learning OI- Open to new ideas

Classroom Time in minutes:

	00-5	5-10	10-15	15-20	20-25	25-30	30-35	35-40	40-45	45-50	50-55	55-60
Instructor												
Student												

	60-65	65-70	70-75	75-80	80-85	85-90	90-95	95-100	100-105	105-110	110-115	115-120
Instructor												
Student												

Describe what you saw. Please indicate how the professor made an HQC facing difficult learning

situation(s)

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

3. The professor purposefully engaged the student in feedback, homework, assignment or grading.

Academic Optimism Trait

T-0	T1	T2	T3
Tr-0	Tr1	Tr2	Tr3
P-0	P-1	P-2	P-3

What HQC was achieved?

      PEM - Positive Emotion   GC- group connection

      PAE- positive arousal or energy   PR - Positive Regard or one another

      CF- respect or cared for in the connection

      GM- Group mutuality, vulnerability, engagement

Cluster Two

      GEC – greater emotional carrying capacity

      BWS- Bend or withstand the strain of learning OI- Open to new ideas

Classroom Time in minutes:

	0-5	5-10	10-15	15-20	20-25	25-30	30-35	35-40	40-45	45-50	50-55	55-60
Instructor												
Student												

	60-65	65-70	70-75	75-80	80-85	85-90	90-95	95-100	100-105	105-110	110-115	115-120
Instructor												
Student												

Describe what you saw. Please indicate how the professor made an HQC feedback, homework,

assignment or grading

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

4. The professor had students focused and engaged in the work

Academic Optimism Trait

T-0	T1	T2	T3
Tr-0	Tr1	Tr2	Tr3
P-0	P-1	P-2	P-3

What HQC was achieved?

Cluster One

PEM - Positive Emotion   GC- group connection

PAE- positive arousal or energy   PR - Positive Regard or one another

CF- respect or cared for in the connection

GM- Group mutuality, vulnerability, engagement

Cluster Two

GEC – greater emotional carrying capacity

BWS- Bend or withstand the strain of learning OI- Open to new ideas

Classroom Time in minutes:

	0-5	5-10	10-15	15-20	20-25	25-30	30-35	35-40	40-45	45-50	50-55	55-60
Instructor												
Student												

	60-65	65-70	70-75	75-80	80-85	85-90	90-95	95-100	100-105	105-110	110-115	115-120
Instructor												
Student												

Describe what you saw. Please indicate how the professor made an HQC having student engaged

and focused on work

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

5. The professor had the students on authentic tasks and placed the students were placed in the center of the learning.

Academic Optimism Trait

T-0	T1	T2	T3
Tr-0	Tr1	Tr2	Tr3
P-0	P-1	P-2	P-3

What HQC was achieved?

Cluster One

      PEM - Positive Emotion   GC- group connection

      PAE- positive arousal or energy   PR - Positive Regard or one another

      CF- respect or cared for in the connection

      GM- Group mutuality, vulnerability, engagement

Cluster Two

      GEC – greater emotional carrying capacity

      BWS- Bend or withstand the strain of learning OI- Open to new ideas

Classroom Time in minutes:

	0-5	5-10	10-15	15-20	20-25	25-30	30-35	35-40	40-45	45-50	50-55	55-60
Instructor												
Student												

	60-65	65-70	70-75	75-80	80-85	85-90	90-95	95-100	100-105	105-110	110-115	115-120
Instructor												
Student												

Describe what you saw. Please indicate how the professor made an HQC having student engaged and focused on work

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

6. The professors had the students seated in clusters or in group work

Academic Optimism Trait

T-0	T1	T2	T3
Tr-0	Tr1	Tr2	Tr3
P-0	P-1	P-2	P-3

What HQC was achieved?

Cluster One

PEM - Positive Emotion   GC- group connection

PAE- positive arousal or energy   PR - Positive Regard or one another

CF- respect or cared for in the connection

GM- Group mutuality, vulnerability, engagement

Cluster Two

GEC – greater emotional carrying capacity

BWS- Bend or withstand the strain of learning OI- Open to new ideas

Classroom Time in minutes:

	0-5	5-10	10-15	15-20	20-25	25-30	30-35	35-40	40-45	45-50	50-55	55-60
Instructor												
Student												

	60-65	65-70	70-75	75-80	80-85	85-90	90-95	95-100	100-105	105-110	110-115	115-120
Instructor												
Student												

Describe what you saw. Please indicate how the professor made an HQC, having students in

clusters for group work

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

7. The professors were actively engaged students

Academic Optimism Trait

T-0	T1	T2	T3
Tr-0	Tr1	Tr2	Tr3
P-0	P-1	P-2	P-3

What HQC was achieved?

Cluster One

PEM - Positive Emotion   GC- group connection

PAE- positive arousal or energy   PR - Positive Regard or one another

CF- respect or cared for in the connection

GM- Group mutuality, vulnerability, engagement

Cluster Two

GEC – greater emotional carrying capacity

BWS- Bend or withstand the strain of learning OI- Open to new ideas

Classroom Time in minutes:

	0-5	5-10	10-15	15-20	20-25	25-30	30-35	35-40	40-45	45-50	50-55	55-60
Instructor												
Student												

	60-65	65-70	70-75	75-80	80-85	85-90	90-95	95-100	100-105	105-110	110-115	115-120
Instructor												
Student												

Describe what you saw. Please indicate how the professor made an HQC being actively engaged

with the students

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

8. Both the students and the professors had a sense of purpose in the learning.

Academic Optimism Trait

T-0	T1	T2	T3
Tr-0	Tr1	Tr2	Tr3
P-0	P-1	P-2	P-3

What HQC was achieved?

Cluster One

       PEM - Positive Emotion   GC- group connection

       PAE- positive arousal or energy   PR - Positive Regard or one another

       CF- respect or cared for in the connection

       GM- Group mutuality, vulnerability, engagement

Cluster Two

       GEC – greater emotional carrying capacity

       BWS- Bend or withstand the strain of learning OI- Open to new ideas

Classroom Time in minutes:

	0-5	5-10	10-15	15-20	20-25	25-30	30-35	35-40	40-45	45-50	50-55	55-60
Instructor												
Student												

	60-65	65-70	70-75	75-80	80-85	85-90	90-95	95-100	100-105	105-110	110-115	115-120
Instructor												
Student												

Describe what you saw. Please indicate how the professor made an HQC having a sense of

purpose to the learning

_____

_____

_____

_____

<center>**Appendix B: Research Survey Protocol**</center>

Introduction

Workforce preparation, workforce relevance, and teacher quality are intertwined. Because of the pressure from employers, higher education is on a search for ways to improve student instruction and thereby career readiness upon graduation. In order to produce better learning outcomes, therefore better workforce readiness, the connection between professor and student are critical. Borrowing a theory of management, high quality connections (HQCs) this research applies current management theory in the classroom. The narrative of this research is characterized as the professor as leader, building high quality connections, enhancing learning, and thereby better workforce employability.

