ABSTRACT

ADAMS, ELIZABETH HOPE. Community-based Programming: Perceived Levels of Utility, Practice, and Encouragement to Participate among North Carolina Community College System Mid-Level Managers. (Under the direction of EDGAR J. BOONE.)

The purpose of this study was to measure the degree to which community-based programming as formulated by ACCLAIM Model fundamental conceptual components is perceived and practiced by North Carolina Community College System mid-level managers. A thirteen-item questionnaire was used to access mid-level manager perceptions regarding community-based programming in three separate yet related contexts: (1) Does community-based programming have utility, (2) Is community-based programming being practiced, and (3) Are mid-level managers encouraged to participate in community-based programming? Bivariate analysis, analysis of variance, and linear regression techniques were used to establish relationships between mid-level manager institutional and personal characteristics and their community-based programming perceptions as measured as well as to determine contribution levels among ACCLAIM Model fundamental conceptual components.

Mid-level manager was defined broadly across both academic and non-academic units and included any NCCCS community college manager holding the title of dean, director, or coordinator who was charged with translating and implementing strategies, policies, and decisions of top managers. Mid-level managers by virtue of organizational placement, institutional responsibilities, and predicted future leadership roles are critical to the effective implementation of community-based programming practices.

Community-based programming was defined as the process of engaging constituent community groups in the process of planned, self-directed social change, and the ACCLAIM
Model, a community-based programming model designed specifically for the community college setting, was used to develop questionnaire items that reflected and gauged mid-level manager perceptions regarding fundamental community-based programming concepts and practices.

The study found that NCCCS mid-level managers perceive community-based programming model to have a high degree of utility within the community college setting, indicating that when promoted to positions of higher leadership, they have a good chance of pursuing and implementing community-based approaches. However, mid-level managers also reported that community-based programming is practiced less often than they perceive it should be and reported even less encouragement to participate in community-based programming. Rural, female mid-level managers reported highest levels of encouragement to participate. This study concluded that mid-level manager receptivity, willingness and ability to effectively pursue and implement community-based programming techniques will be negatively impacted if community-based programming is not revitalized as the focus of institutional operations and the primary vehicle for effective mission accomplishment in NCCCS institutions.
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CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

Community-based programming (CBP) is a widely accepted community service model (Birzer, 1999; Edelman, 2000; Glaser & Soskin, 1996; Heinrich, 2000; Roberts, 1996) whose theoretical base is inherent to the community college setting and to its mission. Consequently, the degree to which community college faculty and staff accept and practice CBP concepts may affect the community college’s ability to effectively address emerging community issues in the 21st Century.

While research examining faculty and staff at the educational mid-management level is limited, management literature (Ebert & Griffin, 1998; Ireland, 1992; Landauer, 1992; Robbins, 2000) suggests that mid-level managers in general are critical to achieving successful organizational outcomes and, therefore, have significant influence on organizational mission accomplishment. Mid-level managers contribute to mission accomplishment by providing key organizational linkages between top administrators and frontline staffers. From their positions in the middle, mid-level managers are responsible for translating broad administrative strategy into specific focused plans of action. Mid-level managers accomplish this by interpreting, communicating, and operationalizing organization-level goals into specific department-level objectives and plans (Ireland, 1992).

In the community college setting, institutional mission defines organizational strategy. According to Vaughan (1995), “The community college’s mission is the fountain from which all of its activities flow” (p. 3). Vaughan also maintains that a key “precept” of the community college mission – one that distinguishes it from other institutions of higher education – is “a commitment to serving its community as a community-based institution” (p. 3). Because
community-based needs and issues are key determiners of organizational strategy in the community college setting and because mid-level managers are responsible for operationalizing organizational strategy, existing mid-level community college managers have particular influence on current CBP practice. In addition, over the next ten years, mid-level community college managers will acquire greater authority to affect CBP practice as they fill leadership positions left vacant by retirements among a large cohort of top administrators (Evelyn, 2001; Jenson, 2000; Twombly & Amey, 1991; Wright, 1997). Therefore, because current mid-level community college managers are key institutional practitioners who will secure increasing influence to implement CBP as they advance to top leadership positions, their perceptions may provide important insight regarding the current and future status of CBP practice.

