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Abstract

An increasing number of community colleges in the United States are becoming baccalaureate-granting institutions. Proponents of the community college baccalaureate (CCB) argue that the CCB provides students with access to higher education, while others argue the CCB will compromise the community college’s core values.

The purpose of this study is to explore faculty members’ intention to support the CCB transition. Ajzen’s Theory of Planned Behavior provides the theoretical framework for the study. The theory assumes that changes in behavior are intentional and, therefore, can be planned. This theory posits that attitudes, subjective (social) norms, and perceived behavioral control predict intentions to support a behavior and, ultimately, to behave in a certain way.

Full-time faculty members from two community colleges in Florida were invited to participate in the Web-based survey; 95 of the 317 faculty members invited to participate in the study chose to complete the survey, representing a 30% response rate. Pearson product-moment correlations were calculated among the direct measures and their underlying beliefs indicate significant relationships among (a) attitude and behavioral beliefs ($r = .46, p = .01$) and (b) subjective norms and normative beliefs ($r = .48, p = .01$). Correlation analysis among the direct measures and behavioral intention indicate significant relationships among (a) attitude and behavioral beliefs ($r = .82, p =
.01), (b) subjective norms and normative beliefs \( (r = .22, p = .05) \), and (c) perceived behavioral control and behavioral intention \( (r = .34, p = .01) \).

The multiple linear regression analysis indicated the linear combination of attitude, subjective norms and perceived behavioral control account for 69% of the variability in faculty members’ intention to support the CCB transition, with greatest the contribution from perceived behavioral control, \( (b = .87) \), followed by attitude \( (b = .22) \), and subjective norms contributing the least \( (b = .05) \).

The findings from this study can be used to reflect upon CCB transitions that have already occurred or are in process. In addition, the findings can inform future efforts by community colleges to develop more effective and efficient processes for making the transition to CCB institutions. Lastly, the findings provide insight of the CCB transition from a faculty members’ perspective, as well as to contribute to existing literature on the theory of planned behavior.
Chapter 1:
Introduction

The community college system in the United States has existed since 1901 (Walker, 2005), and throughout its history it has undergone significant changes. One of the most recent changes, the transition to a community college baccalaureate system, has created controversy among educational leaders, politicians, business leaders, students and policy makers. Those who support two-year colleges becoming baccalaureate-granting institutions, for example, argue that community colleges can provide students with access to baccalaureate degrees in high-demand fields, at an affordable price (Walker, 2005). Walker (2005) reports that those who oppose the movement argue that the community college “core values of open-door access, learner-centeredness, affordability, convenience, and responsiveness” will be compromised (p. 19).

Although the conflicting perspectives surrounding the community college baccalaureate (CCB) have not been addressed adequately (Floyd, 2005), community colleges throughout the United States and Canada are proceeding with the baccalaureate transition. George Boggs, former president of the American Association of Community Colleges, contends that faculty “strifes” represent one of the key concerns for community colleges as they transition to four-year institutions (Lane, 2003). Boggs questions how community colleges can create a cohesive group of faculty when the CCB has the potential to divide faculty into two tiers: upper- and lower-division faculty. A former
president of a northwestern state college adds that reconciling faculty disagreements has been one of the greatest CCB challenges (Lane, 2003).

While research on the CCB has explored the CCB transition from both an administrative perspective (Burrows, 2003; Floyd, 2005; Petry, 2006) and a student perspective (Caporrimo, 2008), the literature lacks meaningful research from a faculty perspective. What is lacking is research exploring faculty concerns and how these concerns can be addressed to facilitate the CCB transition. This study attempts to address this gap by exploring faculty members’ attitudes toward community colleges’ transitions to the baccalaureate degree-granting institutions. This study is contextualized in the Florida baccalaureate movement.

Community colleges transitioning to baccalaureate-granting institutions involve a number of significant changes. Changes in the community college system typically effect classroom practices and require the support of faculty to be successful (Latiolais, Holland, & Sutter, 2009). The effects of the transition to the baccalaureate will similarly impact the community college classrooms and, therefore, require faculty members’ support to be successful. Based upon the history of previous changes, such support is not always forthcoming. In fact, faculty have, at times, undermined change efforts, especially changes related to the work environment (Bolman, 2003).

The theory of planned behavior has been used in a number of contexts to study how people negotiate expectations of behavioral change (c.f., health, Schifter, 1985; leisure activities, Ajzen, 1992; alcohol consumption, Huchting, Andrew, and LaBrie, 2008; education, Kalivoda, 2003; and marketing, King, 2008; see Figure 1).
The theory assumes that changes in behavior are intentional and, therefore, can be planned. This theory posits that attitudes, subjective (social) norms, and perceived behavioral control predict intentions to support a behavior and, ultimately, to behave in a certain way. Each of these constructs “reveals a different aspect of behavior, and each can serve as a point of attack in attempts to change it” (Ajzen, 1991, p. 206). Knowledge about the predictive factors from the theory of planned behavior is used to design interventions that can shape the intentions toward more desirable behaviors (Sauter, 2003). According to Francis et al. (2004), “[a]lthough there is not a perfect relationship between behavioural intention and actual behaviour, intention can be used as a proximal measure of behaviour” (p. 8).

![Model of theory of planned behavior (Ajzen, 1991).](image)

In the context of this research, the theory of planned behavior provides a framework for studying faculty members’ intentions toward the CCB transition. In particular, this study will explore faculty members’ attitudes toward the transition to college baccalaureates, not faculty members’ actual behavior. Intentions to support the transition will be determined by faculty members’ attitudes, subjective norms, and perceived behavioral control in the context of changes to their work environment which
result from the CCB transition. In the tradition of previous studies using the theory of planned behavior, an elicitation questionnaire and a final survey were used to elicit faculty members’ beliefs and intentions; thus, actual behavior was not be the focus of this study. Data were analyzed using cross products, correlations, and regression analyses.

The following sections begin with a statement of the problem and are followed by the significance of the study, purpose of the study, research questions, limitations of the study, assumptions made in conducting this study, and definition of terms to ensure a shared understanding of the vocabulary and concepts in this study. These sections conclude with a summary of Chapter 1.

**Statement of the Problem**

Changes in academia typically occur as follows: administrators and policy makers formulate decisions to implement organizational change and then inform faculty members about these decisions. Faculty members, in turn, adapt the implications of the decisions for the classroom. Research indicates that faculties often resist such organizational changes and this resistance negatively impacts change efforts. One of the reasons that faculty members resist such changes may be that they perceive that these changes will require additional skills that they may not have. Furthermore, faculty members may agree with the critics who argue that the CCB transition will compromise the community college’s core values (e.g., open-door access, learner-centeredness, affordability, convenience, and responsiveness). The CCB transition, inevitably, will require more advanced knowledge and skills as community colleges extend their missions to include upper-division coursework. Thus, faculty members may resist the transition to community college baccalaureate systems (Bolman, 2003).
Significance of the Study

The significance of this study is threefold: (1) it can inform the literature base on the CCB, (2) it can provide insights into how to include faculty members in the CCB transition process and, thereby, improve its success, and (3) it can test the model of the theory of planned behavior to determine if the theory can predict faculty members’ intention to support the CCB transition. The CCB literature recognizes that faculty members’ perspectives are typically not considered in research on the CCB transition. This study addressed this gap by focusing on faculty members’ intentions toward the CCB transition. Faculty members are viewed as the change agents for the classroom, as well as for the institution (Rouseff-Baker, 2002); therefore, it is important to understand faculty members’ perspectives toward the CCB transition and to gain their support.

An understanding of faculty members’ perspectives and what factors shape their intentions toward the CCB will help community colleges to develop interventions that can gain faculty members’ support for the CCB transition.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to use the theory of planned behavior to explore faculty members’ intentions toward their community college’s transition to a CCB institution. The study was contextualized in the Florida college system. It was expected that faculty members’ perceptions would yield insights into their intentions toward supporting the CCB transition (Bolman, 2003). The findings from this study can then be used to reflect upon CCB transitions that have already occurred or are in process. In addition, the findings can inform future efforts by community colleges to develop more effective and efficient processes for making the transition to CCB institutions.
Hypotheses

When placed in the context of the theory of planned behavior, the following hypotheses guide the study:

Hypothesis 1  Behavioral Beliefs about the CCB transition are significantly associated with Attitudes toward the CCB transition.

Hypothesis 2  Normative Beliefs about the CCB transition are significantly associated with Subjective Norms about the CCB transition.

Hypothesis 3  Control Beliefs about the CCB transition are significantly associated with Perceived Behavioral Control about the CCB transition.

Hypothesis 4  Faculty members’ Attitudes about the CCB transition are significantly associated with their behavioral Intentions to support the CCB transition.

Hypothesis 5  Faculty members’ Subjective Norms about the CCB transition are significantly associated with their behavioral Intentions to support the CCB transition.

Hypothesis 6  Faculty members’ Perceived Behavioral Control over the CCB transition are significantly associated with their behavioral Intentions to support the CCB transition.

Hypothesis 7  Attitude, Subjective Norms, and Perceived Behavioral Control predict faculty members’ behavioral intention to support the CCB transition.
The research questions are stated as hypotheses because “a hypothesis forces us to think more deeply and specifically about the possible outcomes of a study” than research questions (Fraenkel & Wallen, 2003, p. 45). Figure 2 presents the hypotheses as related to the theory of planned behavior framework.

Figure 2. Theory of planned behavior and hypotheses.

**Limitations of the Study**

The researcher has identified the following limitations to this study:

1. An increasing number of Florida colleges are moving to baccalaureate-granting institutions; therefore, this study provides only a snapshot of the Florida college system. Therefore, results may not be generalizable to community colleges in other states.

2. The researcher collected data from faculty members at public, two-year institutions in Florida. There is a possibility that faculty members did not want to participate in the study.

3. This study explored faculty members’ attitudes toward the transition to college baccalaureates, not faculty members’ actual behavior.
Limitations of the theory of planned behavior.

1. Factors such as personality and demographic variables were not taken into consideration.
2. There is much ambiguity regarding how to define perceived behavioral control and this ambiguity creates measurement problems.
3. The assumption was made that perceived behavioral control predicts actual behavioral control. This may not always be the case.
4. The theory of planned behavior only works when some aspect of the behavior is not under volitional control.
5. The longer the time interval between behavioral intent and behavior, the less likely the behavior will occur.
6. The theory is based on the assumption that human beings are rational and make systematic decisions based on available information. Unconscious motives are not considered.

Assumptions

1. The researcher assumed that faculty members would answer the survey questions honestly.
2. The CCB transition was a timely issue for Florida colleges and faculty members; therefore, they would be willing to participate in the study.
3. Since access to the Internet has increased dramatically and since colleges utilize the Internet for communication with faculty members, the researcher assumed that faculty members would be more inclined to respond to a Web-based survey, as opposed to a traditional mail survey (Kiernan, 2005).
Definition of Terms

*Attitude* is defined as “the degree to which a person has a favorable or unfavorable evaluation or appraisal of the behavior in question” (Ajzen, 1991, p. 188).

*Baccalaureate degree*: a degree conferred by a college or university to a person who has completed a 4- or 5-year program of study or its equivalent (Floyd & Skilnik, 2005).

*Behavior* is defined as “an action that is carried out at a specified time and is described in terms of the action itself, its target, and the context” (Francis et al., 2004, p. 32).

*Behavioral beliefs*: an individual’s perceived consequences of an action (Francis et al., 2004).

*Content analysis* is the “[q]ualitative analysis of verbal data to discover the underlying topics or themes. References to these themes are often then counted to determine the most frequently mentioned themes” (Francis et al., 2004, p. 32).

*Control beliefs*: “beliefs about the likelihood that one possesses the resources and opportunities thought necessary to execute the behavior” (Francis et al., 2004, p. 32).

*Community college* has been defined by Cohen and Brawer (2003) as “…any institution regionally accredited to award the associate in arts or the associate science as its highest degree” (p. 5). However, as some community colleges expand their mission to become baccalaureate-granting institutions, the definition of the community college may change.

*Community college baccalaureate (CCB)* is a “degree granted by postsecondary institutions approved for associate degree awards with the addition of limited
baccalaureate degree approval in specialized fields” (Floyd & Walker, 2009, p. 101).

*Elicitation study* is defined by Ajzen and Fishbien as “a qualitative investigation of a subset of a population under investigation, to discover the salient behavioural, normative and control beliefs about the behaviour” (Francis et al., 2004, p. 32).

*Endpoints* are defined as “[v]erbal labels that are written at each end of a row of numbers to indicate the meanings of the most extreme numbers” (Francis et al., 2004, p. 32).

*Intention:* “a person’s motivation in the senses of his or her conscious plan to exert effort to carry out a behaviour” (Francis et al., 2004, p. 32).

*Internal consistency:* “A statistic for assessing the equivalence of different items in a scale. It is appropriate for measuring the reliability of a scale composed of multiple items, if it is valid to assume that the items are parallel measures of the same attitude content domain” (Francis et al., 2004, p. 33). According to Francis et al., items need an internal consistency co-efficient > 0.6 to be included in the study.

*Florida College System* “…is comprised of 28 two-year and four-year public institutions. Based on their mission, level of accreditation and appropriate authorization, the colleges within the system offer Bachelor’s degrees, Associate degrees, career and technical certifications, developmental/remedial studies, and/or adult education” (Florida Legislature, 2008, p. 2).

*Motivation to comply:* “The extent to which a person feels inclined to match his or her behaviour to various sources of social pressure” (Francis et al., 2004, p. 32).

*Multiple regression:* “A quantitative analytic procedure that either simultaneously or cumulatively assesses correlations between a number of independent variables and one
dependent variable” (Francis et al., 2004, p. 32).

*Non-traditional student* is defined by Eric J. Smith, Commissioner of the Florida Department of Education (2008) as “…students over 25, working full-time or who have dependent children” (p. 1).

*Normative beliefs* are the “perceptions of significant others’ preferences about whether one should perform a behavior” (Francis et al., 2004, p. 32).

Norms descriptive: “Perceptions about what important people actually do”

injunctive: “Perceptions about what important people think a person should do”

subjective: “Perceived social pressure to perform a behaviour” (Francis et al., 2004, p. 32).

*Outcome evaluations*: “evaluation of the perceived consequences of an action” (Francis et al., 2004, p. 33).

*Perceived behavioral control*: “perceptions about how easy or difficult it is to perform the behaviour” (Francis et al., 2004, p. 33).

*Reliability*: “A property of a measuring instrument, indicating the extent to which it yields consistent results over repeated observations” (Francis et al., 2004, p. 33).

*Self-efficacy*: “The conviction that one can successfully execute a given behaviour” (Francis et al., 2004, p. 33).

*Subjective norms*: “a person’s own estimate of the social pressure to perform or not perform the target behaviour” (Francis et al., 2004, p. 9).

*TACT principle* is a description of behavior in terms of its target, the action itself, the context in which it is performed, and when it is performed (Francis et al., 2004).
Test-retest: “A procedure for determining the extent to which scores from an instrument are reliable over time by correlating the scores from two administrations of the same instrument to the same individuals” (Fraenkel & Wallen, 2003, pp. 1-8).

Theory of planned behavior states the intent to perform a behavior is dependent on the “individual’s attitude toward the behavior, subjective norms about the behavior, and perceived behavioral control over the behavior” (Ajzen, 1991).

Validity: “A property of measuring instruments or of responses, indicating the extent to which they measure what they are supposed to measure” (Francis et al., 2004, p. 33).

Organization of Study

This dissertation includes four additional sections. The first section is a review of the literature related to the CCB movement. This section contains the history of the community college and the community college baccalaureate. The second section describes the research methods for the study, sample population, instrument, and pilot test. The results of the data analysis were presented in the third section. The final section included a discussion of the results and recommendations for future research study.

Summary of Chapter 1

With an increased demand for access to higher education throughout the United States, community colleges are experiencing vertical extensions (Burrows, 2003). This emerging trend has created controversy among educational leaders, politicians, business leaders, students and policy makers (Floyd & Skolnik, 2005). The CCB is a relatively recent development, and, therefore, will continue to create new challenges and opportunities for higher education. Current literature focuses on the CCB from an
administrative or student perspective, while minimal research derives from the faculty members’ perspective. To improve comprehension of the impact that the baccalaureate movement has on faculty members and how this impact affects faculty members’ intentions to support the movement, it is important that more research be conducted from a faculty member’s perspective. The theory of planned behavior provides a theoretical and conceptual framework for this study. The purpose of this study was to explore faculty members’ intentions regarding the CCB transition. The findings from this study can then be used to inform the process of the CCB transition to ensure the support of faculty members.
Chapter 2:  
Literature Review

The literature review provides a framework for this study. The literature review begins with an overview of the community college system and how the baccalaureate movement fits within this system. The second section situates the community college baccalaureate (CCB) movement within the Florida community colleges. The third section reviews the theory of planned behavior to create a methodological framework for exploring faculty members’ intentions to support the community college baccalaureate transition at Florida community colleges. The application of the theory of planned behavior in the context of this study is embedded within the discussion of the theory.

The Baccalaureate within the Community College System

The Community College Baccalaureate (CCB) affords students the opportunity to continue with their advanced education and to achieve an undergraduate degree in a community college setting. Economic demands for a higher educated workforce, as well as increased educational demands by non-traditional college-aged students, make the community college baccalaureate a viable option for higher education (Florida Department of Education, 2008b; Florida Legislature, 2008).

**History of the community college.** In 1901, the first public community college, Joliet Junior College, was established in Illinois. Joliet was designed to accommodate students who wanted a higher education but did not want to leave their community (Joliet
Junior College, 2007). The purpose of community colleges (once called junior colleges) was to provide the first two years of a four-year college education (Bailey & Morest, 2004). The role of the community college, however, evolved as the needs of the community changed. For example, after WWII, the community college expanded its mission to include retraining the surge of veterans to acquire new skills so that they could re-enter the workforce. Altbach (2005) contends that “after WWII the GI Bill led to the greatest and most sustained period of growth in American higher education” (p. 288).