This research seeks to identify the language, action, characteristics and traits of effective college classroom leaders that engender student self-efficacy. It will explore the professor's academic optimism and investigate student self-efficacy, the theories of academic press (positive organizational scholarship (POS), appreciative inquiry, and high quality connections. I will explore whether high quality connections (HQCs) are the important connections made between college student and professor, and the lynchpin for academic optimism, leading to student self-efficacy.

Objectives

The purpose of this research is to develop a theory about how high quality connections (HQCs) help students achieve self-efficacy. This research, in case-study form, specifically investigates the characteristics of professors that have a positive effect on students in classrooms.

High-Quality Connections in the Business Classroom

These case-studies will investigate the qualities and characteristics of higher education professors, at the college level in the state of Michigan. The colleges and the professor are randomly selected from AACSB accredited colleges, found in Southeastern Michigan. Specifically, this research asks the question, what are the language, traits and characteristics, in the form of high quality connections (HQCs) used by successful higher education classroom professors that lead to student self-efficacy? It asks, are HQCs the link between professor and student, leading to student self-efficacy? This is a new area of research.

Research Design

The research design choice is a multiple-case study approach using thematic-qualitative methods, because of the broad scope of the research questions and the data collected are primarily words. The meaning of the study unfolds through thematic descriptions, the author's reflection on the meaning of the data, leading to a larger understanding of the phenomenon of professor, student efficacy and academic optimism. The understanding or theme(s) is best expressed by the story of efficacy and academic optimism that unfolds through language, words, and metaphors in the classroom initiated by the professor and the student.

The philosophical underpinnings of the case-study are based on a constructivist paradigm. Constructivists and constructvism is like any other scientific approach. There is a methodological procedure, logical accuracy and unbiased and unambiguous analysis of the preconditions and consequences leading to relative truth claims and empirical checks. It recognizes the importance of the subjective human creation of meaning, but does not outright reject the idea of objectivity. Constructivist design is interested in the views, values, beliefs, feelings, assumptions and ideologies of the individual.

This research is centered on how, what, and why questions. The researcher is not looking to manipulate behaviors, but to uncover contextual conditions that we consider relevant to the phenomenon of self-efficacy and academic optimism (Baxter & Jack, 2008). A multiple case-study enables the researcher to explore differences within and between cases. The goal is to replicate findings across cases. Because comparisons will be carefully scrutinized for HQCs, it is imperative that the subjects are chosen carefully so that the researcher can predict similar results across cases or predict contrasting results based on theory.

This research follows grounded theory as a basis for investigation. It is a systematic process used to generate theory that explains an interaction regarding academic optimism and HQCs (Creswell, 2012). This method was originally developed by Glaser and Strauss (1967). Glaser and Strauss were interested in closely linking theory to the data from which it was generated (Glaser & Strauss, 1967; Charmaz, 2011). The logic of grounded theory is implied. In developing a theory, Strauss & Corbin (1990) said that if the data upon which theory was based were comprehensive and interpretations conceptual and broad, then the theory should be abstract enough and include sufficient variation to make it applicable to a variety of contexts related to that phenomenon or construct (Strauss & Corbin, 1990). This is a method of research grounded in the data itself and not driven by a preconceived theory (Glaser & Strauss, 1967).

Using discourse analysis to unveil meaning, the aim is to examine the discourse of the participant's statements, the classroom observation and artifacts that construct the meaning. The benefit of this methodological approach is that its primary aim is to interpret the research situation – the phenomenon – not to test a hypothesis (Strauss & Corbin, 1990). The researcher stands outside the studied phenomenon. The data collected is present, not constructed (Charmaz, 2012).

Using qualitative methods to collect data, I will conduct classroom observations of three randomly selected professors. Next, a survey will be conducted with the professors, non-tenured and or tenured track, and the students. This will be followed by an analysis and a review of current artifacts, such as course descriptions, returned course assignments with feedback, and course syllabi. Then a series of selected professors and convenience interviews of students will be taken (Creswell, 2012). All identities of participants will be-kept confidential. All the interviews will be-audio-digitally taped, transcribed and coded for recurring themes. These themes will be analyzed, organized and presented using Dedoose qualitative software. I will begin with transcriber recordings, researcher observations, surveys, artifacts and interviews, to construct or frame themes, patterns, and categories within the responses.

The interviews will be conducted on site at the interviewee's location or, in some cases, over the phone. Interviewees will remain anonymous, identified only by their position as professor or student. All names that come up in the interview will be changed to pseudonyms or numbers. The interviews will contain open-ended questions in a semi-structured format.

Subject Selection – Eligibility Criteria

Participants – Professors

The participants in the research are three of Michigan's best professors. They may be non-tenured or tenured track professors, and their active classrooms, as defined by outstanding or distinguished professor awards, or college review lists, such as the Princeton review of the 300 Best Professors. I will select three of the best professors from seven colleges represented by the international business college accrediting association, (AACSB) or other opportunist, verifiable sources from colleges in the State of Michigan, in Southeast, Michigan.

Participants – Students

Student participants will be selected by convenience sampling from the selected professor's classroom. This is the principal method of obtaining the students as participants. These participants are those who are willing and available to the researcher (Creswell, 2012). The setting is the professor's classroom and these participants will be asked to complete an interview and/or a survey about the classroom professor and their self-efficacy.

INFORMED CONSENT FORM – SEE APPENDIX D

Criteria for Evaluating Response/Statistical Analysis

Data analysis is qualitative. Throughout the data collection process, information is gathered and analyzed for emerging or recurring themes and areas that may yield information or require further examination. Emerging data from the interviews, participant observation, artifacts and surveys also add to the focus and refinement of the ideas. The research uses discourse analysis to identify the overall inferential impact of the text or speech (Wooffitt, 2010). What will emerge is the interrelationship between the phenomena and the individual (Wooffitt, 2010).

Coding

Once the data collection phase has ended, the formal coding process begins. I plan to use Dedoose to import the data for analysis. It is a qualitative research analysis software for managing data and generating ideas. Initially, all transcripts and field notes are read for general themes such as predictors of academic optimism and student self-efficacy. I plan to compare notes between classroom, observations or groups to determine any common themes or differences. The goal of this coding is to examine the participant's verbal conduct on its own terms (Wooffitt, 2010).

Once initial themes are made, all of the transcripts and field notes will be reread to find additional supporting quotations and excerpts, and then placed into Word files. Each file will be read for subthemes. Quotes and excerpts will be categorized and put into the subthemes for more detailed analysis. In addition, all of the transcripts and field notes will be read in their entirety again, looking for counterexamples. Each file will then be read for subthemes. Finally, all transcripts and field notes are to be read in their entirety one more time to look for counterexamples which can be added to the Word files for each theme. The transcripts should contain as much accurate information about the conversation as possible. Care is taken with the transcript to most realistically represent the materials analyzed.