The purpose of this study was to examine CBP practice within the North Carolina Community College System (NCCCS) by undertaking a quantitative analysis of an existing CBP model in order to identify significant relationships existing between its fundamental components and the degree to which NCCCS mid-level managers perceive (1) CBP to have utility, (2) CBP to be practiced at NCCCS institutions, and (3) encouragement to participate in CBP activities for the purpose of assessing the current and future preparedness of NCCCS institutions to address emerging community issues and for the purpose of generating a rank order of CBP component utilization.

Background Information

Community-based Programming

For the better part of two decades, the term “community-based programming” has appeared in the literature as a common descriptor for an approach employed by a wide spectrum of social services-related organizations seeking to involve communities in self-directed social
change (Barker, 1994; Edelman, 2000; Shirley, 1995). Currently, thousands of community-based projects target educational, social, economic, health, and criminal justice issues with variable implementation approaches ranging from the simple establishment of community-based service delivery sites to the highly structured formation of strategic community partnerships (Edelman, 2000). Theoretically, CBP models “help leaders address the most critical issues facing a community . . . [and] . . . are characterized by cooperation and collaboration, and a careful environmental scan to identify the external factors that contribute to the most critical problems in a particular service area” (Edelman, 2000, p. 17). Under this definition, the American community college may be one of the first institutions to employ CBP concepts, pre-dating current practice. “Since their inception, two-year colleges have helped meet the needs and solve the problems of the local community” (Lee, 1997, p.17). The community college is the only institution among all those involved in CBP to have a documented, comprehensive, conceptual, and stepwise implementation model.

**Development of a Community College Model of CBP**

Early development of a community college-specific CBP model originated in 1964 when North Carolina State University (NCSU), responding to community needs, added a department to its agricultural school devoted to educating and preparing specialists serving agricultural extension offices in communities throughout the state (Manzo, 1997). With CBP a centerpiece and major component of its degree programs, the small department has evolved into the “country’s largest community college leadership program” (Anderson, 1997, p.6). Currently, the NCSU Department of Adult and Community College Education -- no longer attached to the agricultural school -- is one of only 32 higher education institutions in 18 states to offer “formal graduate preparation specifically for the future leaders of community colleges” (Anderson, 1997,
NCSU department programs have produced more than 65 NCCCS presidents in addition to many more upper and mid-level NCCCS managers (Anderson, 1997).

A model of CBP specifically constructed for community colleges evolved with the NCSU Adult and Community College Education Department. In Developing Programs in Adult Education, Boone (1985) first introduced a broad educational model of CBP. Over time, this early model was developed further and reformulated for the community college setting (Boone, 1997). In 1991, the Academy for Community College Leadership Advancement, Innovation, and Modeling (ACCLAIM) was established to test and refine the reformulated model. The ACCLAIM Project was a five-year project devoted to developing community-based skills among leaders from 114 community colleges in four Middle Atlantic States (Maryland, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Virginia) (Boone, Pettitt, & Weisman, 1998) and was funded jointly by the W.K. Kellogg Foundation, North Carolina State University, and four state community college systems. Specifically, ACCLAIM was “established to develop, test, and validate a community-based programming process,” (p.2) and “. . . help participants develop community-based skills so that they will be better prepared to lead their institutions to become change agents for the community” (Anderson, 1997, p.28).

The ACCLAIM Model

The underlying framework of the CBP process validated during the ACCLAIM Project is referred to in this study as the ACCLAIM Model. The ACCLAIM Model places the community college at the center of community issues and community improvement and is a proactive model that positions the community college as a leader and catalyst central to facilitating “community change, reform, and progress” (Baker & Athans, 1998, p.45). The ACCLAIM Model is a practical and theoretical model constructed upon a series of interrelated processual tasks and
fundamental concepts. While well within the scope of the community college’s traditionally accepted mission of providing open access to comprehensive education, effective utilization of the ACCLAIM Model nonetheless involves re-examining and expanding the concept of community (Boone, 1997; Flynn, 1998; Lee, 1997; Levin 2000) and re-connecting firsthand with communities “to experience the reality that surrounds those whom we would teach – to know their concerns, their anxieties, their environmental pressures” (Levin, 2000, p. 4). This requires that colleges learn to “listen more even if it means speaking less” (Levin, 2000, p. 4), and it requires building collaboration and ownership from the inside out (Hockaday & Puryear, 1998).