From the late 1950s to the 1980s community colleges experienced an almost 400% growth in enrollment (Vaughan, 1982; Manias, 2007). An increase of under-prepared students accompanied this influx, spurring the need for expanding remedial education. The introduction of non-credit courses created the next significant expansion in community colleges. Bailey and Morest (2004) contend that non-credit courses are available in a “bewildering plethora of areas (including purely avocational interests), small business development, and even economic forecasting” (p. 2). The 1990s was marked by colleges expanding into distance education. The concept of being able to attend classes that are available “any time, any place” appealed to time- and place-bound students. The most significant change community colleges have experienced in the 21st century has been the transition of community colleges to baccalaureate-granting institutions.

**History of the community college baccalaureate.** According to the American Association of State Colleges and Universities (2004), the community college baccalaureate evolved in response to the following concerns: (a) increased demand by nontraditional students who are time- and place-bound, (b) increased labor market
demand in specialized fields (e.g., health care and education), (c) increased demand in specific geographic areas, (d) increased demand for new kinds of baccalaureate degrees in applied and technical fields, (e) overcrowded four-year campuses, with demands exceeding capacity, and (f) limited higher education resources. In response to these concerns, community colleges and universities have collaborated to implement delivery models (e.g., articulation model, university center model, university extension models, CCB; Floyd & Skolnik, 2005) to increase access to higher education:

As the economic landscape changes both nationally and internationally, the necessity of preparing citizens to compete in a global market becomes critical. The expansion of the community college mission to include a baccalaureate degree option paves the way for specific populations served by these institutions to access further education in a cost-effective manner to meet the needs of today’s workforce and to more readily compete in an increasingly globalized market. Several of Florida’s community colleges, like those around the nation, have broadened their mission to meet the growing education demands of the state. Some institutions are developing new baccalaureate programs while maintaining their commitments to providing open access, developmental education, workforce training, service to their surrounding communities, and awarding associate degrees for transfer to four-year institutions (Florida Department of Education, 2008a, p. 1).

Community Colleges in several states—Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Indiana, Massachusetts, Nevada, New Mexico, New York, North Dakota, Texas, Utah, Vermont, Washington, and West Virginia—offer baccalaureate degrees. Although public community colleges are offering baccalaureate programs, they lag behind the number of independent community colleges that offer such programs. At the time of this writing, 18 of the 28 Florida community colleges offer bachelor’s of art, bachelor’s of science, and bachelor’s of applied science. The community colleges include: Broward College, Chipola College, College of Central Florida, Daytona State College, Edison State College, Florida State College at Jacksonville, Gulf Coast Community College, Indian River State College, Miami Dade College, Northwest Florida State College, Palm Beach

Community colleges in Florida are in the forefront of developing baccalaureate programs to meet the critical needs of the state in areas of teacher preparation, nursing, and applied sciences to supplement the crop of professionals that colleges and universities are already producing (Florida Department of Education, 2008a, p. 2).

The following section reviews the historical timeline of the community college baccalaureate movement in Florida.

The baccalaureate movement within the Florida community college system.

In 1998, the State Board of Community Colleges, the Postsecondary Education Planning Commission (PEPC) and the Senate Education Committee found that access to the baccalaureate in Florida had become a major issue for many community college students. These students found, for example, that continuing their baccalaureate education at a university would result in major disruptions in their personal and professional lives, such as relocation and greater financial burdens to pay for a university baccalaureate. The State Board, PEPC and the Florida senate recognized that community colleges could potentially reduce the disruptions for students by providing baccalaureates at community colleges (Florida Department of Education, 2008a).

In 1999, the Florida legislature passed a bill allowing Florida community colleges to offer baccalaureate programs. Two years later, in 2001, Senate Bill 1162 was passed: “Section 35 of Senate Bill 1162 established a process by which community colleges can petition the Florida Board of Education for authorization to offer baccalaureate programs in high-demand areas of workforce need” (Burrows, 2003, p. 7). Senate Bill 1162 also
reestablished St. Petersburg Junior College as St. Petersburg College. The college was
given $1,000,000 toward developing baccalaureate programs in high-need areas such as
education, nursing and applied sciences (Burrows, 2003; Plecha, 2007). As of Fall 2010,
St. Petersburg College offered 24 bachelor’s degrees in these areas.

In 2002, Chipola Community College and Miami Dade Community College were
granted approval by the Florida State Board to confer baccalaureate degrees. Chipola
developed the following program areas: secondary education in mathematics and science.
Miami Dade developed program areas in exceptional student education and secondary
education in mathematics and science. In 2003 Okaloosa-Walton was granted approval
by the Florida State Board to confer baccalaureate degrees in project and acquisitions
management. In 2005, Daytona Beach Community College and Edison Community
College were granted baccalaureate programs in management and supervision and public
safety management, respectively. During the same year, the State Board of Education
initiated a new process for approving community college baccalaureate proposals. By
2006, 30 baccalaureate degrees were approved. By 2010, 20 community colleges were
approved to offer degrees in the following critical-needs areas: education, nursing, and
applied sciences.

In 2004, 123 students graduated from St. Petersburg College, the first in the
Florida baccalaureate program. Since then, the cumulative number who have graduated
from all Florida community colleges conferring baccalaureate degrees has risen from the
initial 123 to 569 by 2007 (Florida Department of Education, 2008a).
The Florida baccalaureate pilot program. In June 2008, Governor Crist signed what is being called “landmark legislation” whereby he created the Florida College System for the purpose of improving local access to higher education for students (Walker, 2008). The 2008 Florida Legislature passed Senate Bill 1716 (see Figure 3) to unify the individual community college baccalaureate efforts under the umbrella of the “State College Pilot Project.” Nine colleges participated: Chipola College, Daytona State College, Edison State College, Indian River State College, Miami Dade College, Northwest Florida State College, Polk College, Santa Fe College, and St. Petersburg College (Florida Legislature, 2008). The Florida Legislature articulated the following vision and rationale for the pilot program:

The vision for state colleges in Florida is to ignite Florida’s long-term economic potential by providing Florida residents with readily available means to maximize their own productivity through higher education. The Florida College System has grown over time to become the state’s foremost resource for postsecondary academic and workforce credentials including the Associate in Arts, Associate in Science, Associate in Applied Science degrees, selected baccalaureate degrees, and many workforce certificates (Florida Legislature, 2008, p. 2).

One of the guiding principles that community colleges are expected to follow concerns faculty members’ philosophy toward teaching lower- and upper-division courses. Specifically, faculty members are expected to maintain a “one faculty” philosophy, which requires that all courses be treated equally within a community college. This principle was included to avert the possibility of a two-tiered system (Florida Legislature, 2008, p. 4). Critics of the CCB, however, indicate that this may not be achieved.
Senate Bill 1716. Senate Bill 1716, Section 1004.875, requires that institutions participating in the pilot project shall:

(a) Maintain, as the institution's primary mission, responsibility for responding to community needs for postsecondary academic education and career degree education as prescribed in s. 1004.65(6), Florida Statutes.

(b) Maintain an open-door admissions policy for associate level degree programs and workforce education programs.

(c) Require, as a condition of admission to upper-division programs, successful completion of the college-level communication and mathematics skills examination established pursuant to s. 1008.29, Florida Statutes, unless the student has been awarded an associate degree from a community college or state university.

(d) Continue to provide outreach to underserved populations.

(e) Continue to provide remedial education.

(f) Comply with all provisions of the statewide articulation agreement which relate to 2-year and 4-year public degree-granting institutions as adopted by the State Board of Education pursuant to s. 1007.23, Florida Statutes.

(g) Be prohibited from awarding graduate credit or graduate 126 degrees.

(h) Be prohibited from participating in intercollegiate athletics beyond the 2-year level.

(i) Deliver the programs and services in providing associate and baccalaureate degrees in a cost-effective manner that demonstrates substantial savings to the student and the state over the cost of providing the degree at a state university (2008).

Figure 3. Senate Bill 1716, State College Pilot Project.
**Challenges presented by the CCB.** Although adaptability to change is a hallmark of community colleges, change has seldom come without controversy from faculty members. Faculty members’ attitudes have generally ranged from “indifferent-to-hostile” (Altbach, Gumport, & Johnstone, 2001). Faculty issues at the community college have revolved around institutional expectations and around concern that they may not be able or may not wish to meet institutional expectations. For example, faculty members who perceive that they lack the skills and confidence to implement changes in expectations may resist the change efforts (Bolman, 2003).

Some of faculty members’ concerns regarding changes in expectations focus on new expectations dictated by a more demanding work environment. Whereas community college faculty members have chosen to work in a community college because they don’t have to conduct research, publish, and are a part of a local community, baccalaureate-faculty members have additional responsibilities and become part of a national community of scholars. (Townsend, 2005) Furthermore, faculty members “who teach at community colleges are committed first and foremost to teaching and to enabling many students who would not traditionally be viewed as ‘college material’ to succeed” (p 51). Townsend (2005), in a study of community college faculty members, found that they preferred teaching at the community college level because doing so “enables them comfortably to achieve professional fulfillment, sometimes combined with raising a family” (Townsend, 1998, p. 660). In addition, “for many women faculty, teaching full-time in a two-year college is the ideal employment because it enables them to “combine having a career and raising a family” (p. 49).
Another concern expressed by faculty members is the emergence of a multi-tiered system whereby higher-division faculty members will receive greater benefits than lower-division faculty (Seidam, 1985). Grubb (2005) found “status distinctions between career and academic faculty members” (p. 4). Specifically, “transferrable education remains the highest-status activity in most 2-year campuses and academic faculty tend to dominate faculty leadership and administrator ranks” (p. 4). A complementary concern to the multi-tier system focuses on faculty members’ credentials. That is, baccalaureate faculty members are required by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools to have a doctorate in the discipline or master’s degree in the discipline, or a master’s degree with 18 graduate hours in the discipline. Furthermore, at least 25% of the baccalaureate-level courses must be taught by faculty members with a terminal degree (Pappas Consulting, 2001).

Community college faculty members may find that the cost and time needed to meet the requirements to teach upper-level courses as a barrier to pursuing additional education. Conversely, faculty members with such credentials may demand higher salaries and resist teaching lower-division courses (Laden, 2005).

**Summary of the CCB.** The CCB represents an effort to meet local economic and educational needs. According to the Florida Legislature (2008), the CCB is expected to bolster and

...support Florida’s economic productivity and competitiveness by increasing access to affordable baccalaureate degrees, thus helping to supply the projected 2.15 million baccalaureate graduates needed to bring Florida to the level of the 10 most productive states by 2027 (Florida Legislature, 2008, p. 3).

Florida community colleges are leading the nation in broadening their mission to meet the emerging needs of the state. This effort, however, is not without criticism.
Specifically, faculty members’ attitudes toward supporting the CCB have been identified as a potential factor that may undermine the success of the CCB. The following section reviews the theory of planned behavior as a potential framework for exploring faculty members’ attitudes toward supporting the CCB.

Theory of Planned Behavior

The theory of planned behavior (Ajzen, 2009) is an extension of the theory of reasoned action (Ajzen, 2009), which has been used as a psychological model to predict a person's behavior. Whereas the theory of reasoned action examines attitudinal and normative factors that influence a person’s intention to perform a behavior, the theory of planned behavior (see Figure 4) adds a third construct: perceived behavioral control, which originates with Bandura’s theory of self-efficacy. The rationale for adding the third construct lies in the understanding that behavior is influenced by people’s confidence in their ability to perform the behavior.

In both theories, intention is used to predict behavior. In this study, the theory of planned behavior provides a theoretical framework for exploring members’ perceptions toward the CCB transition and how these perceptions shape members’ intentions and behaviors toward the CCB transition. That is, by understanding members’ perceptions and intentions toward the CCB transition, we may be able to better predict whether they intend to support the CCB transition.

Attitude, subjective norms, and perceived behavioral control represent direct measures of intention to perform a behavior. The theory of planned behavior also includes indirect measures concerning a person’s beliefs regarding these three constructs (see Figure 5). Specifically, people’s behavioral beliefs determine their attitudes toward a
behavior, their normative beliefs determine their subjective norms about the behavior, and individuals’ control beliefs determine their perceived behavioral control of the behavior. The following sections detail the indirect and direct measures in the theory.

Figure 4. Theories of reasoned action and planned behavior (Ajzen, 1991).

Behavioral beliefs and attitudes toward behavioral intention. Ajzen (1991) defines attitude as “the degree to which a person has a favorable or unfavorable evaluation or appraisal of the behavior in question” (p. 188). It is measured on a spectrum from favorable to unfavorable (Ajzen, 2006). A person’s attitude is determined by the beliefs a person holds concerning the behavior. These beliefs are decomposed into two dimensions: the belief (i.e., B) itself and a person’s evaluation of the outcomes (i.e., E) related to the behavior (Ajzen & Fishbein, 1980; see Figure 5). The strength of each belief (i.e., B = {b₁, …, bₘ}) is weighted by the evaluation of the outcome (i.e., E = {e₁, …, eₙ}) and the cross product (i.e., BxE; see Figure 5: Attitude) is summed to calculate the attitude score as shown in the following equation (Ajzen & Fishbein, 1980):

\[ \text{Attitude} = A \propto \sum b_i e_i \]
If faculty members, for example, believe that it is too costly to pursue further education, then they will be less likely to engage in education-related behaviors. Research has found that attitude is the strongest predictor of behavioral intentions ($r = .67, p < .001$, Sheppard, Hartwick, & Warshaw, 1988; $r = .49, p < .001$, Armitage & Conner, 2001).

In the context of this study, the behavior of interest is faculty members’ support of the CCB transition. The corresponding hypotheses become

**Hypothesis 1** Behavioral Beliefs about the CCB transition are significantly associated with Attitudes toward the CCB transition.

**Hypothesis 4** Faculty members’ Attitudes about the CCB transition are significantly associated with their behavioral Intentions to support the CCB transition.

**Normative beliefs and subjective norms about the behavioral intention.**

According to Ajzen (n.d.), “subjective norms” is defined as a person’s “perceived social pressure to engage or not engage in a behavior;” that is, the social pressure that a person experiences from important others to engage in a specific behavior. A person’s subjective norms are a function of a person’s normative beliefs (i.e., N) concerning how important others, such as family, friends, and colleagues perceive the behavior and how motivated the individual is to comply with these important others’ perceptions. In other words, it is the individual’s motivation to comply (e.g., M) with what important others
**Figure 5.** Direct and indirect measures of intention and behavior as adapted from Jeong, 2008.
perceive as the right or wrong thing to do (see Figure 5). The strength of each normative belief (i.e., $N = \{n_1, \ldots, n_m\}$) is weighted by the evaluation of the motivation to comply (i.e., $M = \{m_1, \ldots, m_n\}$) and the cross product (i.e., $N \times M$; see Figure 5: Subjective Norms) is summed to calculate the subjective norms score as shown in the following equation (Ajzen & Fishbein, 1980):

$$\text{Subjective Norms} = SN \propto \sum nb_i m_i$$

If faculty members, for example, believe that colleagues want them to support the baccalaureate transition and faculty members want to do what their colleagues perceive as important, then faculty members are more likely to support the CCB transition.

Research has found that subjective norms toward the behavior are the second strongest predictor of behavioral intentions ($r = .62, p < .001$, Sheppard, Hartwick, & Warshaw’s, 1988; $r = .34, p < .001$, Armitage & Conner, 2001).

In the context of this study, the behavior of interest is faculty members’ support of the CCB transition. The corresponding hypotheses become

Hypothesis 2  Normative Beliefs about the CCB transition are significantly associated with Subjective Norms about the CCB transition.

Hypothesis 5  Faculty members’ Subjective Norms about the CCB transition are significantly associated with their behavioral Intentions to support the CCB transition.

Control beliefs and perceived behavioral control over the behavioral intention. Ajzen (n.d.) defines perceived behavioral control as “people’s perceptions of their ability to perform a given behavior”; that is, whether people feel they have the skills and abilities to perform the behavior. A person’s perceived behavioral control is
determined by a set of control beliefs (i.e., C) “about the presence of factors that may facilitate or impede performance of the behavior” (Ajzen, n.d.) and the perceived power (i.e., P) a person has over each of these “control” factors (see Figure 5). The strength of each belief (i.e., $C = \{c_1, \ldots, c_m\}$) is weighted by the perceived power of the control factor (i.e., $P = \{p_1, \ldots, p_n\}$) and the cross product (i.e., $C \times P$; see Figure 5: Perceived Behavioral Control) is summed to calculate the perceived behavioral control score as shown in the following equation (Ajzen & Fishbein, 1980):

$$\text{Perceived Behavioral Control} = \text{PBC} \propto \sum c_i p_i$$

If faculty members, for example, believe they have the requisite credentials (e.g., a terminal degree in the teaching field) to support the baccalaureate transition, they may feel that they have more control over the changes that will result from CCB transition. Thus, they may be more likely to support the CCB transition. Research has found a weak correlation between behavioral intention and perceived behavioral control over the behavior ($r = .43, p < .001$, Armitage & Conner, 2001). Perceived behavioral control adds minimally to the prediction of intention. Specifically, it has been found to add, on average, six percent to the prediction of behavioral intention. According to the theory of planned behavior model, perceived behavioral control also has a direct influence on behavior. This relationship is discussed in the following section.

In the context of this study, the behavior of interest is faculty members’ support of the CCB transition. The corresponding hypotheses become

Hypothesis 3  Control Beliefs about the CCB transition are significantly associated with Perceived Behavioral Control about the CCB transition.
Hypothesis 6  Faculty members’ Perceived Behavioral Control over the CCB transition are significantly associated with their behavioral Intentions to support the CCB transition.

Summary of constructs. Intention to perform a behavior is a combination of “individual’s attitude toward the behavior, subjective norms about the behavior, and perceived behavioral control over the behavior” (Ingram et al., 2000, p. 216). These three predictors also directly influence one another; that is, more positive attitudes and subjective norms are directly related to a more positive sense of perceived behavioral control. Collectively, these predictors shape people’s perceived outcome expectations and, as such, shape their intentions toward the behavior.