Once the coding is done, I will reread the files for theme significance and authenticity. All Word files will be compared to the interview transcripts ensuring that the themes reflect the participants' views and words and not mine.

High-Quality Connections in the Business Classroom

Survey questionnaire

Faculty-Professors

How long have you been in your present position? 1-3years_____ 4-6 years, 7-10

years_____, 11-14 years_____, 15-18 years_____, 19 years plus_____

How long have you been at this institution? 1-3years_____ 4-6 years, 7-10 years_____, 11-

14 years_____, 15-18 years_____, 19 years plus_____

Interesting background information:

    What is your highest degree? Bachelors_____ Masters_____ Doctorate_____

    What is your field of study? _____

Introduction

    You have been selected to fill out this survey because you have been identified as

someone who has a great deal to share about teaching, and learning. Thank you for agreeing to

be a part of this research. Our research project as a whole focus on how the college professors

use high quality connections to engender or aid student's self-efficacy.

    High quality connections (HQCs) are sensed by the feelings of vitality in the connections.

People in an HQC are more likely to feel positively aroused in and a heightened sense of positive

energy. Then, the quality of connection is felt through a sense of positive regard for each other.

This positive regard denotes a sense of feeling known and loved, or being respected and cared

for in the connection. Finally, the subjective experience of the connection quality is marked by

the group, to the degree that it is felt mutually. Mutuality captures the feeling of potential

movement in the connection, borne out of mutual vulnerability and responsiveness as both people experience full participation and engagement in the connection at the moment

Our aim is to have you answer a series of questions that ask you to talk about a time in the college classroom when you believed that you used or made a high quality connection and students achieved self-efficacy, we describe self-efficacy as a student's belief in themselves, that they can master the subject or topic.

Please describe or give an example(s) of when you used or made a high quality connection and the student had a 1) mastery experience, 2) when they helped themselves succeed, 3) or through this connection other people increased a student's sense of confidence and ability to succeed and 4) had a reduction of anxiety or stress during a mastery moment.

Our study aims to identify your experiences. We are trying to learn more about teaching and learning, and hopefully learn about faculty practices, making high quality connections that help improve student self-efficacy.

1.   Briefly describe your role as it relates to the classroom student learning.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

2.   If you use innovative teaching techniques. What motivates you to do so?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

B. Classroom Perspective

I noticed in your classroom that you _____. Could you please tell about that, a

story or describe the initiative, climate or other circumstance occurring, that focused on your

awareness of making a high quality connection leading to student self-efficacy. Also, can you tell

me how you felt the connection between you and the student occurred? Please state why you

believe you made a high quality connection, e.g., trust was earned, a heightened state of

awareness etc.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

1.   Are there any other classroom challenges that I may have missed in which you felt you

      helped make a high quality between yourself and the student, a connection leading to

      student self- efficacy? Please tell me about it or them:

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

2.   Is there anything more you'd like to say regarding your classroom the professor and or

      students making high quality connections and self-efficacy?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

C. Homework and Feedback Perspective

      This section applies to student efficacy in feedback, homework, assignment or grading.

Please tell a story or describe an assignment, homework or grading initiated within the past two

years that was focused on your awareness of making a high quality connection leading to student self-efficacy. Also, can you tell me how you felt the connection between the homework or feedback occurred? Please tell how you believe it helped student efficacy.

I noticed that the feedback in your classroom took the form of _____. Could you please tell about that, a story or describe that initiative, the climate or other circumstance occurring, that focused on your awareness of making a high quality connection leading to student self-efficacy. Also, can you tell me how you felt the connection between you and the student occurred using that form of feedback? Please state why you believe you made a high quality connection, e.g., trust was earned, a heightened state of awareness etc.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

D. Teaching and Learning Materials, Grading and Pedagogical Perspective

This section applies to teaching and learning materials. I noticed that your classroom pedagogical approach was _____. Please tell a story or describe teaching, the pedagogy and learning materials that were focused on your awareness of making a high quality connection leading to student self-efficacy. Also, can you tell me how you felt the connection between you and the student occurred? How did you experience or witness this high quality connection which made an improvement in student self-efficacy?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

1. Please discuss *how you used books, articles, case studies*, etc., to make a high quality connection and gain student self-efficacy? These may include, EBooks, on-line learning systems, artificial intelligence.

   _____

   _____

   _____

   _____

2. Please discuss how or give an example of *course materials* that were a high quality connection that improved student self-efficacy?

   _____

   _____

   _____

   _____

3. Can you describe in a story or example how this was a mutual experience? How did this experience make you feel? How do you think it made the students feel?

_____

_____

_____

_____

4. Can you describe how a pedagogical technique you used made a high quality connection
   and helped student efficacy?

   _____

   _____

   _____

   _____

5. Any other course materials or other initiative, which you would like to tell me about?

   _____

   _____

   _____

E. Professor Self-efficacy

This section applies to professor self-efficacy. I noticed in your classroom that you
seemed to have command of the material, class and all the students' attention. Please describe
that incident and you were focused or aware of making a high quality connection leading to
student self-efficacy. Also, can you tell me how you felt the connection between you and the
student occurred?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

1. Please consider how you made the high quality connection and your self-efficacy impacted on student self-efficacy.

   _____

   _____

   _____

   _____

2. How did this experience make you feel? How do you think it made the students feel? Can you give me an example of how positive energy or a mutual arousal was manifest in pursuit of the learning goal?

   _____

   _____

_____

_____

3. Any other professor high quality connections and self-efficacy initiative that you would

   like to tell me about?

   _____

   _____

   _____

   _____

4. What are your lessons learned?

   a. What are the top three recommendations you would have for making and attaining

      professor high quality connections and student self-efficacy?

      _____

      _____

      _____

      _____

   b. What would you say are the top three pitfalls you might foresee in professors

      making high quality connections and attaining student self-efficacy?

      1. _____

         _____

      2. _____

         _____

      3. _____

         _____

PARTICPANT-STUDENT

Interesting background information:

What is your highest degree? Bachelors_____ Masters_____

Doctorate_____

What is your field of study? _____

Age;18-21_____ 22-25_____, 26-30_____, 30 and over_____

Introduction

You have been selected to fill out this survey because you have been identified as someone who has a great deal to share about classroom learning. Thank you for agreeing to be a part of this research. Our research project as a whole focus on how the college professors use high quality connections to engender or aid student's self-efficacy.