The Mid-level Manager

In the context of this study, mid-level manager was defined as any community college manager holding the title of dean, director, or coordinator who is charged with translating and “implementing the strategies, policies, and decisions made by top managers” (Ebert & Griffin, 1998, p.138). Mid-level or middle managers (MLMs) in particular are critical to the effective implementation of community–based programming. By virtue of their organizational placement and institutional responsibilities, middle managers provide key linkages inside and outside community colleges. Middle managers are charged with translating the strategic visions of top administrators into operational practices (Ebert & Griffin, 1998) for college employees who then provide ongoing daily contact with community publics. These individuals have firsthand contact with community stakeholders and are charged with the responsibility for marshalling the daily efforts of frontline faculty and staff. Consequently, existing mid-level managers’ perceptions of CBP may indicate the degree to which institutions currently are practicing CBP thereby providing a measure of future institutional preparedness as it relates to emerging community-based issues.
Inside community colleges, top-level managers including presidents and senior administrators provide the impetus for CBP like that mapped out in the ACCLAIM Model by nurturing an organizational culture that embraces and supports community involvement. Nevertheless, CBP cannot be practiced effectively without the understanding, involvement, and ownership among all community college employees, mid-level managers among them (Baker & Athans, 1998). The experiences of NCCCS mid-level community college managers associated with perceived levels of (a) CBP utility, (b) CBP practice, and (c) encouragement to participate in CBP activities, therefore, may provide a measure of how CBP, as constructed by the ACCLAIM Model, is being practiced within NCCCS institutions.

The mid-level manager, therefore, was an appropriate sample population from which to study CBP perceptions and practices for three reasons: (1) Mid-level community college managers occupy organizational positions that require direct contact and linkage with both internal college groups and external community groups, (2) Mid-level community college managers are responsible for operationalizing college leaders’ strategic plans, including those involving CBP, and (3) Current mid-level community college managers are expected to assume numerous leadership positions predicted to be vacated over the next ten years due to administrative retirement turnover.

Purpose Of The Study

The purpose of this study was to measure the degree to which CBP as constructed by the ACCLAIM Model is perceived and practiced by North Carolina Community College System (NCCCS) mid-level managers. Measurement was achieved using a thirteen-item questionnaire designed to assess community-based experiences of mid-level NCCCS managers via composite mean scores that were analyzed in the following stepwise manner:
Step 1

- Measurement of the degree to which NCCCS mid-level managers perceive CBP to have utility within NCCCS colleges.
- Measurement of the degree to which NCCCS mid-level managers perceive NCCCS institutions to practice CBP.
- Measurement the degree to which NCCCS mid-level managers perceive encouragement to participate in CBP activities.

Step 2

- Determination of relationships existing between NCCCS mid-level manager perception mean scores and mid-level manager age, ethnicity, gender, and length of service within NCCCS location, size, and unit by way of bivariate analysis generating significant relationships between mean scores.

Step 3

- Determination of significant effects among four fundamental ACCLAIM Model conceptual components by way of linear regression yielding a rank order of model components.

Statement Of The Problem

The problem addressed by this study was to determine if any statistically significant relationships exist between mid-level manager perception mean scores among four ACCLAIM Model conceptual components and mid-level manager age, ethnicity, gender, and length of service within NCCCS institutional location, size, and unit. Three key questions were investigated:

1. To what degree do NCCCS mid-level managers perceive CBP to have utility?
2. To what degree do NCCCS mid-level managers perceive colleges to practice CBP?
3. To what degree do NCCCS mid-level managers perceive encouragement to participate in CBP at their colleges?

Significance Of The Findings

This investigation was designed to quantitatively test ACCLAIM Model components as perceived and practiced within NCCCS institutions. The results of this study may be used to monitor the current status and functional utility of the ACCLAIM Model and, therefore, may help NCCCS institutions assess their ability to address emerging CBP issues by (1) shedding light on mid-level manager perceptions regarding CBP utility, practice, and encouragement to participate in CBP, (2) identifying significant relationships existing among institutional characteristics, mid-level manager perceptions, and CBP model components; and (3) identifying significant relationships among ACCLAIM Model conceptual components.

In terms of number of system colleges (J. K. Brown, personal communication, March 21, 2002), the State of North Carolina operates the third largest community college system in the nation (“NCCCS History,” 2001; Yates, 1999). The North Carolina Community College System (NCCCS) oversees 59 institutions including 58 comprehensive community colleges and one technical center, the NC Center of Applied Textile Technology. Two NCCCS community colleges, Guilford Technical Community College and James Sprunt Community College, are among the original ACCLAIM Project institutions. Historically, NCCCS institutions have effectively utilized community-based approaches to address community needs, particularly in the area of economic development (Brooks & Joss, 1997; Lancaster, 1999; Shore, 1997; Yates, 1999).