In the context of the CCB transition, faculty members’ intentions to support the transition will be determined by various degrees of faculty attitudes, subjective norms, and perceived behavioral control. Each of these constructs “reveals a different aspect of behavior, and each can serve as a point of attack in attempts to change it” (Ajzen, 1991, p. 206). The following section provides an overview of different studies that have used the theory of planned behavior to explore behavioral change in different domains.

Studies using the theory of planned behavior. The theory of planned behavior has been used in a number of contexts to study how people negotiate expectations of behavioral change (c.f., health, Schifter, 1985; leisure activities, Ajzen, 1992; alcohol consumption, Huchting, Andrew, and LaBrie, 2008; education, Kalivoda, 2003; and marketing, King, 2008. Francis et al. (2004) report that the theory of planned behavior has been used as the theoretical framework for 222 studies published in the Medline database and 610 studies published in the PsycINFO database from 1985 to January
2004. In a meta-analysis of 185 of these studies, Armitage and Conner (2001) found the average correlation between behavioral belief and attitude to be $r = .50$, between normative belief and subjective norms to be $r = .50$, and between control belief and perceived behavioral control to be $r = .27$. Each was significant at $p < .001$. Although some authors focus on studies that incorporate the complete theory of planned behavior, other studies simply focus on an aspect (e.g., attitude, beliefs) of the theory. Francis et al. caution that “a subset of items may be selected from the recommended questionnaire, but it is important that researchers are clear about the purpose of the research and understand which research questions can and cannot be answered by a reduced data set” (p. 27).

Amidon’s (2008) study utilized the theory of planned behavior to predict and explain middle- and high-school teachers’ behavior in reporting students for cigarette and dress code violations. The researcher modified the theory of planned behavior to include teachers’ attitudes toward punishment as a possible predictor of their intentions and behaviors. Amidon’s study indicated that teachers’ general attitude toward punishment may be considered a background factor by Ajzen. A background factor influences behavior indirectly through its association with beliefs and attitudes (Ajzen, 2005).

Amidon analyzed the data using regression analysis and path analysis. The regression analysis for cigarette violations indicated teacher attitude and internal control beliefs had the strongest correlation. Teachers’ perceived behavioral control and normative beliefs were better predictors for the dress code violations. The path analysis was “consistent with the data from the correlations and multiple regression” (Amidon, 2008, p. 60).
Table 1
Sample Studies using the Theory of Planned Behavior as a Theoretical Framework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author &amp; Date</th>
<th>Indicator of attitude change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amidon, 2008</td>
<td>Faculty intention to report students’ dress code and cigarette violations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barnett &amp; Presley, 2004</td>
<td>Faculty intention to adopt Internet and Web technologies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beck, 1997</td>
<td>Faculty intention to implement constructivism in their classroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crawley, 1990</td>
<td>Faculty intention to use investigative teaching methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin, 1994</td>
<td>Faculty intention to use service learning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Barnett and Presley (2004) used the theory of planned behavior to predict university faculty members’ behavior in adopting Internet and Web technologies. The purpose of their study was: (1) to determine if theory of planned behavior would be an appropriate method for accessing the intent to adopt Web technologies to supplement course delivery, (2) to elicit possible items for a fully developed survey instrument and (3) to conduct a pilot study to validate the instrument. They developed an open-ended questionnaire, collected data, and analyzed them in accordance with the guidelines for conducting a study using the theory of planned behavior model. The researchers used the results of the open-ended questionnaire to develop a survey instrument to predict faculty members’ behavior in adopting Internet and Web technologies.

Fifteen faculty members participated in the pilot study, which represented a 15% response rate. The researchers indicated the low response rate may have been due to the survey being mailed at the end of the semester and the length of the survey. Survey item reliability was assessed using Cronbach’s alpha. Reliability scores for the direct measures (i.e., intention, attitude, subjective norms, and perceived behavioral control)
that shape the theory of planned behavior were .89, .59, .91, and .96, respectively. A
Crombach alpha score of .59 for attitude indicated a problem (e.g., unclear wording or
confusing response scale) with the survey questions measuring attitude. Reliability scores
for the indirect measures (i.e., behavioral beliefs, outcome evaluations, normative beliefs,
motivation to comply, control beliefs, and perceived power) that shape the theory of
planned behavior were within the acceptable level of .60, with the exception of normative
beliefs which had a score of .17. An item analysis report revealed specific questions that
needed to be revised to increase the Crombach alpha scores for attitude and normative
beliefs. The pilot data indicated that attitude toward adopting Internet and Web
technologies and perceived behavioral control over adopting Internet and Web
technologies had the largest effect on faculty members’ intention to adopt Internet and
Web technologies.

Beck’s (1997) study utilized the theory of planned behavior to examine the
teachers’ beliefs regarding their intention to implement constructivism in their classroom.
Beck analyzed data, using multiple regression and ANOVA techniques. The results
indicated that a teacher’s attitude toward the implementation of constructivism in the
their classroom had the greatest influence on the teacher’s intention to implement
constructivism in the classroom. Additionally, “significant differences existed between
the various teacher populations for both intent and the three constructs” (Beck, 1997, p.
iv).

The theory of planned behavior, therefore, has been used in a variety of domains
to explore faculty members’ intentions and behaviors. A review of the literature revealed
numerous studies that tested and validated the theory of planned behavior model.
Although these studies revealed multiple regression and path analysis as the preferred statistical framework, the researcher chose to use multiple linear regression which is in accordance with Francis’s et al. (2004) guide to constructing questionnaires: 

*Constructing Questionnaires Based on the Theory of Planned Behaviour* (Francis et al., 2004). The theory of planned behavior is, therefore, a useful framework for this study since the focus of this study is to explore faculty members’ intentions toward the CCB transition.

**Summary of Chapter 2**

With an increased demand for access to higher education throughout the United States, community colleges are experiencing vertical extensions. This emerging trend has created controversy among educational leaders, politicians, business leaders, students and policy makers (Floyd & Skolnik, 2005). The CCB is a relatively recent development in higher education; thus, it will continue to create new challenges and opportunities for higher education. Current literature focuses on the CCB from an administrative or student perspective, while minimal research has been conducted from the faculty members’ perspective. This study will provide a better understanding of the impact that the baccalaureate movement exerts on faculty members, thus researchers should conduct more studies from faculty members’ perspective. The purpose of this study was to explore faculty members’ attitudes toward the community college transitions to college baccalaureates. The findings from this study can then be used to inform the process of the CCB transition and to illuminate methods that ensure the support of faculty members.
Chapter 3:
Methods

This quantitative study used survey methods (Fraenkel & Wallen, 2003) to assess faculty members’ intentions to support their institution's transition to a baccalaureate system. As shown in Figure 6, the theory of planned behavior was used to develop a model of faculty members’ intentions. The theory of planned behavior posits that behavioral intentions are shaped directly by attitude, subjective norms, and perceived behavioral control and indirectly by behavioral, normative, and control beliefs, respectively.

An elicitation study was conducted to identify faculty members’ beliefs, which were then used to construct the final survey instrument. Faculty members from public, two-year Florida colleges currently in the process of transitioning to baccalaureate institutions were asked to complete a Web-based survey. The survey was designed using the guidelines for theory of planned behavior survey development (Francis et al., 2004) and Web survey development (Dillman, Tortora, & Bowker, 1999). Dillman, Tortora, and Bowker recommend that Web surveys afford participants the option to select “prefer not to answer” and/or “don’t know.” The current survey has adapted these options as: participants have the option to exit the survey at any time.

The purpose of the survey was to explore relationships among faculty members’ beliefs and their intentions to support the CCB transition. These findings can then be used
to predict faculty members’ behaviors toward supporting the CCB transition. Data were analyzed using cross multiplication, Pearson product-moment correlation and multiple linear regression. Multiple linear regression revealed which factors have the greatest predictive power for the targeted behavior. Descriptive statistics were computed for the demographic information.

**Participants**

The possible pool of participants consisted of full-time faculty members at two public, two-year colleges in Florida that are in the process of transitioning to a CCB system.

**Questionnaire Development**

Francis et al. (2004) have constructed specific guidelines for developing an elicitation questionnaire and a final survey based on Ajzen’s theory of planned behavior. Ajzen (2009) provides these guidelines, as well as sample survey questions and other resources for the theory of planned behavior on his Web site. Francis et al. (2004) guidelines for constructing an elicitation questionnaire and a final survey are implemented in the following steps:

**Elicitation study.**

1. Define the population of interest and select a representative sample.
2. Carefully define the behavior under study. Use this definition to construct a general introductory statement for the start of the questionnaire.
3. Conduct a test-retest study of the elicitation questionnaire.
4. From the participants’ responses, identify the
   a. most frequently perceived advantages/disadvantages of the behavior.
b. most important people/groups of people who would approve/disapprove of the behavior.

c. perceived barriers/facilitating factors that could make it easier/more difficult to adopt the behavior.

**Final survey.**

5. Use the findings from the elicitation study to create survey questions that measure the direct and indirect constructs.

6. Test the draft to determine if the survey questions are readable and understandable. Reword items, if necessary.

   a. Conduct a pilot test-retest on the revised survey. Assess the test-retest reliability of the indirect measures by administering the questionnaire twice to the same group of people, with an interval of at least two weeks.

7. Conduct final survey.


The following sections detail these steps and apply them to the current study.

**Elicitation Study**

Francis et al. (2004) recommend that researchers conduct an elicitation study to informally ascertain the salient behavioral, normative, and control beliefs about the targeted behavior in the current research study. In the context of this research effort, the targeted behavior was the intention to support the CCB transition. To study faculty members’ intentions toward this behavior, first it was necessary to conduct an elicitation study to determine the beliefs that underlie faculty members’ attitudes, subjective norms,
and perceived behavioral control with respect to the CCB transition. This was an informal, collaborative effort that identified what factors to include in the final study.

An elicitation study was conducted at a local community college in central Florida, which was in the process of assessing and implementing the CCB. A convenience sample of 25 full-time faculty members across various disciplines were asked to participate in a survey consisting of nine open-ended questions that attempted to elicit faculty members’ beliefs concerning the CCB transition. The questions for the elicitation study were constructed following the theory of planned behavior guide to constructing questionnaires: *Constructing Questionnaires Based on the Theory of Planned Behaviour* (Francis et al., 2004).

The questions were formed such that they elicited the advantages, disadvantages, and faculty members’ views about the CCB transition for each of the belief areas in the theory of planned behavior (see Figure 6). Each belief, therefore, was elicited using three questions. The three questions for the Behavioral Beliefs appeared first in the survey. They were followed by the three questions for the Subjective Norms and three questions for the Perceived Behavioral Control, respectively.

The elicitation study was implemented in a Web-based environment and was administered twice (i.e., test-retest) over a two-week interval. The purpose of the test-retest method was to increase the reliability of the elicitation study’s findings.
Behavioral Beliefs
What do you believe are the advantages of supporting the CCB transition?
What do you believe are the disadvantages of supporting the CCB transition?
Is there anything else you associate with your own views about supporting the CCB transition?

Normative Beliefs
Are there any individuals or groups who would approve of your supporting the CCB transition?
Are there any individuals or groups who would disapprove of your supporting the CCB transition?
Is there anything else you associate with other people’s views about supporting the CCB transition?

Control Beliefs
What factors or circumstances would enable you to support the CCB transition?
What factors or circumstances would make it difficult or impossible for you to support the CCB transition?
Are there any other issues that come to mind when you think about transitioning to a CCB institution?

Figure 6. Theory of planned behavior showing the elicitation questionnaire.
Twenty-five faculty members responded to the elicitation study. As suggested by Francis et al. (2004), two researchers independently analyzed the content of the responses to determine the themes that emerged from them. Inter-rater reliability was 89%. The themes were listed, in order of frequency, for each belief construct (i.e., behavioral, normative, and control). The top 75% of the beliefs were chosen to be included in the main study (Francis et al., 2004). The results of this survey appear in Table 2.

Faculty members identified access, credentials, and participation as three important, behavioral belief constructs that indirectly influence their support of the CCB transition; that is, faculty members identified these constructs as factors that will influence their attitude toward the CCB transition that, in turn, may predict their behavioral intention to support the CCB transition, as well as their actual support of the CCB transition. In addition, faculty members identified administrators, students, and business and industry leaders as important people in their lives who influence their normative beliefs which indirectly influence their support of the CCB transition; that is, these individuals influence faculty members’ subjective norms that, in turn, predict faculty members’ behavioral intention to support the CCB transition.
Table 2

Factors Influencing Beliefs Concerning the CCB Transition Identified in the Elicitation Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Beliefs and Factors</th>
<th>Faculty Members’ Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Behavioral Beliefs</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access</td>
<td>“For students there is an obvious advantage in enabling them to complete a four-year degree without extensive travel perhaps and maybe at less cost.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credentials</td>
<td>“To the faculty who already have the credentials, they will have more opportunity to teach.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation</td>
<td>“With support comes the opportunity to give input and participate in the creation of an acceptable program that will serve the community and and [sic] the mission of the college”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Normative Beliefs</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrators</td>
<td>“I am sure my immediate supervisor and other administrators of the college would approve. I assume they perceive such a transition to be in there [sic] best interests.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>“Current students who are nontraditional and may not be able to leave the area.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business and Industry Leaders</td>
<td>“Business and Industry will be the main supporters of this program.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Faculty</td>
<td>“My colleagues will probably support the baccalaureate.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Control Beliefs</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Support</td>
<td>“Level of support available to faculty to seek advanced degrees.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Needs Assessment</td>
<td>“If the program does not appear to serve a community need.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Quality</td>
<td>“Adherence to strong academic rigor and enrollment criteria.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Finally, faculty members identified faculty support, program needs assessment, and program quality as three key constructs that indirectly influence faculty members’ support of the CCB transition; that is, these factors influence faculty members’ perceived behavioral control concerning their support of the CCB transition. Given the results of the Elicitation Study, the research model for this study is shown in Figure 7.
Figure 7. Research model of the theory of planned behavior adapted for the CCB transition.
Survey Development

In accordance with Ajzen’s method, data from the elicitation study were used to create a Web-based survey concerning faculty members’ intention to support the CCB transition (see Appendix A.) The survey consists of two sections with a total of 46 questions that were measured using a 7-point Likert scale. Section 1 contains 35 questions designed to elicit faculty members’ behavioral intentions; that is, their attitudes, subjective norms, and perceived behavioral control concerning the target behavior. In addition, questions were constructed to ascertain faculty members’ beliefs (i.e., indirect variables) concerning the target behavior as well. Section 2 contains 11 questions to elicit faculty members’ demographics. Survey questions were constructed in accordance with the guidelines established for questionnaires based upon the theory of planned behavior: *Constructing Questionnaires Based on the Theory of Planned Behaviour* (Francis et al., 2004).

Attitude, subjective norms, and perceived behavioral control represent direct measures of the theory of planned behavior concerning the intention to perform a behavior. The theory also includes indirect measures about a person’s beliefs regarding these three constructs. Specifically, a person’s behavioral beliefs determine their attitudes toward a behavior, a person’s normative beliefs determine their subjective norms about the behavior, and a person’s control beliefs determine their perceived behavioral control of the behavior. The following sections detail the direct and indirect measures in the theory of planned behavior that were used to construct the final survey instrument.
**Attitude.** Survey items 1 – 4 were constructed to elicit faculty members’ responses to the direct measures of faculty members’ attitude toward the CCB transition. Two types of questions were used to elicit the direct measures of attitude: experiential and instrumental. Experiential items assess how faculty members feel (e.g., pleasant/unpleasant) when they perform the behavior (i.e., support the CCB transition); whereas, instrumental items assess whether faculty members feel that the behavior achieves something (e.g., useful/worthless).

The direct measures of attitude require a single stem that is repeated with the use of at least three pairs of bipolar adjectives that are evaluative (e.g., good/bad). The behavior is presented in the stem with a pair of evaluative bipolar endpoints. The values of the endpoints must be varied such that some questions end with a negative evaluative whereas others end with a positive evaluative (Francis et al., 2004). The stem used to measure faculty members’ attitude—*Overall I think supporting the CCB transition is*—is followed by the following pairs of bipolar adjectives: *the wrong thing to do/the right thing to do, good/bad, beneficial for me/harmful for me, and harmful for college/beneficial for college*. Table 3 provides a summary of the variables, the survey question number, and the survey questions for the direct measure of attitude.

Direct measures of attitude are scored by recoding the items with negative endpoints on the right, so that higher numbers always reflect a positive attitude to the target behavior (e.g., for *good/bad*, an answer of 6 becomes score of 2; a score of 4 remains a 4). For example, survey question 2, *Overall I think supporting the CCB transition is good 1..7 bad*, has a negatively worded endpoint (e.g., bad). Thus, the question requires recoding so that a high score represents a positive attitude toward
supporting the CCB transition. In addition to survey item 2, item 3 requires recoding. After scores are recoded, the mean of the four items is calculated to give an overall attitude score. In addition, the internal consistency between the items is verified (Francis et al., 2004).

Table 3

Survey Questions to Elicit Faculty Members’ Attitude Toward Supporting the CCB Transition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>SQ#</th>
<th>Bipolar Endpoint</th>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Bipolar Endpoint</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ATT_DM_OSW</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>the wrong thing to do</td>
<td>1..7</td>
<td>the right thing to do</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATT_DM_OSG</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>good</td>
<td>1..7</td>
<td>bad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATT_DM_OSB</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>beneficial for me</td>
<td>1..7</td>
<td>harmful for me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATT_DM_OSH</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>harmful for college</td>
<td>1..7</td>
<td>beneficial for college</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Behavioral beliefs capture the indirect measures for attitude. Beliefs are measured by using two constructs: (1) faculty members’ “beliefs about the behavior” and (2) faculty members’ “corresponding positive or negative judgements about each of the features of the behavior” (Francis et al., 2004, p. 9; see Figure 8.) The elicitation study identified access, credentials, and participation as factors that shape faculty members’ attitudinal beliefs about supporting the CCB transition.