High quality connections (HQCs) are sensed by the feelings of vitality in the connections. People in an HQC are more likely to feel positively aroused in and a heightened sense of positive energy. Then, the quality of connection is felt through a sense of positive regard for each other. This positive regard denotes a sense of feeling known and loved, or being respected and cared for in the connection. Finally, the subjective experience of the connection quality is marked by the group, to the degree that it is felt mutually. Mutuality captures the feeling of potential movement in the connection, borne out of mutual vulnerability and responsiveness as both people experience full participation and engagement in the connection at the moment

Our aim is to have you answer a series of questions that ask you to talk about a time in the college classroom when you believed that you used or made a high quality connection and students achieved self-efficacy, we describe self-efficacy as a student's belief in themselves, that they can master the subject or topic.

High-Quality Connections in the Business Classroom

Please describe or give an example(s) of when you used or made a high quality connection with the professor and had a: 1) mastery experience, 2) when they helped you succeed, 3) or through this connection other people increased their sense of confidence and ability to succeed and 4) had a reduction of anxiety or stress during a mastery moment.

Our study aims to identify your experiences. We are trying to learn more about teaching and learning, and hopefully learn about faculty practices, making high quality connections that help improve student self-efficacy.

1. Briefly describe how you perceive your role as a learner in the classroom

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

2. What innovative teaching techniques have you witnessed that helped you become more self-aware of your learning and lead you to a greater confidence about your learning.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

B. Classroom Perspective

I noticed in professor's _____classroom that he/she did _____.
Could you please tell about that, a story or describe how that professor's initiative, or the climate
or other circumstance affected your self-efficacy and confidence? Please state why or why not
you believe that the professor made a high quality connection, e.g., your trust was earned, or you
had a heightened state of awareness etc.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

3. Are there any other classroom challenges that I may have missed in which you felt you
   achieved a high quality between yourself and the professor, a connection leading to your
   greater self- efficacy? Please tell me about it or them:

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

4. Is there anything more you'd like to say regarding the professor's classroom and or making high quality connections and self-efficacy?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

C. Homework and Feedback Perspective

This section applies to your self-efficacy in homework, assignment or grading.

Please tell a story or describe an assignment, homework or grading initiated within the past two years that was focused on your awareness of making a high quality connection between yourself, the professor and the homework, feedback or the assignment.

I noticed that the feedback in your professor's classroom took the form of

_____. Could you please tell about that, a story or describe that initiative, the climate

or other circumstance occurring, that focused on your awareness of making a high quality

connection leading to the professor. Also, can you tell me how you felt the connection between

you and the professor occurred using that form of feedback? Please state why you believe you

made a high quality connection, e.g., trust was earned, a heightened state of awareness etc.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

D. Teaching and Learning Materials, Grading and Pedagogical Perspective

This section applies to teaching and learning materials. I noticed that your professor's

classroom pedagogical approach was _____. Please tell a story or describe the

teaching, the pedagogy and learning materials that focused on your awareness of making a high

quality connection leading to your self-efficacy. Also, can you tell me how you felt the

connection between you and the professor occurred? How did you experience or witness this

high quality connection which made an improvement in your self-efficacy?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

6. Please discuss *how you used your books, articles, case studies*, etc., to make a high
    quality connection and gain self-efficacy? These may include, EBooks, on-line learning
    systems, artificial intelligence.

    _____

    _____

    _____

    _____

7. Please discuss how or give an example of *course materials* that were a high quality
    connection that improved your self-efficacy?

    _____

    _____

    _____

    _____

8. Can you describe in a story or example how this was a mutual experience? How did this
    experience make you feel? How do you think it made the professors feel?

    _____

    _____

_____

_____

9. Can you describe how a pedagogical technique you used made a high quality connection and helped your self-efficacy?

_____

_____

_____

_____

10. Any other course materials or other initiative, which you would like to tell me about?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

E. Professor Self-efficacy

This section applies to professor self-efficacy. I noticed in your classroom the professor seemed to have command of the material, class and all the students' attention. Please describe that incident and were you focused or aware of making a high quality connection with the professor. Also, can you tell me how you felt the connection between you and the professor occurred?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

5. How did this experience make you feel? How do you think it made the professor feel? Can you give me an example of how positive energy or a mutual arousal was manifest in pursuit of the learning goal?

_____

_____

_____

_____

6. Any other professor high quality connections and self-efficacy initiative that you would like to tell me about?

_____

_____

_____

_____

7. What are your lessons learned?

   a. What are the top three recommendations you would have for making and attaining professor high quality connections and student self-efficacy?

   _____

   _____

   _____

   _____

   b. What would you say are the top three pitfalls you might foresee in professors making high quality connections and attaining student self-efficacy?

   1. _____

      _____

   2. _____

      _____

   3. _____

      _____

Appendix C: Interview Protocol

Research Method

We are investigating the connections that professors make with students in the classroom, leading to student self-efficacy. We are interviewing professors who have been recognized through some award or other identification such as the Princeton Review's 300 Best Professor list, or local college teaching awards. We are also interviewing students for their perceptions of the professors' efforts. The interviews seek actions, words, attitudes, or efforts undertaken by the professor in the college classroom that help students achieve self-efficacy. We will use a research strategy called Critical Incident Technique (CIT).

The Critical Incident Technique (or CIT) is a set of procedures used for collecting direct observations of human behavior that have critical significance and meet methodically defined criteria. In short, CIT is used as an interview technique where the informants are encouraged to tell about organizational incidents (or tell key stories) instead of answering direct questions about more general topics – for example, curriculum or pedagogical changes or occurrences. The idea is that the professor's best efforts to establish high quality connections lead to student self-efficacy and are displayed during key events (critical incidents). By probing for stories and examples, CIT helps avoid stereotyped opinions about the professor, or student, the pedagogy or curriculum, and instead asks participants to focus on key events from their lived experience. From these experiences, data analysis can reveal key issues as themes that give insight into what was operating in the event. In our study, we are asking participants to reflect and share stories related both to efforts that were successful and unsuccessful in the college classroom. This

qualitative interview technique will allow us to examine themes across participants, as well as provide data for follow-up studies.

The interviews will be conducted on site at the interviewee's location or, in some cases, over the phone. Interviewees will remain anonymous, identified only by their position as professor or student. All names that come up in the interview will be changed to pseudonyms or numbers. The interviews will contain open-ended questions in a semi-structured format.

Interview Protocol Form

Faculty Interview Protocol

Institution: _____

Interviewee (Title and Name): _____

Interviewer: _____

Section Used:

_____ A: Interviewee Background

_____ B: Classroom Perspective

_____ C: Homework & Feedback Perspective

_____ D: Teaching, Learning Materials & Pedagogy Perspective

_____ E: Professor Self-Efficacy Perspective

Other Topics Discussed: _____

_____

Documents Obtained: _____

_____

_____

Post Interview Comments or Leads:

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Interview Protocol

Read to interviewee, ask them to sign the consent form.