Size and track record notwithstanding, NCCCS complacency in the face of the social and environmental pressures being brought to bear on 21st Century communities (Boone, 1997;
Gleazer, 2000; Kemppainen, 1999) would be ill advised, particularly when paired with the dramatic changes re-shaping the internal culture of community colleges (Anderson, 1992; Kezar, 1998). In tandem with the critical issues, including racial tension, poverty, healthcare, underemployment, education, political corruption, violence, substance abuse, and pollution, challenging the quality of life in 21st Century communities (Boone, 1997; Gleazer, 2000; Kemppainen, 1999), community colleges face equally critical internal changes. Chief among these internal changes is the aging out of community college administrators (Evelyn, 2001; Jenson, 2000; Twombly & Amey; Vaughan, 1994; Wright, 1997). By 2010 more than half of all presidents along with a significant number of key administrators are expected to retire (Evelyn, 2001). Turnover of this magnitude is noteworthy because it is predicted to occur at a time when communities and their colleges are in greatest need of leadership. Assessing mid-level community college managers’ perceptions of CBP, therefore, is important not only because such an assessment may reflect the degree to which CBP currently is being implemented within NCCCS colleges, but also may predict future CBP implementation since today’s mid-level managers likely will be tomorrow’s senior administrators and presidents.

In light of these circumstances, this study may help the North Carolina Community College System sustain and build upon past successes by determining the current status and future readiness of its institutions to effectively carry CBP into the 21st Century. The findings may be used to identify and benchmark individual and institutional characteristics associated with CBP implementation as constructed by the ACCLAIM Model. Likewise, this information may be used to design professional development agendas to broaden CBP knowledge and skills among middle managers and other NCCCS administrators.
Limitations

The results of this study are limited to mid-level managers employed within the North Carolina Community College System; therefore, generalizations of the results were limited to this target population.

Definitions Of Concepts And Terms

1. **Academic or Instructional**: a designation for community college units involved in formal, credit awarding courses and programs. Academic units as defined by this study included curriculum (instructional) units

2. **ACCLAIM Model**: a conceptual and processual model developed specifically for CBP within the community college setting (Boone, 1997). The ACCLAIM Model outlines fifteen interrelated processual tasks as a vehicle for developing and managing a collaborative, community-directed educational agenda for resolving community issues.

3. **Community college**: a comprehensive, two year public institution of higher education that offers diploma, certificate, and degree programs with curricula in college transfer, technical, and occupational areas.

4. **Community-based programming (CBP)**: the process of engaging constituent community groups in the process of planned, self-directed social change (Boone, 1997; Edelman, 2000; Lee, 1997).

5. **Community-based programming instrument (CBPI)**: thirteen-item questionnaire designed to measure NCCCS mid-level manager perception of ACCLAIM Model fundamental conceptual components.

6. **Composite scores**: Item-specific mean scores computed using Likert Scale responses to specific CPBI items representative of four fundamental ACCLAIM Model conceptual
components: expanded concept of community (CBPI Items 1, 2, and 5), college as leader/catalyst (CBPI Items 7, 12, and 13), critical community issues (CBPI Items 4 and 8), and institutional ownership (CBPI Items 10 and 11).

7. **Correlational matrix**: a table of correlations showing all possible relationships among a set of variables.

8. **Correlational research**: involves the collection and examination of two or more sets of data, analyzed to determine if there is a relationship e.g. if X1 varies, X2 also varies; useful as a first step in causal research and for establishing relationships.

9. **Encouragement (to participate)**: to give favorable support to the pursuit of a concept, idea, or practice.

10. **Fundamental conceptual components (FCCs)**: four study concepts, derived from critical ACCLAIM Model concepts and processual tasks that anchor the conceptual basis of the study design.

11. **Institutional location**: Bureau of the Census 2000 geographic designation as either rural or urban as determined by population density. Institutions located in counties with overall density of 500 people or more per square mile were classified as urban. Institutions located in counties with overall population density of less than 500 people per square mile were classified as rural. Institutions located in counties with populations densities of both rural and urban as defined above were classified as mixed.