Direct measures of attitude were scored by recoding the items with negative endpoints on the right. Survey items 6, 28, and 33 measure behavioral beliefs. Items 29, 31, and 12 measure the evaluations of outcome corresponding to these beliefs. Table 4 provides a summary of the variables, the survey question number, and the survey questions for the indirect measures of attitude.
Figure 8. Indirect attitudinal measures of intention.

Table 4

Survey Questions to Elicit Faculty Members’ Behavioral Beliefs Underlying their Attitudes

**Behavioral Beliefs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>SQ#</th>
<th>Survey question (complete)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ATT_IM_BB_A</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>By supporting the CCB transition, I am providing students with access to a baccalaureate degree. <em>(Likely 1..7 Unlikely)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATT_IM_BB_C</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Supporting the CCB transition will require that I update my credentials. <em>(Likely 1..7 Unlikely)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATT_IM_BB_P</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>If I support the CCB transition, then I will be expected to help implement it. <em>(Likely 1..7 Unlikely)</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Evaluation of Outcome**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>SQ#</th>
<th>Survey question (incomplete)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ATT_IM_OE_A</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Providing students with access to a baccalaureate degree is <em>undesirable 1..7 desirable.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATT_IM_OE_C</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Updating my credentials to meet the CCB requirements is <em>undesirable 1..7 desirable.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATT_IM_OE_P</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>For me, participating in the CCB transition is <em>undesirable 1..7 desirable.</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Survey questions measuring behavioral beliefs (e.g., 6, 28, and 33) were measured on the likely/unlikely scale and were scored by recoding the items with negative endpoints on the right, so that higher numbers always reflect a positive attitude to the target behavior. For each behavioral belief (i.e., access, credentials, and participation), the total belief score on the likely/unlikely scale is multiplied by the relevant outcome evaluation score, which was measured on the undesirable/desirable scale. The resulting products across all the beliefs are summed to create an overall attitude score. Given the three behavioral beliefs identified by the elicitation study, the formula for calculating the faculty members’ attitude (i.e., A) toward supporting the CCB transition becomes

\[ A = (Access \ Behavioral \ Belief \times Access \ Outcome \ Evaluation) + \\
(Credentials \ Behavioral \ Belief \times Credentials \ Outcome \ Evaluation) + \\
(Participation \ Behavioral \ Belief \times Participation \ Outcome \ Evaluation) \]

which, in terms of the variables, becomes

\[ A = (ATT\_IM\_BB\_A \times ATT\_IM\_OE\_A) + \\
(ATT\_IM\_BB\_C \times ATT\_IM\_OE\_C) + \\
(ATT\_IM\_BB\_P \times ATT\_IM\_OE\_P) \]

Table 5 provides a summary of the scoring for the survey items that elicit the direct and indirect measures of attitude.
Table 5

Scoring of Survey Questions Measuring Faculty Members’ Attitude

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attitude Construct</th>
<th>Survey Question</th>
<th>Response format</th>
<th>Reverse scoring</th>
<th>Internal consistency analysis</th>
<th>Requires multiplication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>1 – 4</td>
<td>1 – 7</td>
<td>2 and 3</td>
<td>1 – 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioral beliefs</td>
<td>6, 28, 33</td>
<td>1 – 7</td>
<td>6, 28, 33</td>
<td>6 x 29; 28 x 31;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome Evaluations</td>
<td>29, 31, 12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>33 x 12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Subjective Norms.** Survey questions 26, 14, 10, and 35 are constructed to elicit faculty members’ responses to the direct measures of faculty members’ subjective norms toward the CCB transition. Two different types of question formats were used to elicit the direct measures of subjective norms: incomplete sentences and complete sentences. Incomplete sentences embed the response scale (e.g., should/should not) within the question. Complete sentences append the response scale (e.g., disagree/agree) at the end of the question. A summary of variables, survey question number, and the survey question for the direct measure of subjective norms are provided in Table 6.

Direct measures of subjective norms were scored by recoding the items with negative endpoints on the right, so that higher numbers always reflect a greater social pressure to perform the behavior. Survey item 26 has a response scale of *I should/ should not* and, therefore, requires recoding. After scores were recoded, the mean of the four items was calculated to give an overall subjective norms score. In addition, the internal consistency between the items was verified (Francis et al., 2004).
Table 6
Survey Questions to Elicit Faculty Members’ Subjective Norms about Supporting the CCB Transition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subjective Norms</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>SQ#</th>
<th>Survey question (incomplete)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SN_DM_MP</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Most people who are important to me think that I \textit{should 1..7 should not} support the CCB transition.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subjective Norms</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>SQ#</th>
<th>Survey question (complete)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SN_DM_SP</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>I feel under social pressure to support the CCB transition. \textit{(Disagree 1..7 Agree)}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SN_DM_E</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>People who are important to me expect me to support the CCB transition. \textit{(Disagree 1..7 Agree)}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SN_DM_W</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>People who are important to me want me to support the CCB transition. \textit{(Disagree 1..7 Agree)}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Normative beliefs capture the indirect measures of subjective norms. Beliefs were measured by using two constructs: (1) faculty members’ “beliefs about how other people, who may in some way be important to the person, would like them to behave” and (2) faculty members’ corresponding belief of social pressure from each group or individual (i.e., motivation to comply; see Figure 9.) The elicitation study identified administrators, students, business and industry leaders, and other faculty members as the indirect measures of subjective norms that influence the decision to support the CCB transition.
Two types of questions were used to elicit the indirect measures of the normative beliefs: injunctive and descriptive. Injunctive questions “reflect what important people think a person should do” and descriptive questions “what important people actually do.” One type of question was used to elicit responses on the motivation to comply. This question “indicates the strength of motivation to comply with each reference group or individual” (Francis et al., 2004, p. 19) [emphasis in the original].

Survey items 20, 22, and 34 measure injunctive normative beliefs and question 30 measures the descriptive normative beliefs. In addition, two different types of question formats were used to measure the normative beliefs: incomplete sentences and complete sentences. Incomplete sentences embed the response scale (e.g., should/should not) within the question. Complete sentences append the response scale (e.g., not at all/very much) at the end of the question. Survey items 7, 18, 25, and 21 measure the motivation to comply corresponding to these beliefs. Table 7 provides a summary of the variables, the survey question number, and the survey questions for the indirect measures of subjective norms.
Table 7

Survey Questions to Elicit Faculty Members’ Normative Beliefs Underlying their Subjective Norms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Normative Beliefs</th>
<th>SQ#</th>
<th>Survey question (injunctive, incomplete)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SN_IM_NB_I_A</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Administrators think that I should not support the CCB transition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SN_IM_NB_I_S</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Students think that I should not support the CCB transition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SN_IM_NB_I_BIL</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Business and industry leaders think that I should not support the CCB transition.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Normative Beliefs</th>
<th>SQ#</th>
<th>Survey question (descriptive, incomplete)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SN_IM_NB_D_OF</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Other faculty in my college do not do support the CCB transition.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Motivation to Comply

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>SQ#</th>
<th>Survey question (complete)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SN_IM_MC_A</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Doing what administrators think I should do is important to me. (Not at all 1..7 Very much)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SN_IM_MC_S</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Doing what students think I should do is important to me. (Not at all 1..7 Very much)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SN_IM_MC_BIL</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Doing what business and industry leaders think I should do is important to me. (Not at all 1..7 Very much)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SN_IM_MC_OF</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Doing what other faculty think I should do is important to me. (Not at all 1..7 Very much)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8 provides a summary of the scoring for the survey items that elicit the direct and indirect measures of subjective norms.
Table 8

Scoring of Survey Questions Measuring Faculty Members’ Subjective Norms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subjective Norms Construct</th>
<th>Survey Question</th>
<th>Response format</th>
<th>Reverse coded</th>
<th>Internal consistency analysis</th>
<th>Requires multiplication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>26, 14, 10, 35</td>
<td>1-7</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26, 14, 10, 35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normative beliefs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Injunctive</td>
<td>20, 22, 34</td>
<td>1-7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20 x 7; 22 x 18;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Descriptive</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>34 x 25; 30 x 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation to comply</td>
<td>7, 18, 25, 21</td>
<td>1-7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Perceived behavioral control.** Survey questions 8, 5, 13 and 16 were constructed to elicit faculty members’ responses to the direct measures of faculty members’ perceived behavioral control toward the CCB transition. Two different types of questions were used to elicit the direct measures of perceived behavioral control: self-efficacy and controllability. Self-efficacy measures “a) how difficult it is to perform the behavior” and “b) how confident they are that they could do it” (Francis et al., 2004, p. 21).

Controllability measures “a) whether performing the behaviour is up to them” and “b) whether factors beyond their control determine their behaviour” (Francis et al., p. 21). A summary of the variables, the survey question number, and the survey question for the direct measure of perceived behavioral control are provided in Table 9.
Table 9
Survey Questions to Elicit Faculty Members’ Perceived Behavioral Control

**Self-Efficacy**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>SQ#</th>
<th>Survey question (complete)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PBC_DM_SE_C</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>I am confident that I could support the CCB transition if I wanted to. <em>Disagree 1..7 Agree</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PBC_DM_SE_S</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>For me to support the CCB transition is easy 1..7 difficult.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Controllability**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>SQ#</th>
<th>Survey question (complete)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PBC_DM_C_D</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>The decision to support the CCB transition is beyond my control. <em>Disagree 1..7 Agree</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PBC_DM_C_I</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Whether I support the CCB transition or not is entirely up to me. <em>Disagree 1..7 Agree</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Direct measures of perceived behavioral control were scored by recoding the items with negative endpoints on the right, so that higher scores always reflect a greater level of control over the target behavior. Survey item 5 required recoding. After the score was recoded, the mean of the items was calculated to give an overall perceived behavioral control score. In addition, the internal consistency between the items was verified (Francis et al., 2004).

Control beliefs capture the indirect measures for perceived behavioral control. Beliefs were measured by using two constructs: (1) the strength of faculty members’ control beliefs and (2) the “power of these control factors to influence the behaviour” (Francis et al., 2004, p. 22; see Figure 10). The elicitation study identified faculty support, program needs assessment, and program quality as factors that shape faculty members’ perceived behavioral control over the CCB transition.
Survey questions 19 and 24 measure the control beliefs. Items 17, 9, and 32 measure the perceived power corresponding to these beliefs. In addition, two different types of question formats were used to elicit the direct measures of perceived behavioral control: incomplete sentences and complete sentences. Complete sentences append the response scale (e.g., unlikely/likely) at the end of the question. Incomplete sentences embed the response scale (e.g., less likely/more likely) within the question. Table 10 provides a summary of the variables, the survey question number, and the survey questions for the indirect measures of perceived behavioral control.

For each control belief (i.e., faculty support, program needs assessment, and program quality), the total belief score on the unlikely/likely scale was multiplied by the relevant perceived power score, which was measured on the less likely/more likely scale. The resulting products across all the beliefs are summed to create an overall perceived behavioral control score. Given the three control beliefs identified by the elicitation study, the formula for calculating the faculty members’ perceived behavioral control (i.e., PBC) toward supporting the CCB transition becomes
PBC = \((Faculty \ Support \ Control \ Belief \times Faculty \ Support \ Perceived \ Power) + \\
\(Program \ Needs \ Assessment \ Control \ Belief \times Program \ Needs \ Assessment \ Perceived \ Power) + (Program \ Quality \ Control \ Belief \times Program \ Quality \ Perceived \ Power)\)

\[
PBC = (PBC_{IM\_CB\_FS} \times PBC_{IM\_PP\_FS}) + \\
(PBC_{IM\_CB\_NA} \times PBC_{IM\_PP\_NA}) + \\
(PBC_{IM\_CB\_PQ} \times PBC_{IM\_PP\_PQ})
\]

Table 10

Survey Questions to Elicit Faculty Members’ Control Beliefs Underlying their Perceived Behavioral Control

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Control Beliefs</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>SQ#</th>
<th>Survey question (complete)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PBC_{IM_CB_FS}</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>If the college does not provide faculty support, it is difficult for me to support the CCB transition. (Unlikely 1..7 Likely)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PBC_{IM_CB_NA}</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>If a program needs assessment is not conducted, then it is difficult for me to support the CCB transition. (Unlikely 1..7 Likely)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PBC_{IM_CB_PQ}</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>I feel that the college will not provide quality baccalaureate programs, so it makes it difficult for me to support the CCB transition. (Unlikely 1..7 Likely)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perceived Power</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>SQ#</th>
<th>Survey question (incomplete)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PBC_{IM_PP_FS}</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>When the college provides faculty support, I am less likely 1..7 more likely to support the CCB transition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PBC_{IM_PP_NA}</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>When the college does not conduct a program needs assessment, I am less likely 1..7 more likely to support the CCB transition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PBC_{IM_PP_PQ}</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Feeling that the college will not provide quality baccalaureate programs, I am less likely 1..7 more likely to support the CCB transition.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A summary of the scoring for the survey items that elicit the direct and indirect measures of perceived behavioral control are presented in Table 11.

Table 11

Scoring of Survey Questions Measuring Faculty Members’ Perceived Behavioral Control

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subjective Norms Construct</th>
<th>Survey Question</th>
<th>Response format</th>
<th>Reverse coded</th>
<th>Internal consistency analysis</th>
<th>Requires multiplication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Direct</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-efficacy</td>
<td>8, 5</td>
<td>1-7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8, 5, 13, 16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controllability</td>
<td>13, 16</td>
<td>1-7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indirect</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control belief</td>
<td>15, 19, 24</td>
<td>1-7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15x17; 19x9;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived power</td>
<td>17, 9, 32</td>
<td>1-7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24x32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Behavioral intention.** Survey items 11, 23, and 27 were constructed to elicit faculty members’ responses to their behavioral intentions toward the CCB transition. Three different types of question formats were used to elicit behavioral intentions: expect, want, and intend to support the CCB transition. These three different formats ensure the internal consistency of behavioral intentions (Francis et al., 2004). The mean score of the responses provides an overall behavioral intention score. A summary of the variables, survey question number, and survey questions are provided in Table 12.
Table 12

Survey Questions to Elicit Faculty Members’ Behavioral Intention

*Behavioral Intention*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>SQ#</th>
<th>Survey question (complete)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BI_E</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>I expect to support the CCB transition. <em>(Disagree 1..7 Agree)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BI_W</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>I want to support the CCB transition. <em>(Disagree 1..7 Agree)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BI_I</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>I fully intend to support the CCB transition. <em>(Disagree 1..7 Agree)</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The mean of the three items was calculated to give a behavioral intention score:

\[
BI = \text{mean} (\text{expect} + \text{want} + \text{intend})
\]

which, in terms of the variables, becomes

\[
BI = \text{mean} (BI_E + BI_W + BI_I).
\]

Table 13 provides a summary of the scoring for the survey items that elicit the direct measures of behavioral intention.

Table 13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behavioral Intentions Construct</th>
<th>Survey Question</th>
<th>Response format</th>
<th>Reverse coded</th>
<th>Internal consistency analysis</th>
<th>Requires multiplication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>11, 23, 27</td>
<td>1-7</td>
<td>11, 23, 27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Demographic variables.** Section 2 of the survey was designed to elicit demographic information (e.g., age, gender, race/ethnicity, and highest degree earned to date).
Survey Testing

The survey was tested for comprehension and clarity as well as for reliability. The following sections detail the procedures that were used for survey testing.

Testing for comprehension and clarity. After the survey was developed, five faculty members from a local community college in central Florida were asked to review the questions to ensure their comprehension and clarity (Francis et al., 2004). They were asked to address the following questions from the theory of planned behavior guidelines:

- Are any items ambiguous or difficult to answer?
- Does the questionnaire feel too repetitive?
- Does it feel too long?
- Does it feel too superficial?
- Are there any annoying features of the wording or formatting?
- Are there inconsistent responses that might indicate that changes in response endpoints are problematic for respondents who complete the questionnaire quickly? (p. 27).

Their feedback was used to revise the survey questions. The researcher adhered to the guidelines of the theory unless the clarity of the question was compromised. For example, faculty members identified survey questions with double negatives as confusing and difficult to answer. One respondent stated “I wasn’t sure what part of the question I should answer – it’s asking two things”. Therefore, the survey was revised to enhance the clarity of the survey questions and response scales.
Pilot testing of survey instrument. The survey was pilot tested with five participants representative of the sample (Francis et al., 2004). The reliability of the survey was measured using test-retest. Therefore, participants were asked to take the survey twice within a two-week period. A test-retest reliability coefficient was then computed for each survey item (Rudner & Schafer, 2001; see Table 14).

Table 14

Test-Retest of the Faculty Survey Assessing Faculty Members’ Support of the CCB Transition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Test-Retest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intention</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Measures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjective Norms</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Behavioral Control</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect Measures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioral Beliefs – Beliefs</td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioral Beliefs – Evaluation of Outcome</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normative Belief – Beliefs</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normative Belief – Motivation to Comply</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control Beliefs – Beliefs</td>
<td>.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control Beliefs – Perceived Power</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Survey Administration

In Spring 2010, faculty members received an email inviting them to participate in this research study. One week after receiving the invitation to participate, faculty members received an email containing the link to access the Web-based survey. To facilitate an adequate response rate, two weeks after the initial email faculty members
received an email reminding them to complete the survey. Faculty members had another week to submit their responses before the researcher closed the survey.

A Web-based survey was used for the final survey. Data were stored on a password-protected server to which only the researcher has access. The researcher could delete the survey and data at any time. Data were exported from the server and imported into Statistical Analysis Software (SAS) for data analysis.

**Use of human subjects in research.** Faculty member participation in the survey was voluntary. In addition, the researcher took the appropriate measures to ensure faculty members’ responses remained anonymous (e.g., names will not be associated with faculty members’ responses). Faculty members choosing to withdraw from the study were able to do so by exiting the browser at any time and their responses were not used in the study.