To facilitate our note-taking, we would like to audio tape our conversations today. Please sign the release form. For your information, only researchers on the project will be privy to the tapes which will be eventually destroyed after they are transcribed. In addition, you must sign a form devised to meet our human subject requirements. Essentially, this document states that: (1) all information will be held confidential, (2) your participation is voluntary and you may stop at any time if you feel uncomfortable, and (3) we do not intend to inflict any harm. Thank you for your agreeing to participate.

We have planned this interview to last no longer than one hour. During this time, we have several questions and topics that we would like to cover regarding student and professor self-efficacy. If time begins to run short, it may be necessary to interrupt you in order to push ahead and complete this line of questioning.

Introduction

You have been selected to speak with us today because you have been identified as someone who has a great deal to share about teaching, and learning. Thank you for agreeing to be a part of this research. Our research project as a whole focus on how the college professors use high quality connections to engender or aid student's self-efficacy.

High quality connections (HQCs) are sensed by the feelings of vitality in the connections. People in an HQC are more likely to feel positively aroused in and a heightened sense of positive energy. Then, the quality of connection is felt through a sense of positive regard for each other. This positive regard denotes a sense of feeling known and loved, or being respected and cared for in the connection. Finally, the subjective experience of the connection quality is marked by

the group, to the degree that it is felt mutually. Mutuality captures the feeling of potential

movement in the connection, borne out of mutual vulnerability and responsiveness as both

people experience full participation and engagement in the connection at the moment

Our aim is to have you answer a series of questions that ask you to talk about a time in

the college classroom when you believed that you used or made a high quality connection and

students achieved self-efficacy, we describe self-efficacy as a student's belief in themselves, that

they can master the subject or topic.

Please describe or give an example(s) of when you used or made a high quality

connection and the student had a 1) mastery experience, 2) when they helped themselves

succeed, 3) or through this connection other people increased a student's sense of confidence and

ability to succeed and 4) had a reduction of anxiety or stress during a mastery moment.

Our study aims to identify your experiences. We are trying to learn more about teaching

and learning, and hopefully learn about faculty practices, making high quality connections that

help improve student self-efficacy.

<center>INFORMED CONSENT FORM – SEE APPENDIX D</center>

A. Interviewee Background

How long have you been in your present position? _____

How long have you been at this institution? _____

Interesting background information on the interviewee:

What is your highest degree? _____

What is your field of study? _____

1. Briefly describe your role as it relates to the classroom student learning (if

appropriate).

Probes: How are you involved in teaching, and learning?

How did you get involved?

2. What motivates you to use innovative teaching techniques?

B. Classroom Perspective

Please tell a story or describe a classroom initiative, climate or other circumstance occurring within the last two years, that was focused on your awareness of making a high quality connection leading to student self-efficacy. Also, can you tell me how you felt the connection between you and the student occurred?

Possible probes:

1. After or during what you consider a crucial classroom lecture, how would you describe your making of a high quality connection?

2. Can you tell me a story about your classroom demeanor, where the students may have been excited, happy, sad, engaged, purposeful, etc., explain please? In your opinion, how did this classroom response, lead to a high quality connection? Was your effort, purposeful, in order to elicit that student response?

3. Can you describe in a story or example how this was a mutual experience (between student & professor)? How did this experience make you feel? How do you think it made the students feel? Can you give me an example of how positive energy or a mutual arousal was manifest in pursuit of the learning goal?

4. Can you give me an example of where you thought you made a high quality connection with a student or students?

   a. In this high quality connection how was trust earned or gained?

   b. In this high quality connection how was resistance overcome?

5. Are there any other classroom challenges that you felt helped you make a high quality student connection leading to student self- efficacy?

6. Is there anything more you'd like to say regarding professors and students making high quality connections and self-efficacy?

C. Homework and Feedback Perspective

This section applies to student efficacy in homework, assignment or grading.

Please tell a story or describe an assignment, homework or grading initiated within the past two years that was focused on your awareness of making a high quality connection leading to student self-efficacy. Also, can you tell me how you felt the connection between the homework or feedback occurred? Please tell how you believe it helped student efficacy.

Possible probes:

1. Can you tell me a story about the high quality connection challenge you faced in the explaining, a student's understanding, or the type of correction or feedback you gave to improve student self-efficacy?

2. Can you tell me an incident or exchange between you and a student that illustrates your point?

3. Can you tell or give me an example of oral and written feedback that made a high quality connection which improved student self-efficacy? Do you have examples to share with me?

4. Can you describe in a story or example how this was a mutual experience (between student & professor)? How did this experience make you feel? How do you think it made the students feel? Can you give me an example of how positive energy or a mutual arousal was manifest in pursuit of the learning goal?

5. Can you give me an example, or a story of how grading made a high quality connection and may have helped students achieve self-efficacy?

6. Any other homework, assignment, grading or other initiative, which you would like to tell me about that you felt, made a high quality connection?

D. Teaching and Learning Materials Pedagogical Perspective

This section applies to teaching and learning materials. Please tell a story or describe teaching and learning materials that were focused on your awareness of making a high quality connection leading to student self-efficacy. Also, can you tell me how you felt the connection between you and the student occurred? How did you experience or witness this high quality connection which made an improvement in student self-efficacy?

Possible probes:

1. Can you tell me a story about the making high quality connections, the successes or challenges you faced in selecting course materials to improve student self-efficacy?

2. Can you tell me an incident or exchange between you and a student that illustrates your point?

3. Please tell me a story about *how you used books, articles, case studies*, etc., to make a high quality connection and gain student self-efficacy? These may include Ebooks, on-line learning systems, artificial intelligence.

4. Can you tell or give me an example of *course materials* that were a high quality connection that improved student self-efficacy? Do you have examples to share with me?

5. Can you describe in a story or example how this was a mutual experience? How did this experience make you feel? How do you think it made the students feel?

6. Can you describe in a story or example how this was a mutual experience? How did this experience make you feel? How do you think it made the students feel? Can you give me an example of how positive energy or a mutual arousal was manifest in pursuit of the learning goal?

7. Can you tell me a story about a pedagogy you used that made high quality connections and helped student efficacy?

8. Any other course materials or other initiative, which you would like to tell me about?

E. Professor Self-efficacy

This section applies to professor self-efficacy. Please tell a story or describe an incident where you were focused or aware of making a high quality connection leading to student self-efficacy. Also, can you tell me how you felt the connection between you and the student occurred? Tell me how your high quality connection helped students achieve self- efficacy.

Possible probes:

1. Can you tell me about a story about how you as a professor made a high quality connection and your professor self-efficacy impacted on student self-efficacy?

2. Please tell me a story about how you used your high quality connection and self-efficacy to help the student. Can you tell me an incident or exchange between you and a student that illustrates your point?

3. Can you describe in a story or example how this was a mutual experience? How did this experience make you feel? How do you think it made the students feel? Can you give me an example of how positive energy or a mutual arousal was manifest in pursuit of the learning goal?