12. **Institutional size**: the classification of NCCCS institutions as either small, medium, or large as determined by Total Combined Full Time Equivalent (FTE) enrollment. Institutions with FTE enrollments of less than 2,000 were defined as small, institutions with FTE enrollments
of more than 2,000 but less than 4,000 were defined as medium, and institutions with FTE enrollments of 4,000 or more were defined as large.

13. **Institutional unit**: the specific organizational department or division within an individual NCCCS institution including administrative, curriculum, occupational extension, public service, and support service department or divisions.

14. **Length of service**: the total number of years a particular mid-level manager has been employed in the community college setting.

15. **Mid-level manager**: community college managers holding the titles of dean, director, or coordinator and who are charged with translating and “implementing the strategies, policies, and decisions made by top managers” (Ebert & Griffin, 1998, p. 138).

16. **Model**: a comprehensive conceptual and procedural framework that, when followed, leads to a standard of practical excellence and is broadly applicable across a general field of study or line of work.

17. **Non-academic**: a designation for community college units concerned with programming or support services and not involved with formal, credit-bearing courses and programs. Non-academic units as defined by this study include basic skills, business and industry, business office, human resources development, institutional effectiveness, student services, learning resources center, and occupational extension.

18. **Perception**: interpretation, knowledge, or understanding of a concept or idea predicated upon personal and practical experiences and how the interaction of these variables affects the subsequent application of said concepts.

19. **Practice**: to apply or to put knowledge into practice.
20. **Processual Task**: a conceptual and situation-driven approach to community-based programming; the ACCLAIM Model is comprised of a series of fifteen interconnected processual tasks.

21. **Perceptual subscales**: CBPI items stated in one of three different perceptual contexts or subscales: (1) perceived utility, (2) perceived practice, and (3) perceived encouragement to participate.

22. **Perceptual subscale scores**: mean scores computed using Likert Scale responses to each of three different perceptual contexts or subscales: (1) perceived utility, (2) perceived practice, and (3) perceived encouragement to participate.

23. **Utility**: the practical value or efficacy of a concept or idea.

**Summary**

Community-based programming (CBP) is a widely accepted though variably practiced community service model that seeks to involve communities in self-directed social change through mutual cooperation and collaboration. Of all those involved in CBP, the community college stands alone as the only discipline to have a documented, comprehensive implementation model. The ACCLAIM Model of CBP grew out of and with the NCSU Department of Adult and Community College Education whose programs have produced scores of North Carolina Community College System managers. Mid-level managers by virtue of organizational placement, institutional responsibilities, and predicted future leadership roles are critical to effective CBP implementation. While the ACCLAIM Model has been validated through anecdotal and case study research, it has never been quantitatively examined and tested. Therefore, this study was designed to measure the degree to which CBP as constructed by the ACCLAIM Model is perceived and practiced among NCCCS mid-level managers for the
purpose of assessing the current and future preparedness of NCCCS institutions to address emerging community issues and for the purpose of generating a rank order of CBP component utilization.
CHAPTER TWO
CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK AND REVIEW OF THE RELATED RESEARCH

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to measure the degree to which community-based programming (CBP) as constructed by the ACCLAIM Model (Boone, 1997) is perceived and practiced by North Carolina Community College System (NCCCS) mid-level managers. Study results may assist in identifying relationships between mid-level manager perception mean scores among ACCLAIM Model conceptual components and specific institutional and individual characteristics. Results also may assist in establishing a rank order of ACCLAIM Model components. This chapter establishes conceptual relationships via a graphic framework, describes relevant study concepts, reviews related literature and research, and presents study questions and hypotheses.

Concepts Relevant To The Study

The concepts relevant to this study are organized into three categories and diagrammed in Figure 2.1 on the following page. The concepts of institutional and individual characteristics are subsumed within the first category labeled “independent variables.” The second category, “dependent variables,” includes the concepts of perceived utility, perceived practice, and perceived encouragement to participate. Category 3, “significant relationships,” describes four fundamental conceptual components (FCCs) of the ACCLAIM Model: (1) expanded concept of community, (2) community college as leaders and catalyst, (3) critical community issues, and (4) institutional ownership.
Figure 2.1. The conceptual framework of concepts relevant to the study.