**Data collection and analysis.** Data were collected in Spring 2010. Data from completed surveys were imported into SAS for data analysis. Initial data analysis included descriptive statistics to identify the overall sample. Another set of analyses focused on the relationships between the direct measures (e.g., attitude, subjective norms, and perceived behavioral control) and the indirect measures (e.g., beliefs). The goal of the correlational analysis was to determine whether and to what extent (a) behavioral beliefs, normative beliefs, and control beliefs predict faculty members’ attitudes, subjective norms, and perceived behavioral control concerning the CCB transition; (b) faculty members’ attitudes, subjective norms, and perceived behavioral control predict faculty members’ intentions to support the CCB transition; and (c) faculty members’ intentions and perceived behavioral control predict faculty member behavior toward supporting the CCB transition.
Reliability. Reliability for direct measures (e.g., attitude, subjective norms, and perceived behavioral control) was established using an index of internal consistency to ensure the items were measuring the same construct. Reliability for indirect measures was established using test-retest reliability. The reliability ranged from .61 -.99, indicating the survey questions were reliable. In accordance with the theory of planned behavior surveys, the survey was administered twice with a two-week lapse between surveys. Twenty-five faculty members responded to nine open-ended questions directed to elicit their behavioral belief (e.g., outcome of the behavior and outcome evaluation), normative belief (e.g., normative expectation and motivation to comply), and control belief (e.g., control belief and perceived power). The 25 faculty members who responded to the elicitation questionnaire were from one of the two community colleges that were invited to participate in this study.

Summary of Chapter 3

The purpose of this study was to explore faculty members’ attitude toward the CCB transition. Specifically, this study focused on faculty members’ intention to support the CCB transition. A Web-based survey was utilized to gather descriptive data from faculty members in two public, two-year colleges in Florida. The survey was used to gather quantitative data that were imported into SAS for data analysis. The hypotheses were tested using Pearson product-moment correlation and multiple linear regression.
Chapter 4:

Results

The purpose of this study was to explore faculty members’ intention to support the CCB transition, so that a prediction could be made about their actual behavior in supporting the transition. Ajzen’s theory of planned behavior provided the theoretical framework for studying faculty members’ intentions, as well as for making a prediction about their behavior toward supporting the CCB transition. The theory of planned behavior proposes that an assessment of individuals’ beliefs, attitudes, subjective norms, and perceived behavioral control can determine their intention and predict their actual behavior. A survey was developed to assess each one of these constructs. Cross products, correlations, and regression analyses were performed using the data gathered to predict faculty members’ intention of supporting the CCB transition. Based on the model, the data were analyzed in two stages: (1) how faculty members’ beliefs shaped the predictor variables (i.e., attitude, subjective norms, and perceived behavioral control) and (2) how the predictor variables predicted faculty members’ intentions. The two stages provided the framework for analyzing the data to assess the corresponding hypotheses. Stage One addressed hypotheses 1-3 and Stage Two addressed hypotheses 4-7. These analyses were then used to predict faculty members’ intention to support the CCB transition.
This chapter is organized in three parts: (1) demographic data, (2) data from questions that supplement the model, and (3) data results corresponding to the hypotheses and their implications for predicting faculty members’ intention to support the transition.

**Demographics**

A total of 319 full-time faculty members from two public, two-year colleges in Florida were invited to complete a Web-based survey. Ninety-five of those responded, representing a 30% response rate. Seventy-eight percent of the faculty members surveyed were 45 years or older. The population was almost evenly split between the two genders, with females consisting of 58% and males consisting of 42%. The population was predominately White (91%) with the remainder belonging to various minority groups. Sixty-three percent of the faculty members have a master’s degree, 21% have a doctorate, 6% have a specialist degree, and the remaining faculty members (9%) have a bachelor’s degree or less. Sixty-four percent of the respondents were from College A, while the remainder (36%) were from College B. A summary of the demographic data is presented in Table 15.

The two colleges that participated in the study were in the process of becoming baccalaureate-granting institutions; however, both colleges were not at identical stages within the transition. College A was waiting for approval by the state and regional accrediting agency. College B was in their first term of offering one community college baccalaureate degree. However, the demographics for each college were similar, with the overwhelming majority of the faculty members being White females 45 or older, holding a masters. The demographics of the faculty members who responded to the survey were representative of their college.
Table 15

Demographic Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 - 34</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 - 44</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 – 54</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 and over</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race/Ethnicity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or Alaska Native</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Highest Degree</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Institution</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School A</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School B</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>.36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Supplemental Questions to the Model**

Three questions were added to solicit direct information about faculty members’ behavioral beliefs, and three questions were added to solicit direct information about faculty members’ control beliefs. The three behavioral-belief questions were rated on a
7-point Likert scale (1 = Disagree, 7 = Agree; see Table 16) whereas the three control-belief questions were rated dichotomously (yes/no; see Table 17).

Fifty-seven percent of the faculty members (see Table 16) responded negatively (e.g., selected a 1 or 2 on a 7-point Likert scale) when asked *I feel providing baccalaureate degrees at community colleges may compromise the community college’s core values* (e.g., open-door access, learner-centeredness, affordability, convenience, or responsiveness). Twenty-five percent of the faculty members reported feeling that the CCB may compromise the core values (e.g., selected a 6 or 7 on a 7-point Likert scale).

When faculty members were asked if they planned to pursue a terminal degree, 35% responded negatively (e.g., selected a 1 or 2 on the 7-point Likert scale), 26% responded neutrally (e.g., selected a 4 on a 7-point Likert scale), and 20% responded positively (e.g., selected 6 or 7 on a 7-point Likert scale). The faculty members seemed to be split among teaching or not teaching baccalaureate courses. Twenty-seven percent of the faculty members responded positively (selected a 6 or 7 on a 7-point Likert scale), 30% responded negatively (e.g., selected 1 or 2 on a 7-point Likert scale), and 24% showed no preference (e.g., selected a 4 on a 7-point Likert scale). Faculty members indicated that they perceived they had control over the CCB transition (see Table 17). Specifically, they felt that their college would provide them with the necessary funds to update their credentials (54%), perform a needs assessment (77%), and provide high-quality, baccalaureate degrees (90%).
Table 16

Behavioral Beliefs – Supplemental Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey question</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I feel providing baccalaureate degrees at community colleges may compromise the</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>community college’s core values (e.g., open-door access, learner-centeredness,</td>
<td>(37.9)</td>
<td>(19)</td>
<td>(2.1)</td>
<td>(7.4)</td>
<td>(8.4)</td>
<td>(10.5)</td>
<td>(14.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>affordability, convenience, or responsiveness). <em>(Disagree 1..7 Agree)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I plan to get a terminal degree in my field. <em>(Disagree 1..7 Agree)</em></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Disagree 1..7 Agree)</td>
<td>(30.5)</td>
<td>(4.2)</td>
<td>(7.4)</td>
<td>(26.3)</td>
<td>(11.6)</td>
<td>(5.3)</td>
<td>(14.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I plan to teach baccalaureate-level courses at my college. <em>(Disagree 1..7 Agree)</em></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Disagree 1..7 Agree)</td>
<td>(24.2)</td>
<td>(7.4)</td>
<td>(8.4)</td>
<td>(24.2)</td>
<td>(8.4)</td>
<td>(8.4)</td>
<td>(19)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 17

Control Beliefs - Direct Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey question</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My college will provide me with the funds to update my credentials.</td>
<td>51 (53.7)</td>
<td>44 (46.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My college performed a needs assessment for the CCB.</td>
<td>73 (76.8)</td>
<td>22 (23.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My college will provide high-quality baccalaureate degrees.</td>
<td>85 (89.5)</td>
<td>10 (10.5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hypotheses

The hypotheses that guide this study, as well as how the hypotheses fit in the theory of planned behavior model, are presented below and in Figure 11.

Hypothesis 1  Behavioral Beliefs about the CCB transition are significantly associated with Attitudes toward the CCB transition.

Hypothesis 2  Normative Beliefs about the CCB transition are significantly associated with Subjective Norms about the CCB transition.

Hypothesis 3  Control Beliefs about the CCB transition are significantly associated with Perceived Behavioral Control about the CCB transition.

Hypothesis 4  Faculty members’ Attitudes about the CCB transition are significantly associated with their behavioral Intentions to support the CCB transition.

Hypothesis 5  Faculty members’ Subjective Norms about the CCB transition are significantly associated with their behavioral Intentions to support the CCB transition.

Hypothesis 6  Faculty members’ Perceived Behavioral Control over the CCB transition are significantly associated with their behavioral Intentions to support the CCB transition.

Hypothesis 7  Attitude, Subjective Norms, and Perceived Behavioral Control predict faculty members’ behavioral intention to support the CCB transition.
Figure 11. Theory of planned behavior model with hypotheses results.
Hypotheses Results

**Hypothesis 1: Behavioral beliefs about the CCB transition are significantly associated with attitudes toward the CCB transition.** Hypothesis 1 posits that behavioral beliefs about the CCB transition are significantly associated with attitudes toward the CCB transition. A correlational analysis between the behavioral beliefs that underlie attitude and actual attitude questions shows a statistically significant and positive relationship \((r = .46, p = .01)\) between the behavioral beliefs and actual attitude measures.

**Behavioral beliefs that underlie attitude.** The attitude score was derived by assessing faculty members’ behavioral beliefs about supporting the CCB transition. These beliefs were constructed using two components: (1) the behavioral beliefs about the consequences of the behavior (i.e., supporting the CCB transition) and (2) the corresponding positive and negative judgments about each of these behavioral beliefs. In an elicitation study faculty members identified access (i.e., access to a baccalaureate degree), credentials, and participation as features of the behavioral beliefs. Figure 12 shows the relationship among attitude and its components as well as the survey questions that measured them. Table 18 shows the responses for each of the behavioral beliefs and their corresponding outcome evaluation.

![Figure 12](image.png)

*Figure 12. Relationship between behavioral beliefs and attitude.*
Table 18

Responses to Survey Questions Measuring Behavioral Beliefs and Outcome Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Question</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>N (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Behavioral Beliefs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. By supporting the CCB transition, I am providing students with access to a baccalaureate degree. <em>(Likely 1..7 Unlikely)</em></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>(0) (0) (0) (10.5) (15.8) (26.3) (47.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Supporting the CCB transition will require that I update my credentials. <em>(Likely 1..7 Unlikely)</em></td>
<td>37</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>(39) (12.6) (7.4) (8.4) (7.4) (8.4) (16.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. If I support the CCB transition, then I will be expected to help implement it. <em>(Likely 1..7 Unlikely)</em></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>(12.6) (6.3) (6.3) (17.9) (7.4) (22.1) (27.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcome Evaluation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Providing students with access to a baccalaureate degree is <em>Undesirable/Desirable.</em></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>(1.1) (0) (1.05) (8.4) (9.5) (24.2) (55.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Updating my credentials to meet the CCB requirements is <em>Undesirable/Desirable.</em></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>(11.6) (8.4) (8.4) (25.3) (8.42) (15.8) (22.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. For me, participating in the CCB transition is <em>Undesirable/Desirable.</em></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>(1.1) (3.2) (6.3) (14.7) (20) (19) (35.8)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: In accordance to the theory of planned behavior, the validity of the survey questions measuring behavioral beliefs, three items had negative endpoints: survey questions 6, 28, and 23. The responses to survey questions 6, 28, and 23 were recoded so that higher numbers reflect a positive behavioral belief about the target behavior. Care was taken to invert the responses on the reverse scored statements in order to analyze them in a consistent manner (1 becomes 7, 2 becomes 6, 3 becomes 5, 4 stays a 4, 3 becomes 5, 2 becomes 6, 1 becomes 7).*
An example of one faculty member’s responses to the survey questions (SQ) measuring behavioral beliefs and the corresponding outcome evaluations, as well as attitude score, is presented in Table 19.

Table 19
Example of One Faculty Member’s Response to Survey Questions Measuring Behavioral Beliefs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behavioral Beliefs</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Outcome Evaluation</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Calculation</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access SQ 6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Access SQ 29</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6 x 6</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credentials SQ 28</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Credentials SQ 31</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4 x 4</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation SQ 33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Participation SQ 12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1 x 5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Attitude Score: 57**

*Note:* The faculty member’s attitude score is 57 out of a maximum possible score of 147. The maximum possible score is calculated by multiplying the highest score on the Likert scale (7) for each question, then summing the maximum score for each attribute.

The attitude score for each faculty member was computed by adding the cross product of each behavioral belief and the corresponding outcome evaluation (see Table 19). Given the survey questions, attitude was then computed: \[\text{Attitude} = (\text{SQ 6} \times \text{SQ 29}) + (\text{SQ 28} \times \text{SQ 31}) + (\text{SQ 33} \times \text{SQ 12}).\] For example, the faculty member responded as follows: 6, 4, 1 for survey questions 6, 28, and 33, respectively, and 6, 4, 5 for survey questions 29, 31, and 12, respectively. The faculty member’s attitude was computed: \[\text{Attitude score} = (6 \times 6) + (4 \times 4) + (1 \times 5) = 57,\] out of a maximum possible score of 147.

Attitude scores were computed for each faculty member. A total attitude score for all participants was then computed by taking the average of the individual attitude scores. The total attitude score was found to be 81 out of a maximum possible score of 147.
Correlation between attitude behavioral beliefs and attitude. Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient statistics were computed to calculate the correlation between the faculty members’ behavioral beliefs that underlie attitude and their actual attitudes. The results indicated a statistically significant and positive relationship between them, with less than a 1% chance for Type I error. As attitude ratings among survey questions 1-4 increased, so did behavioral belief ratings for access, credentials, and participation. The correlation between the behavioral beliefs and attitude was $r = .46, p = .01$, with the strongest correlation ($r = .61, p = .01$) between attitude ratings and access ratings. Table 20 shows the relationship between attitude and its components.

Table 20
Correlations Between Behavioral Beliefs and Attitude

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>$r$</th>
<th>$P$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Behavioral Beliefs</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credentials</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hypothesis 2: Normative beliefs about the CCB transition are significantly associated with subjective norms about the CCB transition. Hypothesis 2 posits that normative beliefs about the CCB transition are significantly associated with subjective norms about the CCB transition. A correlation analysis between normative beliefs that underlie subjective norms and actual subjective norms questions shows a statistically significant and positive relationship ($r = .48, p = .01$) between normative beliefs and actual subjective norms measures.
Normative beliefs that underlie subjective norms. The subjective norms score was derived by assessing faculty members’ normative beliefs about supporting the CCB transition. These beliefs were constructed using two components: (1) faculty members’ “beliefs about how other people who may in some way be important to the person, would like them to behave” and (2) how motivated the faculty members are to comply with these important peoples’ perception (i.e., motivation to comply; Francis et al., 2004, p. 9). In an elicitation study faculty members identified administrators, students, business and industry leaders, and other faculty members as features of normative beliefs. Figure 13 shows the relationship between subjective norms and its components, as well as the survey questions that measured them. Table 21 shows the responses for each of the normative beliefs and their corresponding motivation to comply.

Figure 13. Relationship between normative beliefs and subjective norms.
Table 21

Responses to Survey Questions Measuring Normative Beliefs and Motivation to Comply

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Question</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Normative Beliefs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Administrators think that I <em>should not</em> 1..7 <em>should</em> support the CCB transition.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(1.1)</td>
<td>(1.1)</td>
<td>(31.6)</td>
<td>(10.5)</td>
<td>(22.1)</td>
<td>(33.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Students think that I <em>should not</em> 1..7 <em>should</em> support the CCB transition.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.1)</td>
<td>(1.1)</td>
<td>(5.3)</td>
<td>(56.8)</td>
<td>(11.6)</td>
<td>(9.5)</td>
<td>(14.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Business and industry leaders think that I <em>should not</em> 1..7 <em>should</em> support the CCB transition.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.1)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(5.3)</td>
<td>(43.2)</td>
<td>(11.6)</td>
<td>(13.7)</td>
<td>(25.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Other faculty in my college <em>do not</em> 1..7 <em>do</em> support the CCB transition.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.1)</td>
<td>(1.1)</td>
<td>(3.2)</td>
<td>(45.3)</td>
<td>(8.4)</td>
<td>(17.9)</td>
<td>(23.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Motivation to Comply</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Doing what administrators think I <em>should</em> do is important to me. (<em>Not at all 1..7 Very much</em>)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(7.4)</td>
<td>(8.4)</td>
<td>(10.5)</td>
<td>(19)</td>
<td>(27.4)</td>
<td>(16.8)</td>
<td>(10.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Doing what students think I <em>should</em> do is important to me. (<em>Not at all 1..7 Very much</em>)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(6.3)</td>
<td>(4.2)</td>
<td>(7.4)</td>
<td>(27.4)</td>
<td>(31.6)</td>
<td>(11.6)</td>
<td>(11.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Doing what business and industry leaders think I <em>should</em> do is important to me. (<em>Not at all 1..7 Very much</em>)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(9.5)</td>
<td>(8.4)</td>
<td>(8.4)</td>
<td>(22.1)</td>
<td>(21.1)</td>
<td>(13.7)</td>
<td>(16.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Doing what other faculty think I <em>should</em> do is important to me. (<em>Not at all 1..7 Very much</em>)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(12.6)</td>
<td>(14.7)</td>
<td>(10.5)</td>
<td>(20.0)</td>
<td>(26.3)</td>
<td>(14.7)</td>
<td>(1.1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
An example of one faculty member’s responses to the survey questions measuring normative beliefs and the corresponding motivation to comply, as well as the normative beliefs score, is presented in Table 22.

Table 22

Example of One Faculty Member’s Response to Survey Questions Measuring Normative Beliefs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Normative Beliefs</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Motivation to Comply</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Calculation</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrators SQ 20</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Administrators SQ 7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7 x 3</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students SQ 22</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Students SQ 18</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6 x 5</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business &amp; Industry Leaders SQ 34</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Business &amp; Industry Leaders SQ 25</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6 x 7</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Faculty SQ 30</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Other Faculty SQ 21</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6 x 5</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subjective Norms Score: 123

Note: Faculty member’s subjective norms score is 123 out of a maximum possible score of 196. The maximum possible score is calculated by multiplying the highest score on the Likert scale (7) for each question, then summing the maximum score for each attribute.