4. Any other professor high quality connections and self-efficacy initiative that you would like to tell me about?

5. What are your lessons learned?

    a. What are the top three recommendations you would have for making and attaining professor high quality connections and student self-efficacy?

    b. What would you say are the top three pitfalls you might foresee in professors making high quality connections and attaining student self-efficacy?

Conclusion

That concludes our interview. I would like to thank you for your help and participation. If you would like to have a copy of the research results, I would be happy to provide you with those conclusions. Again, thank you for your time.

Appendix D: Informed Consent FORM

Consent Form for Participation in a Research Study

Researcher: Timothy D. Hartge, LEO IV Lecturer & Ed. D candidate

Study Title: Unpacking Academic Optimism and Student Efficacy: Using High Quality Connections in the Business College Classroom

This consent form will give you the information you will need to understand why this study is being done and why you are being invited to participate. It will also describe what you will need to do to participate and any known risks, inconveniences or discomforts that you may have while participating. If you decide to participate, you will be asked to sign this form and you will be given a copy for your records.

ELIGIBILITY TO PARTICIPATE

1) Faculty who is considered to be one of Michigan's best professors, selected based upon teaching awards or other published documents such as Rate My Professor's list of "300 Best on Rate MY Professor"

2) Students who are taking or took a class from _____ (specify professor).

3) All Subjects must be at least 18 years old to participate.

THE PURPOSE OF THIS STUDY

One of the primary missions of a college, or university business education is to prepare the student for the work force. Higher education is on a search for ways to improve student instruction and thereby employment outcomes. What better way to examine classroom learning,

but through the student and teacher efficacy dynamic? Borrowing on a theory of management, high quality connections (HQCs) this research applies this management theory in the classroom. Therefore the narrative of this research could be characterized as: the professor as leader, building high quality connections, enhancing learning. What are the characteristics, the words and the actions that may produce professor and student efficacy?

THE STUDY TAKE PLACE AND HOW WILL LAST

The research will be conducted on-site, in the professor's office or with students in the classroom within the college of business. The participants will be asked to answer a series of question that will take up to one hour of interview time.

WHAT WILL I BE ASKED TO DO?

If you agree to take part in this study, you will be asked to recall incidents of making student high quality connections. We are investigating the connections that professors make with students in the classroom. We are interviewing professors who have been recognized through some award or other identification such as the Princeton Review's 300 Best Teacher list or 300 Best Professors on Rate MY Professor.

We are also interviewing students for their perceptions of the professors' efforts. The interviews seek actions, words, attitudes, or efforts undertaken by the professor in the college classroom that help students achieve self-efficacy. We will use a research strategy called Critical Incident Technique.

The Critical Incident Technique (or CIT) is a set of procedures used for collecting direct observations of human behavior that have critical significance and meet methodically defined criteria. In short, CIT is used as an interview technique where the informants are encouraged to tell about organizational incidents (or tell key stories) instead of answering direct questions about

more general topics – for example, curriculum or pedagogical changes or occurrences. The idea is that the professor's best efforts to establish high quality connections lead to student self-efficacy and are displayed during key events (critical incidents). By probing for stories and examples, CIT helps avoid stereotyped opinions about the professor, or student, the pedagogy or curriculum, and instead asks participants to focus on key events from their lived experience. From these experiences, data analysis can reveal key issues as themes that give insight into what was operating in the event. In our study, we are asking participants to reflect and share stories related both to efforts that were successful and unsuccessful in the college classroom. This qualitative interview technique will allow us to examine themes across participants, as well as provide data for follow-up studies.

The interviews will be conducted on site at the interviewee's location or, in some cases, over the phone. Interviewees will remain anonymous, identified only by their position as professor or student. All names that come up in the interview will be changed to pseudonyms or numbers. The interviews will contain open-ended questions in a semi-structured format.

BENEFITS OF BEING IN THIS STUDY

By being a participant in this study you may directly benefit through the advancement of knowledge of how classroom learning occurs and what impact the professor has on learning.

RISKS OF BEING IN THIS STUDY

We believe there are no known risks associated with this research study; however, a possible inconvenience may be the time it takes to complete the study.

WILL MY PERSONAL INFORMATION BE PROTECTED?

The following procedures will be used to protect the confidentiality of your study records. These study records include all written notes, audio and video digital files (if applicable). The

researchers will keep all study records, including any codes of your data, in a secure location in a locked file cabinet. Research records will be labeled with a code. A master key that links names and codes will be maintained in a separate and secure location. The master key and audio tapes will be destroyed three years after the close of the study. All electronic files (include all the types of electronic files that are used, such as databases, spreadsheets, etc.) containing identifiable information will be password protected. Any computer hosting such files will also have password protection to prevent access by unauthorized users. Only the members of the research staff will have access to the passwords. At the conclusion of this study, the researchers may publish their findings. Information will be presented in summary format and you will not be identified in any publications or presentations.

WILL I RECEIVE ANY PAYMENT FOR TAKING PART IN THE STUDY?

There is no compensation for participation.

WHAT IF I HAVE QUESTIONS?

Take as long as you like before you make a decision. We will be happy to answer any question you have about this study. If you have further questions about this project or if you have a research-related problem, you may contact the researcher(s), Timothy D. Hartge at (313) 583-6465 or thartge@umich.edu. If you have any questions concerning your rights as a research subject, you may contact the University of Michigan-Dearborn Human Subjects Protection Program (HSPP) at (313) 593-5000 or http://www.research.umd.umich.edu/irb/

CAN I STOP BEING IN THE STUDY?

You do not have to be in this study if you do not want to. If you agree to be in the study, but later change your mind, you may drop out at any time. There are no penalties or consequences of any kind if you decide that you do not want to participate.

SUBJECT STATEMENT OF VOLUNTARY CONSENT

When signing this form, I am agreeing to voluntarily enter this study. I have had a chance to read this consent form, and it was explained to me in a language which I use and understand. I have had the opportunity to ask questions and have received satisfactory answers. I understand that I can withdraw at any time. A copy of this signed Informed Consent Form has been given to me.

_____   _____   _____

Participant Signature: Print Name: Date:

By signing below, I indicate that the participant has read and, to the best of my knowledge, understands the details contained in this document and has been given a copy.

_____   _____   _____

Signature of Person Consenting   Print Name: Date:

Appendix E: Curriculum Vitae– Timothy D. Hartge

Vita of Timothy D. Hartge

Doctoral Student (ABD), Ed.D. - College of Education, Health and Human Services *University of Michigan – Dearborn: expected graduation fall, 2016.*

Master's Degree, University of Michigan - 1988 – Rackham School, Organization & Administration

Bachelor's Degree, Wayne State University – 1975, School of Communication, Marketing, Journalism & Advertising concentration

Public efolio site: http://timothyhartge.myefolio.com/Home

ACADEMIC APPOINTMENT/EXPERIENCE

University of Michigan-Dearborn – College of Business - September 2000 to present: **Participating, full-time faculty** in the College of Business, Business and Marketing Communications.