1. **Independent Variables**
   - **PRIMARY**
     - Institutional Characteristics
   - **SECONDARY**
     - Individual Characteristics

2. **Dependent Variables**
   - Mid-Level Mgr Perception Subscales

3. **Significant Relationships**
   - CBP Fundamental Conceptual Components (FCC)

**Subscale 1:** Perceived Utility
- 1A. Age
- 1B. Ethnicity
- 1C. Gender
- 1D. Length of Service

**Subscale 2:** Perceived Practice
- 2A. Age
- 2B. Ethnicity
- 2C. Gender
- 2D. Length of Service

**Subscale 3:** Perceived Encouragement to Participate
- 3A. Age
- 3B. Ethnicity
- 3C. Gender
- 3D. Length of Service

**Institutional Characteristics**
- 1. **INSTITUTIONAL LOCATION**
  - Rural, Urban, or Mixed
- 2. **INSTITUTIONAL SIZE**
  - Large, Medium, or Small
- 3. **INSTITUTIONAL UNIT**
  - Academic or Non-Academic

**FCC1**
- Expanded concept of community

**FCC2**
- Concept of community college as leader & catalyst

**FCC3**
- Concept of critical community issues

**FCC4**
- Concept of institutional ownership
The focus of this study was to identify significant relationships between mid-level manager perception of CBP as constructed by the ACCLAIM Model and specific institutional and individual characteristics. The ACCLAIM Model is a theoretical and practical service approach for the contemporary community college constructed within a framework of fifteen processual tasks guided by a number of central concepts. The conceptual basis of the study design was predicated upon CBP as constructed by the ACCLAIM Model. Four fundamental conceptual components (FCCs), formulated from ACCLAIM Model processual tasks and concepts, anchor the conceptual design of this study and are depicted in Column 3 of Figure 2.1.

“Community-based programming . . . provides a means for organizations such as community and technical colleges to address critical issues of our time” (Hulsey-Killacky & Killacky, 1997, p. 509). The ACCLAIM Model of CBP is a “process involving a series of interconnected processual tasks in which the community college functions as a leader and catalyst in effecting collaboration among the people, their leaders, and other community agencies and organizations in identifying and seeking resolution of major community issues” (Boone, 1997, p.3).

ACCLAIM Model Concepts and Processual Tasks

The concept of “processual task” is fundamental to ACCLAIM Model intent and meaning and, therefore, fundamental to study design. Boone (1997) reasons that effecting change in basic behaviors and broad social issues is too complex for simplistic, formulaic procedures and instead calls for tailoring programmatic actions to individual situations. The processual task approach addresses these complexities by elevating practitioners thinking from a “mechanistic, rules-based steps” approach to a conceptual, situational, systems-oriented
approach to programming. The protocol for implementing a processual task is two-fold: (1) define the intended outcome of the processual task and (2) construct and carry out situationally tailored actions to bring about outcome achievement.

Of the ACCLAIM Model’s fifteen processual tasks and related concepts (catalyst, issue, collaboration, and coalition), the first three processual tasks are critical to overall model comprehension, interpretation, and implementation. These processual tasks establish and contribute to formulating a conceptual foundation for interpreting and implementing the model (See Figure 2.2 on the following page).

The first three processual tasks set the stage for all other ACCLAIM Model processual tasks by encouraging colleges to (1) embrace and share, first with internal (faculty and staff) and then external publics, a CBP definition that fits unique institutional settings, (2) acquire and share expanded knowledge about environmental issues impacting college service areas, and (3) adjust college missions, philosophies, structures, and operations to accommodate the adoption of CBP as a major institutional approach.

In addition to those highlighted and implied within the first three processual tasks, several other concepts are central to conceptualizing the ACCLAIM model (Boone, 1992). The first concept is that of community college as “leader and catalyst” in which the college serves as an axis or hub for focusing, stimulating, and nurturing community teams toward the resolution of critical, quality of life issues. A second concept is that CPB as constructed by the ACCLAIM Model is “issue-driven.” “An issue is defined as a matter of wide public concern that arises out of complex problems that influence the daily life of human beings” (Boone, 1992, p.14). Critical issues are broad, complex, and subject to controversy. “Collaboration” is a third important CBP concept. Collaboration involves working “jointly with significant others in seeking solutions to
an issue” (Boone, 1992, p.15) and implies that issue-effected groups agree on issue definition and resulting plans of action and expected outcomes.