The subjective norms score for each faculty member was computed by adding the cross product of each normative belief and its corresponding motivation to comply (see Table 22). Given the survey questions, subjective norms were then computed: Subjective Norms = (SQ 20 x SQ 7) + (SQ 22 x SQ 18) + (SQ 34 x SQ 25) + (SQ 30 x SQ 21). For example, the faculty member responded as follows: 7, 6, 6, 6 for survey questions 20, 7, 22, & 18, respectively, and 3, 5, 7, 5 for survey questions 34, 25, 30, and 21, respectively. The faculty member’s subjective norms score was computed: Subjective
Norms Score = (7 x 3) + (6 x 5) + (6 x 7) + (6 x 5) = 123, out of a maximum possible score of 196.

Subjective norms scores were computed for each faculty member. A total subjective norms score for all participants was then computed by taking the average of the individual subjective norms scores. The total subjective norms score was found to be 87.9 out of a maximum possible score of 196.

**Correlation between normative beliefs and subjective norms.** Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient statistics were then calculated to determine the correlation between the faculty members’ normative beliefs that underlie subjective norms and their actual subjective norms. The results indicated a statistically significant and positive relationship (r = .48, p = .01). As subjective norms ratings among survey questions 10, 14, 26, and 35 increased, so did normative belief ratings for administrators, students, business and industry leaders, and other faculty members. The correlation between normative beliefs and subjective norms was r = .48, p = .01, with the strongest correlation (r = .59, p = .01) among subjective norms ratings and administrators’ ratings. Table 23 shows the relationship between subjective norms and its components.

Table 23

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Normative Beliefs</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrators</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business and Industry Leaders</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Faculty</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hypothesis 3: **Control beliefs about the CCB transition are significantly associated with perceived behavioral control about the CCB transition.** Hypothesis 3 posits that control beliefs about the CCB transition are significantly associated with perceived behavioral control over the CCB transition. A correlational analysis between the control beliefs that underlie perceived behavioral control and actual perceived behavioral control questions shows a correlation of \( r = .08, p = .01 \) between the normative beliefs and actual perceived behavioral control measures.

**Control beliefs that underlie perceived behavioral control.** The perceived behavioral control score was derived by assessing faculty members’ control beliefs about supporting the CCB transition. These beliefs were constructed using two components: (1) the strength of faculty members’ control beliefs and (2) the “power of these control factors to influence the behaviour” (Francis et al., 2004, p. 22). The elicitation study identified faculty support, program needs assessment, and program quality as features of control beliefs. Figure 14 shows the relationship among perceived behavioral control and its components, as well as the survey questions that measured them. Table 24 shows the responses for each of the control beliefs and their corresponding perceived power.

![Diagram showing the relationship between perceived behavioral control and control beliefs]

**Figure 14.** Relationship between perceived behavioral control and control beliefs.
Table 24

Reponses to Survey Questions Measuring Control Beliefs and Perceived Power

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Question</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Control Beliefs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. If the college does not provide faculty support, it is difficult for me</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|  to support the CCB transition.  
(Unlikely 1..7 Likely)                                                              | (9.5)| (3.2)| (5.3)| (23.2)| (16.8)| (22.1)| (20.1)|
| 19. If a program needs assessment is not conducted, then it is difficult for me | 7   | 7   | 4   | 23  | 23  | 15  | 16  |
|  to support the CCB transition.  
(Unlikely 1..7 Likely)                                                              | (7.4)| (7.4)| (4.2)| (24.2)| (24.2)| (15.8)| (16.8)|
| 24. I feel that the college will not provide quality baccalaureate programs, so | 41  | 2   | 5   | 13  | 6   | 5   | 4   |
| it makes it difficult for me to support the CCB transition.  
(Unlikely 1..7 Likely)                                                          | (43.2)| (22.1)| (5.3)| (13.7)| (6.3)| (5.3)| (4.2)|
| **Perceived Power**                                                             |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| 17. When the college provides faculty support, I am less likely 1..7 more        | 1   | 2   | 1   | 14  | 10  | 24  | 43  |
| likely to support the CCB transition.                                           | (1.1)| (2.1)| (1.1)| (14.7)| (10.1)| (25.3)| (45.3)|
| 9. When the college does not conduct a program needs assessment, I am less      | 23  | 18  | 21  | 25  | 3   | 2   | 3   |
| likely 1..7 more likely to support the CCB transition.                           | (24.2)| (19.0)| (22.1)| (26.3)| (3.2)| (2.1)| (3.2)|
| 32. Feeling that the college will not provide quality baccalaureate programs, I | 24  | 16  | 12  | 31  | 7   | 2   | 3   |
| am less likely 1..7 more likely to support the CCB transition.                   | (25.3)| (16.8)| (12.6)| (32.6)| (7.4)| (2.1)| (3.2)|

An example of one faculty member’s responses to the survey questions measuring control beliefs and the corresponding perceived power, as well as the perceived behavioral control score, is presented in Table 25.
The perceived behavioral control score for each faculty member was computed by adding the cross product of each control belief and its corresponding perceived power.

Given the survey questions, perceived behavioral control was then computed: *Perceived Behavioral Control* = (SQ 15 x SQ 17) + (SQ 19 x SQ 9) + (SQ 24 x SQ 32). For example, the faculty member responded as follows: 6, 5, 2, for survey questions 15, 19, and 24, respectively, and 7, 1, and 5 for survey questions 17, 9, and 32, respectively. The faculty member’s perceived behavioral control score was computed: *Perceived Behavioral Control Score* = (6 x 7) + (5 x 1) + (2 x 5) = 57, out of a maximum possible score of 147.

Perceived behavioral control scores were computed for each faculty member. A total perceived behavioral control score for all participants was then computed by taking the average of the individual perceived behavioral control scores. A total perceived behavioral control score was found to be 48.9 out of a maximum possible score of 147.
Correlation between control beliefs and perceived behavioral control. Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient statistics were calculated to determine the correlation between the faculty members’ control beliefs that underlie perceived behavioral control and their perceived behavioral control. The results indicated no significant relationship between them. As perceived behavioral control ratings among survey questions 5, 8, 13, and 16 increased, control belief ratings for faculty support, program needs assessment, and program quality remained the same. The correlation between control beliefs and perceived behavioral control was \( r = .08, p = .55 \) with the strongest correlation \( (r = .17, p = .10) \) among perceived behavioral control and program needs assessment ratings. Table 26 shows the relationship between Perceived Behavioral Control and its components.

Table 26

Correlations Between Control Beliefs and Perceived Behavioral Control

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>( r )</th>
<th>( p )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control Beliefs</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Support</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Needs Assessment</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Quality</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hypotheses 4 – 7: Faculty members’ attitudes, subjective norms, and perceived behavioral control as predictive factors of intention to support the CCB transition. Hypotheses 3-7 posit that attitude, subjective norms, and perceived behavioral control, individually and collectively, predict faculty members’ intention to support the CCB transition. Hypotheses 4–6 measure the predictability of the predictor variables, individually. Hypothesis 7 measures the predictability of all three measures combined.
A correlational analysis between (a) attitude and behavioral intentions shows a statistically significant and positive relationship ($r = .82, p = .01$); (b) subjective norms and behavioral intention shows a statistically significant and positive relationship ($r = .22, p = .05$); and (c) perceived behavioral control and behavioral intention shows statistically significant and positive relationship ($r = .34, p = .01$). A multiple linear regression on attitude, subjective norms, and perceived behavioral control indicates that attitude, subjective norms and perceived behavioral control account for 69% of the variability in faculty members’ intention to support the CCB transition.

Survey items 11, 23, and 27 were constructed to elicit faculty members’ responses to faculty members’ behavioral intentions toward the CCB transition (see Table 27). Three different types of question formats with a 7-point Likert scale were used to elicit behavioral intentions: expect, want, and intend to support the CCB transition. These three different formats ensure the internal consistency of behavioral intentions (Francis et al., 2004). The three survey questions used to illicit faculty members’ behavioral intention had an internal consistency of .95.

Table 27

Responses to Survey Questions Measuring Behavioral Intention

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Question</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>N (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11. I expect to support the CCB transition. (Disagree 1..7 Agree)</td>
<td>1 (1.1)</td>
<td>2 (2.1)</td>
<td>4 (4.2)</td>
<td>6 (6.3)</td>
<td>13 (13.7)</td>
<td>17 (17.9)</td>
<td>52 (54.7)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. I want to support the CCB transition. (Disagree 1..7 Agree)</td>
<td>3 (3.2)</td>
<td>1 (1.1)</td>
<td>2 (2.1)</td>
<td>15 (15.8)</td>
<td>13 (13.7)</td>
<td>18 (19)</td>
<td>43 (45.3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. I fully intend to support the CCB transition. (Disagree 1..7 Agree)</td>
<td>1 (1.1)</td>
<td>2 (2.1)</td>
<td>3 (3.2)</td>
<td>15 (15.8)</td>
<td>15 (15.8)</td>
<td>19 (20)</td>
<td>40 (42.1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A close examination of the survey questions that measured behavioral intention shows that 73% of the faculty members expect to support the CCB transition (e.g., selected a 6 or 7 on the 7-point Likert scale), 64% want to support the CCB transition (e.g., selected a 6 or 7 on the 7-point Likert scale), and 62% fully intend to support the CCB transition (e.g., selected a 6 or 7 on the 7-point Likert scale).

**Hypothesis 4: Faculty members’ attitudes about the CCB transition are significantly associated with their behavioral intentions to support the CCB transition.** Hypothesis 4 posits that faculty members’ attitude about the CCB transition are significantly associated with behavioral intentions to support the CCB transition. A correlational analysis between attitude and behavioral intention shows a statistically significant and positive relationship ($r = .82, p = .01$).

A close examination of the survey questions that measured attitude shows that the majority of the faculty members (67%) indicated supporting the CCB transition is the right thing to do (e.g., selected a 6 or 7 on the 7-point Likert scale), as well as 73% indicated that supporting the CCB transition is good (e.g., selected a 6 or 7 on the 7-point Likert scale). Seventy-seven percent of the faculty members indicated that supporting the CCB transition is beneficial to the college (e.g., selected a 6 or 7 on the 7-point Likert scale), while 53% of the faculty members indicated that supporting the CCB transition would be beneficial to them (e.g., selected a 6 or 7 on the 7-point Likert scale). Overall, faculty members indicated a positive attitude toward supporting the CCB transition.

The responses for each survey question measuring attitude are presented in Table 28.
Table 28

Responses to Survey Questions Measuring Attitude

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Question</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Overall I think supporting the CCB transition is the wrong thing to do/the right thing to do.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.1)</td>
<td>(2.1)</td>
<td>(4.2)</td>
<td>(8.4)</td>
<td>(16.8)</td>
<td>(15.8)</td>
<td>(51.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Overall I think supporting the CCB transition is good/bad.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(5.3)</td>
<td>(3.2)</td>
<td>(9.5)</td>
<td>(9.5)</td>
<td>(16.8)</td>
<td>(55.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Overall I think supporting the CCB transition is beneficial to me/harmful to me.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(4.2)</td>
<td>(3.2)</td>
<td>(24.2)</td>
<td>(15.8)</td>
<td>(14.7)</td>
<td>(37.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Overall I think supporting the CCB transition is harmful to college/beneficial to college.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(2.1)</td>
<td>(4.2)</td>
<td>(9.8)</td>
<td>(7.4)</td>
<td>(22.1)</td>
<td>(54.7)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: In accordance to the theory of planned behavior, the validity of the survey questions measuring attitude, two items had negative endpoints: survey questions 2 and 3. The responses to survey questions 2 and 3 were recoded so that higher numbers reflects a positive attitude to the target behavior. Care was taken to invert the responses on the reverse scored statements in order to analyze them in a consistent manner (1 becomes 7, 2 becomes 6, 3 becomes 5, 4 stays a 4, 3 becomes 5, 2 becomes 6, 1 becomes 7).

**Correlation between attitude and behavioral intention.** A Pearson product-moment correlation was used to calculate the strength and direction of relationship between attitude scores (i.e., cumulative summary of survey questions 1-4 ratings), and behavioral intention (i.e., cumulative summary of survey questions 11, 23 and 27 ratings). The results indicated a statistically significant and positive relationship ($r = .82$, $p = .01$) between attitude and behavioral intention. As attitude ratings increased, so did behavioral intention ratings. The four survey questions used to illicit faculty members’ attitude had an internal consistency of .89.
Hypothesis 5: Faculty members’ subjective norms about the CCB transition are significantly associated with their behavioral intentions to support the CCB transition. Hypothesis 5 posits that faculty members’ subjective norms about the CCB transition are significantly associated with their behavioral intentions to support the CCB transition. A correlational analysis between subjective norms and behavioral intention shows a statistically significant and positive relationship ($r = .22$, $p = .05$).

The responses for each survey question measuring subjective norms are presented in Table 29.

Table 29

Responses to Survey Questions Measuring Subjective Norms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Question</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10. People who are important to me expect me to support the CCB transition.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Disagree 1..7 Agree)</td>
<td>(2.1)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(2.1)</td>
<td>(47.4)</td>
<td>(14.8)</td>
<td>(14.7)</td>
<td>(17.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. I feel under social pressure to support the CCB transition. (Disagree 1..7</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree)</td>
<td>(44.2)</td>
<td>(17.9)</td>
<td>(8.4)</td>
<td>(16.8)</td>
<td>(4.2)</td>
<td>(5.3)</td>
<td>(3.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Most people who are important to me think that I should/should not support</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the CCB transition.</td>
<td>(10.5)</td>
<td>(5.3)</td>
<td>(7.4)</td>
<td>(31.6)</td>
<td>(16.8)</td>
<td>(17.9)</td>
<td>(10.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. People who are important to me want me to support the CCB transition.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Disagree 1..7 Agree)</td>
<td>(2.1)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(9.5)</td>
<td>(41.1)</td>
<td>(15.8)</td>
<td>(13.7)</td>
<td>(17.9)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: In accordance with the theory of planned behavior, survey question 26 was scored by recoding the item so that a higher number reflects a greater social pressure to perform the behavior. The responses to survey question 26 was recoded so that higher numbers reflect a positive subjective norms about the target behavior. Care was taken to invert the responses on the reverse scored statement in order to analyze them in a consistent manner (1 becomes 7, 2 becomes 6, 3 becomes 5, 4 stays a 4, 3 becomes 5, 2 becomes 6, 1 becomes 7).
A close examination of the survey questions that measured subjective norms shows that 62% of the faculty members indicated they do not feel under social pressure to support the CCB transition (e.g., selected a 1 or 2 on the 7-point Likert scale). Thirty-two percent of faculty members responded neutrally when asked if “Most people who are important to me think that I should/should not support the CCB transition” (e.g., selected a 4 on the 7-point Likert scale). Additionally, 47% of the faculty members responded neutrally when asked if people who were important to them expected them to support the CCB transition, or 41% when asked if people who were important to them wanted them to support the CCB transition.

**Correlation between subjective norms and behavioral intention.** A Pearson product-moment correlation was used to calculate the strength and direction of relationship between subjective norms (i.e., cumulative summary of survey questions 10, 14, 26, and 35 ratings), and behavioral intention (i.e., cumulative summary of survey questions 11, 23 and 27 ratings). The results indicated a statistically significant and positive relationship ($r = .22, p = .05$) between subjective norms and behavioral intention. As subjective norms ratings increased, so did behavioral intention ratings. The four survey questions used to elicit faculty members’ subjective norms had an internal consistency of .67.

**Hypothesis 6: Faculty members’ perceived behavioral control over the CCB transition are significantly associated with their behavioral intentions to support the CCB transition.** Hypothesis 6 posits that faculty members’ perceived behavioral control over the CCB transition are significantly associated with their behavioral intentions to support the CCB transition. A correlational analysis between perceived behavioral
control and behavioral intention shows a statistically significant and positive relationship \((r = .34, p = .01)\).

A close examination of the survey questions that measured perceived behavioral control shows that 78% of the faculty members indicated supporting the CCB transition would be easy (e.g., selected a 6 or 7 on a 7-point Likert scale; see Table 30).

Furthermore, 70% of the faculty members were confident they could support the CCB transition if they wanted to do so (e.g., selected a 6 or 7 on a 7-point Likert scale). Therefore, faculty members responded positively (e.g., selected a 6 or 7 on a 7-point Likert scale) to the survey questions measuring self-efficacy. Faculty members were split between agreeing (e.g., 39% selected a 6 or 7 on the 7-point Likert scale) and disagreeing (e.g., 34% selected a 1 or 2 on the 7-point Likert scale) that the decision to support the CCB was beyond their control. Fifty-one percent of the faculty members felt strongly (e.g., selected a 6 or 7 on the 7-point Likert scale) that support for the CCB transition was up to them. Table 30 shows the responses for each survey question measuring perceived behavioral control.

**,Correlation between perceived behavioral control and behavioral intention.** A Pearson product-moment correlation was used to calculate the strength and direction of relationship between perceived behavioral control (i.e., cumulative summary of survey questions 5, 8, 13 and 16 ratings) and behavioral intention (i.e., cumulative summary of survey questions 11, 23 and 27 ratings). The results indicated a statistically significant and positive relationship \((r = .34, p = .01)\) between perceived behavioral control and behavioral intention. As perceived behavioral control ratings increased, so did behavioral
intention ratings. The four survey questions used to elicit faculty members’ perceived behavioral control had an internal consistency of .61.