- **University of Michigan- Dearborn – College of Business – BBA Assurance of Learning Coordinator -** September 2013 to present. Key responsibilities lead the AOL process for the BBA program at the College of Business.

University of Michigan Ann Arbor – Stephen M. Ross School of Business - June to August 2013; Intermittent **Lecturer, International MBA** English Language Institute for Business Students, marketing, and business communications

Currently teach two subjects within the Management Studies Department: Primary teaching responsibility: Managerial Communication, secondary: Marketing/Advertising.

Courses taught: Business Communications (BA 330), Marketing Communications – Advertising (MKTG 458 and 352). The University of Michigan – Dearborn is ranked by US News and World Report, Best Business School 2012 and Princeton Review's 301 Best Business Schools in the country. University of Michigan- Dearborn, College of Business are AACSB (Association of Advanced Collegiate Schools of Business) an accreditation earned by approximately seven percent of the world's business schools.

In service work: Faculty adviser to the American Advertising Federation (AAF) UM-D student chapter. A member of the Special Interest Group, (SIG) Rhetoric Committee for The Association for Business Communications, teacher and lecturer and judge in e-Academy, sponsored by the University of Michigan – Dearborn College of Business. Member Ford Foundation Grant to the University of Michigan- Dearborn, Difficult Dialogues, 2005-2008.

RESEARCH

Doctoral research

Business Professors Using High-Quality Connections to Attain High Student Self-Efficacy: Doctoral Dissertation, Timothy D. Hartge, fall, 2016

This research examines the academic optimism of the classroom, college professor, and the role the professor's plays in student self-efficacy. A professor's sense of academic optimism is their belief that they can teach effectively, their students can learn, and the system will support them as they press hard for learning. Student efficacy is the belief that they can overcome difficulty and master the course material. I utilize a current business management theory of high-quality connections (HQC's) to unpack professor, academic optimism and its role in student self-efficacy. This research examines the professor's academic optimism characteristics, the words, the teaching materials, and the actions that produce student self-efficacy. The uniqueness and contribution of this research are the use of business theory and applying it to the college classroom. To examine this construct I use case study research design. The participants in this research are three of Michigan's best professors of colleges in the region of Southeastern Michigan, all are accredited, AACSB colleges.

Conferences

High-Quality Connections in the Business Classroom

- Business Professors Using High-Quality Connections to Impact Student Self-Efficacy is accepted for presentation as an Individual Presentation at the 81st Annual International Conference in Albuquerque, New Mexico, USA, October 19-22, 2016.

- What Does a Future Leader Look and Act Like? Ironman or The Flash? Presentations & Panel Discussion Society of Automotive Engineers Convergence Convention at the Suburban Collection Showplace, September 19-21, 2016

- A Gumbo of Favorite Assignments: Global, Communicating Complex Information, Short Message Packaging: The World Is Flat? Business and Professional Communication Quarterly, Fall 2014, Vol. 77(2) 217–237. 78th Annual International Conference in New Orleans, October 2013

- Effective Communications Practices during Organizational Transformation; A Benchmarking Study of the U.S Automobile Industry and the US Naval Aviation Enterprise. 2009 Center for Defense Management Reform- Graduate School of Business & Public Policy, Naval Postgraduate School

  Communication Strategies and Organizational Change: A Study of the Automobile Industry:
  http://www.businesscommunicationconferences.org/ocs/papers.php?first_letter=K&cf=1
  5

- Attended the Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB) Assurance of Learning Seminars Tampa FL. June 2014.

Published Papers
Timothy Hartge, Thomas Callahan, and Cynthia King

Leaders' Behaviors During Radical Change Processes: Subordinates' Perceptions of How Well Leader Behaviors Communicate Change International Journal of Business Communication 2329488415605061, first published on September 15, 2015, doi:10.1177/2329488415605061

My Favorite Assignment - Selections from the ABC 2013 Annual Convention, New Orleans, Louisiana: A Gumbo of Favorite Assignments: Global, Communicating Complex Information, Short-Message Packaging Business and Professional Communication Quarterly June 2014 77: 217-237

Other University of Michigan – Dearborn

Activities/Responsibilities:

- BBA Undergraduate Assessment Coordinator for AACSB and COB contact for Higher Learning Commission (HLC) at the University of Michigan- Dearborn College of Business.

- Faculty Adviser to the UM- Dearborn Chapter of the American Advertising Federation

Activities: Professional

- SEAL Energy Development Corporation 2013-2014

- Price Waterhouse Copper- seminar in business communication conducted for administrative assistants. June 2012.

- Concours d' Elegance of America – communications consultant. May to October 2012

- Children's Hospital of Michigan Foundation- Internal and external communications consultant January – May 2012

- Vista Maria June 2009 to August 2011

- Keiper Corporation, sales seminar conducted through UM - Dearborn SOM, April 2009

- Detroit International Auto Salon – communications consultant, March 2009 - present

RESEARCH ASSOCIATE

iLabs, The University of Michigan - Dearborn, School of Management,

Fairlane Center South,

19000 Hubbard Drive

High-Quality Connections in the Business Classroom

Dearborn, Michigan 48126- 2638

313-583-6465

http://www.umdilabs.com/casestudies/documents/CDMR%20Benchmark%20Study.pdf

And:

Center for Defense Management Reform

Naval Postgraduate School
555 Dyer Road, Ingersoll Hall, IN-320, Monterey, CA 93950
Tel: (831) 656-3487   Fax: (831) 656-2253
http://www.defensereform.org/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=35&Itemid=38&

82e46bd00b6d9c71d8715407e903ab94=815a81b964407d9df19986a2d4ab8c02

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

Full Time Employment Experience

Reserve Brain, LLC Consulting, Farmington Hills, Michigan   May 2007 – present

This is a consultancy created to deliver thought and communications products to businesses. This organization was created to service both the public non-profits, private and educational sectors of the community.

Absolute Multimedia, Inc. Winding Road, Austin, TX January 2006 to March 2008

Consultant and Midwest Sales Director

Internet Publishing, Communications, Marketing Management and Sales and Sales Management – Write proposals, make presentations, and manage the Midwest Sales Territory for a start-up company. Winding Road is a digital automotive enthusiast's magazine. Responsibilities encompass all auto manufacturers in the Midwest and a geographical territory.

The Wall Street Journal, Dow Jones, Inc. NY, NY   August 2004 to December 2005

Manager, Marketing, Advertising

Newspaper Publishing, Communications, Marketing and Sales for the *Wall Street Journal* - Newspaper Publishing, Marketing and Sales for *The Wall Street Journal,* wrote a proposal, letters, produced and developed presentations memos and reports. Office sales of $18 million, personal sales are over being $11 million. Major accounts are Cadillac, Audi, General Motors, Hummer, Chevrolet, DaimlerChrysler, *increased 2005 first half revenues by 18%.*

American Express Publishing, NY, NY   February 2001 to August 2004
Midwest Advertising Manager -- Magazine Publishing, Communications, Marketing Management and Sales and Sales Management – Wrote proposals, developed and wrote presentations, letters and managed two people and responsible for approximately $4M in Detroit Advertising Revenue for Travel and Leisure, Travel and Leisure Family and T&L Golf, supervise a staff of four.