Figure 2.2. The first three ACCLAIM Model processual tasks establish a conceptual foundation for comprehensive model interpretation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACCLAIM MODEL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Processual Task 1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The community college develops and adopts a definition of community-based programming that encompasses those basic principles and concepts required to fulfill its mission as a community-based institution.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Processual Task 2** |
| The community college engages in a careful study of its community to increase its knowledge of its social-cultural, economic, technological, and political environment. |

| **Processual Task 3** |
| The community college examines and, if needed, reinterprets or modifies its mission, philosophy, goals, organizational structure, and mode of operation to emphasize community-based programming as one of its major programmatic efforts. |

(Boone, 1997, pp. 5-6)

Fundamental Conceptual Components (FCCs)

This study focused on four fundamental conceptual components (FCCs) formulated from the aforementioned ACCLAIM Model concepts and processual tasks. These concepts and
processual tasks provide the foundation for and are fundamental to comprehensive model conceptualization. Four FCCs representing critical ACCLAIM Model concepts and tasks, therefore, anchored the conceptual basis of this study’s design and are reflected in ten Community-Based Programming Instrument (CBPI) Institutional Statements.

**FCC1 – expanded concept of community**

FCC1 focuses on an expanded concept of community in which the driving force behind the community college’s mission is developing the potential of the community and improving the quality of life for all of its citizens. FCC1 is conceptualized in CBPI items 1, 2, and 5:

- CBPI Institutional Statement 1: “The primary and driving force behind the community college mission is the concept of community, which involves developing the potential of and improving the quality of life for citizens and their communities.”
- CBPI Institutional Statement 2: “Developing and improving the service area by educating and, thus, empowering the people of the community is a major focus of the community college mission.”
- CBPI Institutional Statement 5: “The community college is devoted to the education of all of the people in its service area.

**FCC2 – community college as leader/catalyst**

FCC2 focuses on the concept of the college as leader/catalyst in which the college positions itself as a proactive, collaborator and facilitator for community reform. FCC2 is conceptualized in CBPI Institutional Statements 7, 12, and 13:

- CBPI Institutional Statement 7: “The community college works with other service area agencies and organizations as part of a larger team effort to develop and improve the community.”
CBPI Institutional Statement 12: “The community college promotes itself in the service area as a leaders and catalyst for community development and improvement.”

CBPI Institutional Statement 13: “People who live in the service area and their leaders (public leaders, business leaders, religious leaders, etc.) turn to the community college for direction when addressing and resolving critical community issues.”

FCC3 – critical issues

FCC3 focuses on the concept of critical issues in which the community college adopts a formal and systematic approach for identifying and collaboratively resolving critical community problems. FCC3 is conceptualized in CBPI Institutional Statements 4 and 8:

- CBPI Institutional Statement 4: “Community outreach extends the campus of a community college beyond its physical property limits to encompass the geographic boundaries of its service area.

- CBPI Institutional Statement 8: “The community college has a formal system for gathering information that reveals the critical issues shaping the lives of people in the service area.

FCC4 – institutional ownership

FCC4 focuses on the concept of institutional ownership in which employees across the institution identify with CBP and feel shared ownership for developing and improving the service area. FCC4 is conceptualized in CBPI Institutional Statements 10 and 11:

- CBPI Institutional Statement 10: “Community college employees across the institution understand how their daily jobs contribute to developing and improving the service area”

- CBPI Institutional Statement 11: “Community college employees feel a collective ownership for developing and improving the service area”
Conceptual Basis of Dependent Variables

The design of this study assumed that mid-level community college manager perception of community-based programming as constructed by ACCLAIM Model FCCs in three separate yet associated perceptual contexts or subscales is related to current and future CBP implementation. This study further assumed that mid-level manager perception is dependent upon institutional and personal characteristics. Column 2 of Figure 2.1 depicts the three mid-level manager perceptual subscales that served as this study’s dependent variables.

Mid-level Manager

According to Wharton (1997), college leaders work through their staffs to implement strategic visions and plans. In the community college, mid-level managers are located between top administrators and frontline faculty and staff, thereby providing an important and causal link between the setting of administrative strategy and its practical application. Moreover, mid-level managers are predicted to gain increasing influence in the setting of strategic direction as they assume key community college leadership positions over the next ten years (Evelyn, 2001; Jenson, 2000). In addition, because individual perceptions may give rise to management-based attitudes and in that way shape specific management behavior, how mid-level managers perceive or feel about the usefulness and practical application of CBP may be related to its effective current and future implementation.