Table 30

Responses to Survey Questions Measuring Perceived Behavioral Control

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Question</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>N (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Self-efficacy</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. For me to support the CCB transition is difficult 1..7 easy.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3.2)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(1.1)</td>
<td>(6.3)</td>
<td>(11.6)</td>
<td>(26.3)</td>
<td>(51.6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I am confident that I could support the CCB transition if I wanted to. (Disagree 1..7 Agree)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(17.9)</td>
<td>(12.6)</td>
<td>(31.6)</td>
<td>(37.9)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Controllability</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. The decision to support the CCB transition is beyond my control. (Disagree 1..7 Agree)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(20)</td>
<td>(13.7)</td>
<td>(5.3)</td>
<td>(15.8)</td>
<td>(6.3)</td>
<td>(13.7)</td>
<td>(25.3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Whether I support the CCB transition or not is entirely up to me. (Disagree 1..7 Agree)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(11.6)</td>
<td>(7.4)</td>
<td>(5.3)</td>
<td>(12.6)</td>
<td>(12.6)</td>
<td>(15.8)</td>
<td>(34.7)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Hypothesis 7: Attitude, subjective norms, and perceived behavioral control predict faculty members’ behavioral intention to support the CCB transition.**

Hypothesis 7 posits that attitude, subjective norms, and perceived behavioral control ratings will predict behavioral intention toward supporting the CCB transition. A multiple linear regression was calculated to predict faculty members’ behavioral intention to support the CCB transition. The prediction is based on the cumulative ratings of attitude, subjective norms, and perceived behavioral control. Table 31 presents the variables and corresponding estimates for the multiple linear regression.
Table 31

Multiple Linear Regression for Behavioral Intention

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>b/Estimates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept constant</td>
<td>-0.642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X_1 = \text{Attitude}$</td>
<td>0.221*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X_2 = \text{Subjective Norms}$</td>
<td>0.050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X_3 = \text{Perceived Behavioral Control}$</td>
<td>0.870*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*statistical significance, $p = .01$

Note: $n = 95$
$R^2 = 69.2$, $F[3, 91] = 68.21$, $p = .0001$ for all predictor variables.
Adjusted $R^2 = 68.2$

As presented in Table 31, attitude and perceived behavioral control have significant b/estimates. A statistically significant $R^2$ value (.69) represents the percentage of variance in behavioral intention that is accounted for by the linear combination of predictor variables (e.g., attitude, subjective norms, and perceived behavioral control). Therefore, attitude, subjective norms, and perceived behavioral control explain 69% of faculty members’ intention to support the CCB transition, with the greatest independent contributions from perceived behavioral control ($b = .87$) and attitude ($b = .22$).

The accuracy of the prediction is increased by adding the intercept constant (-0.642), which represents the value of behavioral intention when all the variables (e.g., attitude, subjective norms, and perceived behavioral control) are zero (Hatcher & Stepanski, 1994). The multiple linear regression coefficient, or $b$, reveals the amount of weight that the variable is given when computing behavioral intention. As can be seen in Table 28, attitude and perceived behavioral control were statistically significant.
Therefore, when faculty members’ behavioral intention score increased by one point, attitude increased by .22 points and perceived behavioral control increased by .87.

**Summary of Chapter 4**

Based on the data analysis above, the following conclusions were reached:

1. Hypothesis 1 posits that behavioral beliefs about the CCB transition are significantly associated with attitudes toward the CCB transition. This hypothesis is accepted. There were statistically significant ($r = .46, p = .01$) relationships between attitude and behavioral beliefs (e.g., behavioral beliefs (B) x evaluation of outcomes (E) categorized by access, credentials, and participation. As attitude scores among survey questions 1-4 increased, so did behavioral belief scores for access, credentials, and participation with the strongest correlation ($r = .61, p = .01$) among attitude and access.

2. Hypothesis 2 posits that normative beliefs about the CCB transition are significantly associated with subjective norms toward the CCB transition. This hypothesis is accepted. There were statistically significant ($r = .48, p = .01$) relationships between subjective norms and normative belief (e.g., normative beliefs (N) x motivation to comply (M) categorized by administrators, students, business/industry leaders, and other faculty members. As subjective norms scores increased, so did scores for normative beliefs scores among categories of administrators, students, business and industry leaders, and other faculty members with the strongest correlation ($r = .59, p = .01$) among subjective norms and administrator motivation to comply.
3. Hypothesis 3 posits that control beliefs about the CCB transition are significantly associated with perceived behavioral control over the CCB transition. This hypothesis is rejected. There were no statistically significant relationships between perceived behavioral control and control beliefs. As perceived behavioral control scores increased, scores for control beliefs among categories of faculty support, program needs assessment, and program quality remained essentially the same.

4. Hypothesis 4 posits that attitudes about the CCB transition are significantly associated with behavioral intention. This hypothesis is accepted with statistical significance. There was a statistically significant \((r = .82, p = .01)\) relationship between attitude and behavioral intention. As attitude scores increased, so did behavioral intention scores.

5. Hypothesis 5 posits that subjective norms about the CCB transition are significantly associated with behavioral intention. There was a statistically significant \((r = .22, p = .05)\) relationship between subjective norms and behavioral intention. This hypothesis is accepted with statistical significance. As subjective norms scores increased, so did behavioral intentions scores.

6. Hypothesis 6 posits that perceived behavioral control about the CCB transition is significantly associated with behavioral intention. There was a statistically significant \((r = .32, p = .01)\) relationship between perceived behavioral control and behavioral intention. This hypothesis is accepted with statistical significance. As perceived behavioral control scores increased, so did behavioral intentions scores.
Hypothesis 7 posits that attitude, subjective norms, and perceived behavioral control scores will predict behavioral intention related toward the CCB transition. This hypothesis is accepted with statistical significance. Attitude, subjective norms, and perceived behavioral control account for 69% of the variability, with the greatest contributions from perceived behavioral control ($b = .87$) and attitude ($b = .22$).

The findings, implications, and recommendations for future research will be discussed in Chapter 5.
Chapter 5:
Findings, Implications and Recommendations

Introduction

Community colleges have more than a 100-year history of adapting to meet the needs of the community. Walker (2001) contends that community colleges have survived in the past by being adaptive and responsive to community needs. The most recent movement that has led to changes in the community college system is the community college baccalaureate (CCB). Florida is leading the CCB movement with 18 of the state’s 28 community colleges offering a total of 111 bachelor’s of arts, bachelor’s of science, and bachelor’s of applied science degrees in high-demand and specialized fields. Those who support the two-year colleges becoming baccalaureate-granting institutions argue that community colleges can provide students with access to baccalaureate degrees in high-demand fields, at an affordable price (Walker, 2005). Those who oppose the movement argue that the community college core values of open-door access, learner-centeredness, affordability, convenience, and responsiveness will be compromised (Walker, 2005).

The purpose of this study was to explore faculty members’ intentions toward supporting their college’s transition to a CCB institution. An understanding of faculty members’ perspectives and what factors shape their intentions toward the CCB will help
community colleges to develop interventions that can gain faculty members’ support for the CCB transition.

Three hundred and nineteen full-time faculty members’ from two community colleges that were in the process of transitioning to CCB institutions were invited to participate in this study. Ninety-five of those responded, representing a 30% response rate. The faculty members from the two colleges were in different stages of the transition when completing the survey in January, 2010. College A was waiting to be approved to offer baccalaureate degrees and College B was offering their first BAS program. The following section provides a summary of the results of hypotheses that guided this study.

Findings

Hypothesis 1: Behavioral beliefs about the CCB transition are significantly associated with attitudes toward the CCB transition. Faculty members identified providing students with access to a baccalaureate degree, updating their credentials, and participating in the CCB transition as the important behavioral beliefs that will influence their attitude toward supporting the CCB transition. The results of this study indicate that the three factors—access, credentials, and participation—shape faculty members’ attitudes toward their intention to support the CCB transition. Of the three factors, access had the strongest relationship ($r = 46, p = .01$) with faculty members’ attitude toward supporting the transition. Faculty members believe that providing students with access to earning a baccalaureate degree is important.

Hypothesis 2: Normative beliefs about the CCB transition are significantly associated with subjective norms about the CCB transition. Faculty members identified administrators, students, business and industry leaders, and other faculty as
important individuals or groups who could influence their perception of the social pressure toward the CCB transition. The results of this study indicate that the four groups—administrators, students, business and industry leaders, and other faculty—shape faculty members’ perceptions of the social pressure toward their intention to support the CCB transition. Of the four groups, administrators had the strongest correlation \( (r = .59, p = .01) \) with faculty members’ subjective norms (i.e., a person’s own estimate of the social pressure to perform or not perform the target behavior). In other words, faculty members indicate feeling social pressure from college administrators to support the CCB transition.

**Hypothesis 3: Control beliefs about the CCB transition are significantly associated with perceived behavioral control about the CCB transition.** Faculty members identified faculty support, program needs assessment, and program quality as the important control beliefs that will influence their perception of control over the CCB transition. However, the results of this study indicate no relationship between the three factors and faculty members’ perceptions of control over the CCB transition.

**Hypothesis 4: Faculty members’ attitudes about the CCB transition are significantly associated with their behavioral intentions to support the CCB transition.** The results of this study indicate faculty members’ attitudes about the CCB transition are associated with their behavioral intention to support the transition. The relationship between attitude and behavioral intention was the strongest \( (r = .82, p = .01) \) of the three direct measures—attitude, subjective norms, and perceived behavioral control.
Hypothesis 5: Faculty members’ subjective norms about the CCB transition are significantly associated with their behavioral intentions to support the CCB transition. The results of this study show a relationship between faculty members’ subjective norms (i.e., social norms) about the CCB transition are associated with their behavioral intention to support the transition. The relationship between behavioral intention and subjective norms was the weakest relationship ($r = .22$, $p = .01$) of the three direct measures—attitude, subjective norms, and perceived behavioral control.

Hypothesis 6: Faculty members’ perceived behavioral control over the CCB transition are significantly associated with their behavioral intentions to support the CCB transition. The results of this study indicate that faculty members’ perceived control over the CCB transition is associated with their intentions to support the CCB transition. The relationship between behavioral intention and perceived behavioral control was the second strongest ($r = .32$, $p = .01$) of the three direct measures—attitude, subjective norms, and perceived behavioral control.

Hypothesis 7: Attitude, Subjective Norms, and Perceived Behavioral Control predict faculty members’ behavioral intention to support the CCB transition. The results of this study indicate that faculty members’ attitude toward the CCB transition, subjective norms (i.e, social pressure) about the CCB transition, and perceived control over the CCB transition can be used to predict faculty members’ intention to support the transition. The combination of attitude, subjective norms, and perceived behavioral control account for 69% of the variability, leaving 31% of the variability unexplained.
Implications for Practice

Getting faculty members to “buy-in” to change is recognized in the literature as a critical problem. Faculty members are viewed as the change agents for the classroom, as well as for the institution (Rouseff-Baker, 2002); therefore, it is important to understand faculty members’ perspectives toward the CCB transition and to gain their support. As reported in Chapter 4 of this study, faculty members indicate they want to, intend to, and plan to support the CCB transition. Administrators need to identify ways to continually strengthen faculty members’ intentions toward supporting the CCB transition, as well as to encourage faculty members’ who are undecided or opposed to the CCB transition, to support to the transition. The results of this study would seem to indicate that administrators can help gain the support of faculty members by (a) emphasizing how offering the CCB maintains the core values of the community college, especially the long-held tradition of access, (b) providing faculty members professional development opportunities to obtain advanced degrees if they would like to teach upper-division courses, and (c) including faculty members in the decision-making process for their college’s transition to a CCB institution.

Maintain community college core values. Findings of this study indicate that faculty members believe the community college’s “core values of open-door access, learner-centeredness, affordability, convenience, and responsiveness” (Walker, 2005, p. 19) are important. They believe that by providing students with access to a CCB degree, they are providing students with greater access to a baccalaureate degree. Since a high percentage of community college students are learners who work full-time, have families, and are not geographically close to a university, faculty members’ belief that they are
providing students with access to a baccalaureate degree is a reasonable assumption. One faculty member stated, in the elicitation study to develop the survey questions, that an advantage of the CCB is that “[f]or the student, there is an obvious advantage in enabling them to complete a four-year degree without extensive travel perhaps and maybe at less cost.” Furthermore, faculty members’ beliefs about access are supported in the literature by proponents of the CCB. For example, proponents of the CCB argue that community colleges can provide students with access to baccalaureate degrees in high-demand fields, at an affordable price (Walker, 2005).

The community college core values are important to faculty members, and likely very important to community college leaders themselves. However, it will be important for college administrators to reassure faculty members that the introduction of baccalaureate programs will not compromise the college’s core values, and will in fact expand the definition of access in ways that are very compatible with the democratic mission of the community college. Any major change requires greater focus on communicating the purpose and the goals of the change. Kotter (1996) suggests that getting buy-in for any change requires effectively communicating the purpose and goal of the change, and doing so over an extended period of time. It won’t be enough to simply announce that the CCB is another dimension of student access; the message must be communicated in many different ways to many different audiences, until it becomes part of the new “tradition” of access in the evolving history of the community college.

**Provide faculty members with professional development.** As community colleges expand their mission to include baccalaureate programs, the required entry-level credentials for faculty members may change (Townsend & Twombly, 2007). Some
faculty members “believe that a masters’ degree is already not enough” (Laden, 2005, p. 166) and a terminal degree will become mandatory (Skolnik, 2005). As a result, faculty members, particularly tenured faculty, may resist updating their credentials.

Faculty members teaching in baccalaureate programs in Florida are required by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS) to have a doctorate in the discipline or master’s degree in the discipline, or a master’s degree with 18 graduate hours in the discipline. Furthermore, at least 25% of the baccalaureate-level courses must be taught by faculty members with a terminal degree (Pappas Consulting, 2001). According to Townsend (2007), many community college faculty members seek terminal degrees in higher education or educational leadership, not in a discipline. Thus, some faculty members with terminal degrees may not have the credentials to meet SACS requirements.

Community college faculty members may find the cost and time needed to meet the requirements to teach upper-division courses as barriers to pursuing additional education. However, providing faculty members with support to earn a higher-level degree is an efficient strategy for increasing the number of faculty members with terminal degrees (Townsend & Twombly, 2007). As community colleges transition to CCB institutions and the baccalaureate programs within those institutions expand, additional funds for faculty professional development may be needed. While some colleges already offer faculty members support, such as tuition assistance or release time to take graduate-level courses, additional support may encourage more faculty members to seek terminal degrees. The results of this study show that 54% of the faculty members believe their college will provide them with the funds to update their credentials (e.g., selected a 6 or 7
on a 7-point Likert scale). Thus, more than half the faculty members surveyed believe that their college will support professional development. Community college professional development programs that provide additional tuition assistance to faculty members seeking terminal degrees in specific, high-demand fields have the potential of increasing credentialed faculty members.

Recruiting current faculty members to obtain terminal degrees may be challenging due to the length of time it takes to complete a doctoral degree, as well as the expense. Doctoral programs can take four or five years to complete; therefore, it may be difficult to find faculty members willing to make such a long-term commitment. In addition to the commitment of time, doctoral programs are expensive. Considering the length of time and expense to complete a doctoral program, faculty members may expect a raise or, at the very least, additional compensation for developing and teaching baccalaureate-level courses. It is not unreasonable to assume faculty members may be unwilling to seek terminal degrees without the possibility of an increase in compensation. Without a raise or additional compensation for developing and teaching baccalaureate-level courses, faculty members have little incentive to seek terminal degrees. Furthermore, faculty members with terminal degrees in a discipline that is offered at the baccalaureate level may be expected to develop and teach the higher-level courses whether they want to or not.

The alternative to providing current faculty members with the funds or sabbaticals to seek terminal degrees is to hire new faculty members with the required credentials. Hiring faculty members with the required credentials may become challenging due to the (a) increased demand for credentialed faculty members to teach at CCB institutions, (b)
expected increase in faculty members retiring, and (c) faculty members with terminal
degrees in a discipline may demand higher salaries (Laden, 2005). Eighteen of Florida’s
28 community colleges are offering baccalaureate programs, which means 18 community
colleges are seeking faculty members with terminal degrees. Therefore, community
colleges may have difficulty attracting credentialed faculty members due to an increased
demand, as well as “the massive impending community college faculty retirements
(Townsend & Twombly, 2007, p. 79.)” Furthermore, “community college faculty salaries
are the lowest in academe” (p. 78), which may make it even more difficulty for
community colleges to attract credentialed faculty members to teach baccalaureate-level
courses. For example, one of the community colleges that participated in this study has
been looking for a faculty member with a Ph.D. in business and organizational
management; however, only one qualified candidate has applied thus far.

Faculty members are concerned that CCB institutions may create a multi-tiered
system whereby higher-division faculty members will receive greater benefits than lower-
division faculty (Seidam, 1985). Critics of the CCB also believe that the CCB will create
multi-tier systems (Lane, 2003). Therefore, if community colleges pay baccalaureate
faculty members more to attract them to the institution, lower-division faculty members
may view the difference in salaries as a multi-tiered system. In addition to the possible
salary difference, upper-division faculty members may expect to teach few courses.
According to Laden (2005), faculty members teaching baccalaureate courses are
“expected to offer courses that include much more theory and provide opportunities for
students to do applied research projects” (p. 165), which requires more preparation time
than developing curriculum for lower-division courses. However, any variance in
teaching load between lower- and upper-division faculty members may be viewed as a multi-tiered system.

The CCB is a relatively recent development, and will continue to create new challenges in higher education. Establishing and maintaining equity among upper- and lower-division faculty members’ salaries and teaching loads may be a few of the challenges college administrators encounter in the near future.

**Include faculty members in the decision-making process.** Although adaptability to change is a hallmark of community colleges, change has seldom come without controversy from faculty members (Altbach, Gumport, & Johnstone, 2001). Research indicates that faculty members often resist organizational changes and this resistance negatively impacts change efforts (Bolman, 2003). Transitioning to a baccalaureate institution will require the support of faculty members to be successful (Latiolais, Holland, & Sutter, 2009). Laden (2005) contends that the success of baccalaureate programs is ultimately up to the faculty members teaching the courses. College administrators could reduce faculty members’ resistance to the baccalaureate process at their institution by including faculty members in the decision-making process. This has the potential to increase faculty members’ perception of control over the changes that occur as a result of becoming a CCB institution.

The results of this study show that 54% of the faculty members surveyed indicate a desire to participate in the CCB transition (e.g., selected a 6 or 7 on the 7-point Likert scale). College administrators should encourage faculty members to participate in all phases of the CCB transition. Fifty-three percent of the faculty members indicate that they feel administrators think they should support the CCB transition (e.g., selected a 6 or
7 on the 7-point Likert scale). However, only 26 faculty members indicate that doing what administrators thought they should do is important. An even greater concern is that 25 faculty members responded negatively (e.g., selected a 1 or 2 on a 7-point Likert scale).