American Media, Inc. Southfield, Michigan   May 2000 to January 2001

VP Digital Media /Publisher / National Sales Director

Internet and Magazine Publishing, Communications, Marketing Management and Sales and Sales Management – Wrote proposals, developed letters, memos, reports and managed eight people, wrote the business plan, this was a dual position, combining corporate print sales and digital media, along with responsibility for *Auto World Weekly*. Responsible for $1.5 million in sales revenue, Publisher with an account list directed sales staff strategies, development and assisted and made key client presentations.

Hachette Filipacchi New Media New York, NY   August 1999 to May 2000
Midwest Communications Manager, Digital
Internet and Magazine Publishing, Communications, Marketing Management and Sales and Sales Management - – Wrote proposals, made presentations Responsible for the representation of all Hachette Filipacchi Magazines online titles to automotive accounts in Detroit; secured first major GM up front buy $1MM for 2000.

535 Groups and H&M Group, Communications West Bloomfield, Mi.

President March 1993-August 1999

This is a communications company, advertising, market strategies' and tactics, responsible for corporate communications internally and externally, for multi-million dollar corporations. Owned and managed The 535 Group, Inc.; this advertising agency was started from scratch; developed strategic communications programs, business plans and implemented advertising, public relations and affinity-marketing programs for clients; responsible for the agency client acquisition, strategic client positioning. Agency gross revenues exceeded $1.5MM.

Client roster: Credit Counseling Centers, Inc., Bar's Leaks, Ligne Roset Furniture, Classic Design Concepts, Meredith Publishing, Mature Outlook Magazine, Woven Treasures, My Bakery, Detroit Institute of Ophthalmology, trans2 Corporation (an electric car company), StarCraft Automotive, Dale Carnegie Training, See-Me Lights Corporation, and Green Lake Communications.

Corporate Detroit Magazine   Southfield, Mi.   November 1989 - March 1993
Publisher, Business Journal Publishing
Magazine publishing, Columnist, Writer, a Communications, Marketing Management and Sales and Sales Management - Wrote proposals, and made presentations for this magazine. Corporate Detroit Magazine is a city and regional business publication.   Responsible for the bottom line; created and developed a new market position for the magazine, *managed a hired, organized, trained and developed a 15-person staff of advertising sales, marketing, editorial and administrative personnel;* also the author of several editorial columns every month in the magazine. Increased market share 30% in two years.

Crain Communications, Inc. Detroit, Mi.   October 1979 - November 1989

AutoWeek Magazine Associate Publisher, Advertising Director

Magazine publishing, a Communications, Marketing Management and Sales and Sales Management - *AutoWeek* is a national automobile enthusiast's weekly magazine. *AutoWeek* is Crain Communications, Inc., largest and third highest revenue producing the publication. Highlights: Increased advertising revenues from $1 million to $18 million in 11 years. I developed marketing, promotional, communications programs and events for the magazine. *Managed and defined staff job descriptions, set goals, objectives and provided annual evaluations for 12-15 employees.*

- *AutoWeek* Territory Salesman, Ad Manager *AutoWeek* Magazine 1981- 1983

- *AutoWeek* Telemarketing Salesman, *AutoWeek* Magazine   1979 -1981

PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATIONS,
Community and Charitable Activities
Association for Business Communication, http://www.businesscommunication.org/

SIG Rhetoric Committee, Co-Chairperson

High-Quality Connections in the Business Classroom

Business Liaison Committee - Statement of Purpose

The *Business Liaison Committee* (BLC) of SIG Rhetoric is a bridge between the practical and theoretical study of business rhetoric in the workplace.

This committee's focus is to query and involve the business community in the substance and discussion of the rhetoric of business communication. We connect pressing rhetorical issues in business communications and provide possible solutions to business. All rhetorical issues that surround the discipline of business communications are open for discussion; email overload, current research on proposal creation rhetoric, team rhetoric, and using communications consultants. BLC finds effective links between business (practical) and research (theoretical) and invites the business community into the inner sanctum of research to help solve real-world business communications issues.

- International Association of Business Communicators, http://www.iabc.com/
- National Council of English Teachers http://www.ncte.org/
- Adcraft of Detroit, September 1979 to present
  http://www.adcraft.org/i4a/pages/index.cfm?pageid=1

DIRECTORSHIPS, CONSULTANCIES--
COMMUNITY AND CHARITABLE INVOLVEMENT
January 2008 – September 2008

Communications and marketing consultant to the Woodward Avenue Dream Cruise; This one-day event is the largest single-day automotive event, attracting over 1.5 million people and 40,000 classic automobiles.

www.woodwarddreamcruise.com

March 1973 - present

Board Member and Director of Communications RHEMA INTERNATIONAL Medical Relief Agency to Haiti, ***Rhema, International*** is an IRS recognized 501C3, non-profit medical organization servicing the island of Haiti in the Bocazel region. I am a member of the board of directors, and as such, I act as the communications director. My work directly relates to the classroom in similar ways to my professional experience. I interface with the community and oversee the communications effort with donors and sponsors and other constituencies, media and broadcast.

www.rhemainternational.org

Other Professional Community Recognition

- Diversity in the Workplace, Is Business the Channel for Social Change? Steering Committee Difficult Dialogues-Ford Foundation Grant. In-service work at the University of Michigan-Dearborn – Difficult Dialogues, as part of a Ford Foundation Grant given to the University and developed in the School of Management. Colleague Joy Beatty and I developed a lecture that was attended by 350 students, faculty and business people discussing diversity in the workplace. Guest panelists and speakers; Dennis Archer, former mayor the City of Detroit, Ron Gettelfinger, president of the United Auto Workers Union, and Steve Moore, editorial page, economics editor, The Wall Street Journal.

- http://www.umd.umich.edu/nc/fullstory/article/diversity-in-the-workplace/

- http://www.umd.umich.edu/fileadmin/template/ia/files/University%20Relations/Reporter%20PDFs/2007/021207REP.pdf

- Difficult Dialogues, Video Presentation

  http://www-personal.umd.umich.edu/~thartge/Difficult_Dialog.html

- Volunteer of the Month the Detroit Free Press September 2004

- http://www.umich.edu/~urecord/0405/Nov22_04/accolades.shtml

- http://www.umd.umich.edu/595001/?cx=005063787326091876979%3Axs31umdphaw&cof=FORID%3A11&ie=UTF-8&q=Tim+Hartge#1020