It is not unusual for faculty members and administrators to have different viewpoints, particularly regarding the change associated with the CCB transition. Some faculty members inevitably find change difficult and unsettling (Remington, 2005). It is important that faculty members who oppose the transition do not undermine the transition (Bolman, 2003). Including faculty members in the decision-making process of all phases of the CCB transition may reduce any resistance faculty members feel toward their college’s transition to a CCB institution.

Limitations of the Study

The researcher attempted to use community colleges that were in the development stage of the CCB transition. Due to a delay in sending out the link to the survey, College B was in its first semester of offering a baccalaureate program. Therefore, the data were gathered from faculty members in the development and implementation stages of the CCB transition. It is unknown how this difference in implementation of the CCB influenced survey responses.

Survey questions were constructed in accordance with the guidelines established for questionnaires based upon the Theory of Planned Behavior: Constructing Questionnaires Based on the Theory of Planned Behaviour (Francis et al., 2004). There is a concern that faculty members may have found some survey questions unclear, particularly due to some of the response scales. Nineteen faculty members began the
survey but did not complete the survey. Although the researcher has no way of knowing why faculty members exited the survey prematurely, it is a reasonable assumption that faculty members may have found some survey questions unclear and chose not to complete the survey. The number of faculty members who chose not to complete the survey could also be explained by faculty members following the instructions for the survey, which stated that if the faculty member chose not to participate they could withdraw from this survey at any time by exiting the survey.

Researchers using the theory of planned behavior as a theoretical framework should consider conducting a second pilot study which would provide additional feedback for enhancing the clarity and understanding of the survey questions and response scales, as well as identifying and defining key terms.

**Recommendations for Future Research**

The CCB is a relatively recent development in higher education, and will continue to create new challenges and opportunities for higher education. As a result, there are many opportunities for further research. Current literature focuses on the CCB from an administrative or student perspective, while minimal research has been conducted from the faculty member’s perspective. To better understand the impact that the baccalaureate movement has on faculty members and how this impact affects faculty members’ intentions to support the CCB transition, it is important that more research be conducted from a faculty member’s perspective. The results of this study suggest several areas of future research that will help fill this gap.

Proponents of the CCB argue that community colleges can provide students with access to baccalaureate degrees in high-demand fields, at an affordable price (Walker,
2005). Critics of the movement argue that the CCB will compromise the community college core values of open-door access, learner-centeredness, affordability, convenience, and responsiveness (Walker, 2005). A study should be conducted to determine if faculty members believe the CCB is compromising the community college core values. If so, what core values are compromised, and how?

Currently, 18 of the 28 community colleges in Florida are offering 111 baccalaureate programs. An investigation to determine if faculty members’ perceptions of the strengths and weaknesses of their colleges' CCB programs would be valuable information to institutions in the process of becoming baccalaureate-granting institutions. Are CCB institutions providing quality baccalaureate programs, and how would “quality” be defined and measured?

As community colleges continue to expand their mission to include baccalaureate degrees, the need for faculty members with terminal degrees will increase. Some faculty members may have the credentials to teach baccalaureate courses, but have no desire to teach upper-level courses. Will faculty members who have the credentials be required to teach upper-level courses? It will be important to determine if faculty members feel they have a choice of whether they develop and teach baccalaureate-level courses.

Laden (2005) contends baccalaureate faculty members “are expected to offer courses that include much more theory and provide opportunities for students to do applied research projects” (p. 165), which requires more preparation time to develop and assess than lower-level curriculum. Furthermore, the results of this study indicate that faculty members believe more time would be needed to prepare for teaching baccalaureate-level courses. Therefore, a study should be conducted to determine if
faculty members teaching baccalaureate-level courses have the same workload (i.e., number of courses, number of students in each course, and additional duties and responsibilities) as faculty members teaching lower-level courses. If not, how do the workloads between upper- and lower-division faculty compare?

The factors that influence faculty members’ intentions to support the CCB transition may change over time, more specifically, change at different stages (e.g., development and implementation) of the CCB transition. A study to identify faculty members’ perceptions at different stages of the CCB transition would yield insights on CCB transitions that have already occurred or are in process.
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Appendices
Appendix A: Faculty Questionnaire

Faculty Questionnaire
Understanding Your Participation

Please read this page carefully.

Although established research exists on administrator and student attitudes and beliefs regarding the Community College Baccalaureate (CCB) transition, the research literature is lacking in exploring faculty’s attitudes and beliefs. This study is asking you to participate in a research effort to understand faculty’s intentions toward supporting the Community College Baccalaureate transition. Your participation is very important as it will provide faculty input into the CCB transition. Such feedback can help to facilitate a more successful transition.

The study uses the Theory of Planned Behavior by Ijek Ajzen as its theoretical framework. Ajzen has created specific guidelines for designing surveys based upon his theory. One feature of these guidelines is that questions are asked from different perspectives. The differences are very subtle and, therefore, may make you think that they are the same questions. In fact, however, they are measuring different constructs. The Theory of Planned Behavior measures attitudes, subjective norms, and perceived behavioral control toward a behavior. Each question is, therefore, phrased from these three perspectives. This may give you the impression that a question is repeated, but, as you can see, it is not. It simply appears so because it is asked from three different subtle perspectives. Thus, please be sure you answer all the questions.

Please note that the Community College Baccalaureate degree is defined as a “degree granted by postsecondary institutions approved for associate degree awards with the addition of limited baccalaureate degree approval in specialized fields” (Floyd & Walker, 2009, p. 141).

This survey is conducted anonymously, so your identity will be protected at all times. Although what you said will be reported, your name will not be associated with your responses. Your participation in this survey will also be accepted as your consent to participate. You may withdraw from this survey at any time by exiting the survey. If you do choose to participate, please be sure to answer all the questions because incomplete surveys cannot be used as part of this study.

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me. My contact information is

Lori Kielty
(352) 237-2947
kieltyl@cf.edu

Thank you,

Lori Kielty
1. Overall I think supporting the CCB transition is the:
   Wrong thing to do: ___1 ___2 ___3 ___4 ___5 ___6 ___7 : Right thing to do

2. Overall I think supporting the CCB transition is:
   Good: ___1 ___2 ___3 ___4 ___5 ___6 ___7 : Bad

3. Overall I think supporting the CCB transition is:
   Beneficial to me: ___1 ___2 ___3 ___4 ___5 ___6 ___7 : Harmful to me

4. Overall I think supporting the CCB transition is:
   Harmful to college: ___1 ___2 ___3 ___4 ___5 ___6 ___7 : Beneficial to college

5. For me to support the CCB transition is:
   Easy: ___1 ___2 ___3 ___4 ___5 ___6 ___7 : Difficult

6. By supporting the CCB transition, I am providing students with access to a baccalaureate degree.
   Likely: ___1 ___2 ___3 ___4 ___5 ___6 ___7 : Unlikely

7. Doing what administrators think I should do is important to me.
   Not at all: ___1 ___2 ___3 ___4 ___5 ___6 ___7 : Very much

8. I am confident that I could support the CCB transition if I wanted to.
   Disagree: ___1 ___2 ___3 ___4 ___5 ___6 ___7 : Agree

9. When the college does not conduct a program needs assessment, I am (less likely/more likely) to support the CCB transition.
   Less likely: ___1 ___2 ___3 ___4 ___5 ___6 ___7 : More likely

10. People who are important to me expect me to support the CCB transition.
   Disagree: ___1 ___2 ___3 ___4 ___5 ___6 ___7 : Agree

11. I expect to support the CCB transition.
   Disagree: ___1 ___2 ___3 ___4 ___5 ___6 ___7 : Agree

12. For me, participating in the CCB transition is:
   Undesirable: ___1 ___2 ___3 ___4 ___5 ___6 ___7 : Desirable

13. The decision to support the CCB transition is beyond my control.
   Disagree: ___1 ___2 ___3 ___4 ___5 ___6 ___7 : Agree
14. I feel under social pressure to support the CCB transition.
   Disagree: ___1 ___2 ___3 ___4 ___5 ___6 ___7 : Agree

15. If the college does not provide faculty support, it is difficult for me to facilitate the CCB transition.
   Unlikely: ___1 ___2 ___3 ___4 ___5 ___6 ___7 : Likely

16. Whether I support the CCB transition or not is entirely up to me.
   Disagree: ___1 ___2 ___3 ___4 ___5 ___6 ___7 : Agree

17. When the college provides faculty support, I am (less likely/more likely) to support the CCB transition.
   Less likely: ___1 ___2 ___3 ___4 ___5 ___6 ___7 : More likely

18. Doing what students think I should do is important to me.
   Not at all: ___1 ___2 ___3 ___4 ___5 ___6 ___7 : Very much

19. If a program needs assessment is not conducted, then it is difficult for me to support the CCB transition.
   Unlikely: ___1 ___2 ___3 ___4 ___5 ___6 ___7 : Likely

20. Administrators think that I (should not/should) support the CCB transition.
   Should not: ___1 ___2 ___3 ___4 ___5 ___6 ___7 : Should

21. Doing what other faculty think I should do is important to me.
   Not at all: ___1 ___2 ___3 ___4 ___5 ___6 ___7 : Very much

22. Students think that I (should not/should) support the CCB transition.
   Should not: ___1 ___2 ___3 ___4 ___5 ___6 ___7 : Should

23. I want to support the CCB transition.
   Disagree: ___1 ___2 ___3 ___4 ___5 ___6 ___7 : Agree

24. I feel the college will not provide quality baccalaureate programs, so it makes it difficult for me to support the CCB transition.
   Unlikely: ___1 ___2 ___3 ___4 ___5 ___6 ___7 : Likely

25. Doing what business and industry leaders think I should do is important to me.
   Not at all: ___1 ___2 ___3 ___4 ___5 ___6 ___7 : Very much
26. Most people who are important to me think that I (should/should not) support the CCB transition.
   Should : ___1 ___2 ___3 ___4 ___5 ___6 ___7 : Should not
27. I fully intend to support the CCB transition.
   Disagree : ___1 ___2 ___3 ___4 ___5 ___6 ___7 : Agree
28. Supporting the CCB transition will require that I update my credentials.
   Likely : ___1 ___2 ___3 ___4 ___5 ___6 ___7 : Unlikely
29. Providing students with access to a baccalaureate degree is:
   Undesirable : ___1 ___2 ___3 ___4 ___5 ___6 ___7 : Desirable
30. Other faculty in my college (do not/do) support the CCB transition.
   Do not : ___1 ___2 ___3 ___4 ___5 ___6 ___7 : Do
31. Updating my credentials to meet the CCB requirements is:
   Undesirable : ___1 ___2 ___3 ___4 ___5 ___6 ___7 : Desirable
32. Feeling that the college will not provide quality baccalaureate programs, I am (less likely/more likely) to support the CCB transition.
   Less likely : ___1 ___2 ___3 ___4 ___5 ___6 ___7 : More likely
33. If I support the CCB transition, then I will be expected to help implement it.
   Likely : ___1 ___2 ___3 ___4 ___5 ___6 ___7 : Unlikely
34. Business and industry leaders think that I (should not/should) support the CCB transition.
   Should not : ___1 ___2 ___3 ___4 ___5 ___6 ___7 : Should
35. People who are important to me want me to support the CCB transition.
   Disagree : ___1 ___2 ___3 ___4 ___5 ___6 ___7 : Agree
**Demographic Information**

A. I feel providing baccalaureate degrees at community colleges may compromise the community college’s core values (e.g., open-door access, learner-centeredness, affordability, convenience, or responsiveness).
   Disagree: ___1 ___2 ___3 ___4 ___5 ___6 ___7 : Agree

B. I plan to get a terminal degree in my field.
   Disagree: ___1 ___2 ___3 ___4 ___5 ___6 ___7 : Agree

C. I plan to teach baccalaureate-level courses at my college.
   Disagree: ___1 ___2 ___3 ___4 ___5 ___6 ___7 : Agree

D. My college will provide me with the funds to update my credentials.
   ____ Yes    ____No

E. My college performed a needs assessment for the CCB.
   ____Yes    ____ No

F. My college will provide high-quality baccalaureate degrees.
   ____Yes    ____ No

G. What is your age?
   _____ Under 25
   _____ 26 – 34
   _____ 35 – 44
   _____ 45- 54
   _____ 55 and over

H. What is your gender? ________ Male ________ Female
I. Race/Ethnicity:

- American Indian or Alaska Native
- Asian
- Black or African American
- Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
- White
- Hispanic or Latino

J. Highest degree earned to date:

- No degree to date
- Certificate
- Associate
- Bachelor
- Master
- Specialist
- Doctorate

K. What institution are you employed?

- Central Florida Community college
- Seminole State College

Thank you for participating in this survey.

Lori Kielty
### Table B1

Descriptive Statistics for Survey Questions Measuring Behavioral Intention

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Question</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>$x$</th>
<th>sd</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11. I expect to support the CCB transition. <em>(Disagree 1..7 Agree)</em></td>
<td>95</td>
<td>6.02</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. I want to support the CCB transition. <em>(Disagree 1..7 Agree)</em></td>
<td>95</td>
<td>5.74</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. I fully intend to support the CCB transition. <em>(Disagree 1..7 Agree)</em></td>
<td>95</td>
<td>5.72</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1-7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table B2
Descriptive Statistics for Survey Questions Measuring Attitude, Subjective Norms, and Perceived Behavioral Control

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Question</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>$x$</th>
<th>$sd$</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Direct Measure: Attitude</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Overall I think supporting the CCB transition is the wrong thing to do/the right thing to do.</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>5.92</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Overall I think supporting the CCB transition is good/bad.</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>5.97</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Overall I think supporting the CCB transition is beneficial to me/harmful to me.</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>5.47</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Overall I think supporting the CCB transition is harmful to college/beneficial to college.</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>6.07</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>2-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Direct Measure: Subjective Norms</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. People who are important to me expect me to support the CCB transition. (Disagree 1..7 Agree)</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. I feel under social pressure to support the CCB transition. (Disagree 1..7 Agree)</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Most people who are important to me think that I should/should not support the CCB transition.</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>4.89</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. People who are important to me want me to support the CCB transition. (Disagree 1..7 Agree)</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>4.81</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Direct Measure: Perceived Behavioral Control</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. For me to support the CCB transition is difficult 1..7 easy.</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>5.89</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>4-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I am confident that I could support the CCB transition if I wanted to. (Disagree 1..7 Agree)</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>6.08</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. The decision to support the CCB transition is beyond my control. (Disagree 1..7 Agree)</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Whether I support the CCB transition or not is entirely up to me. (Disagree 1..7 Agree)</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>4.94</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1-7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table B3

Descriptive Statistics for Survey Questions Measuring Behavioral Beliefs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Question</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>x</th>
<th>sd</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Behavioral Beliefs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. By supporting the CCB transition, I am providing students with access to a baccalaureate degree. <em>(Likely 1..7 Unlikely)</em></td>
<td>95</td>
<td>6.11</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>4-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Supporting the CCB transition, will require that I update my credentials. <em>(Likely 1..7 Unlikely)</em></td>
<td>95</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. If I support the CCB transition, then I will be expected to help implement it. <em>(Likely 1..7 Unlikely)</em></td>
<td>95</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcome Evaluation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Providing students with access to a baccalaureate degree is <em>(Undesirable/Desirable)</em></td>
<td>95</td>
<td>6.21</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Updating my credentials to meet the CCB requirements is <em>(Undesirable/Desirable)</em></td>
<td>95</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. For me, participating in the CCB transition is <em>(Undesirable/Desirable)</em></td>
<td>95</td>
<td>5.49</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1-7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B: Extra Tables

Table B4

Descriptive Statistics for Survey Questions Measuring Normative Beliefs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Question</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>x</th>
<th>sd</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Normative Beliefs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Administrators think that I should not 1..7 should support the CCB transition.</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>5.53</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>2-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Students think that I should not 1..7 should support the CCB transition.</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Business and industry leaders think that I should not 1..7 should support the CCB transition.</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>5.06</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Other faculty in my college do not 1..7 do support the CCB transition.</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>5.05</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Motivation to Comply</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Doing what administrators think I should do is important to me. (Not at all 1..7 Very much)</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Doing what students think I should do is important to me. (Not at all 1..7 Very much)</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Doing what business and industry leaders think I should do is important to me. (Not at all 1..7 Very much)</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Doing what other faculty think I should do is important to me. (Disagree 1..7 Agree)</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1-7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table B5

Descriptive Statistics for Survey Questions Measuring Control Beliefs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Question</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>$x$</th>
<th>sd</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Control Beliefs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. If the college does not provide faculty support, it is difficult for me to</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>4.81</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>support the CCB transition. (<em>Unlikely 1..7 Likely</em>)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. If a program needs assessment is not conducted, then it is difficult for</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>me to support the CCB transition. (<em>Unlikely 1..7 Likely</em>)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. I feel that the college will not provide quality baccalaureate programs, so</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>it makes it difficult for me to support the CCB transition. (*Unlikely 1..7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likely*)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Perceived Power</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. When the college provides faculty support, I am less likely 1..7 more likely</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>5.88</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to support the CCB transition. (<em>Less likely 1..7 More likely</em>)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. When the college does not conduct a program needs assessment, I am less</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>likely 1..7 more likely to support the CCB transition. (*Less likely 1..7 More</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>likely*)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Feeling that the college will not provide quality baccalaureate programs,</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am less likely 1..7 more likely to support the CCB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>transition. (<em>Less likely 1..7 More likely</em>)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table B6

Descriptive Statistics for Survey Questions Measuring Demographic Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Information: Direct Question</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>$x$</th>
<th>$sd$</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. I feel providing baccalaureate degrees at community colleges may compromise the community college’s core values (e.g., open-door access, learner-centeredness, affordability, convenience, or responsiveness). (Agree 1..7 Disagree)</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. I plan to get a terminal degree in my field. (Agree 1..7 Disagree)</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. I plan to teach baccalaureate-level courses at my college. (Agree 1..7 Disagree)</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1-7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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