Perceptual Subscales

According to Asch (as cited in Baker, Sheffield, & Caison, 1998, p.164), “Perception is how we see and make sense of everything.” Likewise, individual response or behavior depends upon one’s perceptions or attitudes with regard to a particular target (Baker, Sheffield, & Caison, 1998; Czerniak & Lumpe, 1996). While measuring perception is complicated by its
individualistic nature, the link between perception and behavior is well established in the fields of organizational and consumer behavior (Bagozzi, et al., 2000; Stadjkovic & Luthans, 1998).

This study draws from a number of perception-related theories and models including Expectancy Theory (Vroom, 1964), the Porter-Lawler Model (as cited in Baker & Caison, 1998), the Theory of Reasoned Action (Ajzen & Fishbein, 1980), and the Theory of Planned Behavior (Ajzen & Madden, 1986) to identify three discrete perceptual variables held by mid-level community college managers. While the interrelatedness of variables is apparent, this study treated them separately since no previous research has been conducted on CBP in relation to mid-level community college managers as defined within the context this study. The perceptual contexts or subscales examined by this study included the following:

Perceptual Subscale 1: Mid-level manager perception of the practical utility of CBP

Current mid-level community college managers are key institutional practitioners who will secure increasing influence to implement CBP as they advance to top leadership positions left vacant by retirements predicted among a large cohort of top administrators over the next ten years (Evelyn, 2001; Jenson, 2000; Twombly & Amey, 1991; Wright, 1997); therefore, their perceptions may provide important insight regarding the current and future status of CBP practice. Because perceptions or feelings about a concept or practice shape one’s overall positive or negative evaluation of that concept or practice (Bagozzi, et al., 2000), and because beliefs influence intent and behavior (Ajzen & Madden, 1986), the design of this study was predicated upon the assumption that mid-level managers will be positively disposed to pursue and implement CBP if they perceive it to have utility in the community college setting. These perceptions, therefore, may help assess current as well as predict future implementation of CBP.
Perceptual Subscale 2: Mid-level manager perception of the practical application of CBP

By virtue of their organizational positions, mid-level managers have firsthand and, therefore, may have more accurate knowledge of the practical application of CBP. Because they are closer to the action, mid-level managers’ perceptions about the practical application of CBP may be closer to reality than administrators who are farther-removed from day-to-day practice. These perceptions may provide a more accurate assessment of the effectiveness with which colleges currently are implementing CBP.

Perceptual Subscale 3: Mid-level manager perception of encouragement to participate in community-based activities

Within institutions, employees adjust their behaviors to conform with what they perceive to be accepted institutional norms and practices (Cohen, 1994; Ashforth, 1985; Orbell & Hodgkins, 1997). Likewise, the perceived level of ease or difficulty of performing a task or behavior influences an individual’s intent to perform the behavior (Orbell & Hodgkins, 1997). Ajzen (1991) states, "Intentions are assumed to capture the motivational factors that influence a behavior, they are indicators of how hard people are willing to try, of how much effort they are planning to exert, in order to perform the behavior" (p. 181). Mid-level managers may interpret perceived levels of encouragement as representing organizational norms regarding the acceptability of CBP. Therefore, the amount of encouragement mid-level managers perceive they are getting to participate in CBP may predict their current and future willingness to pursue and practice CBP.

Conceptual Basis of Independent Variables

The design of this study further assumed that mid-level community college manager perception is influenced by specific institutional and individual characteristics. Because the
mind is unable to process all of the information bombarded on the senses from the external environment, individuals tend to unconsciously select out the bits and pieces of information that can be processed (Zalkind & Costello as cited in Baker, Sheffield, & Caison, 1998; McBurney & Collings as cited in Baker, Sheffield, & Caison, 1998). According to the concept of selective perception, the bits and pieces of information that are selected by any one individual are based on internal characteristics such as personalities, beliefs, and attitudes, as well as on external factors. The Porter-Lawler Model (as cited in Baker & Caison, 1998) recognizes that “individual abilities and traits and role perceptions interact with the exerted effort to produce the actual performance or accomplishment of a goal” (p.120). Mid-level manager perception of CBP as constructed by ACCLAIM Model fundamental conceptual components in three separate yet related perceptual subscales, therefore, may be influenced by both institutional (external) and personal (internal) characteristics.

This study assumed that three institutional characteristics are external influencers on mid-level manager perception: institutional location, size, and unit. Within these institutional variables, individual characteristics of age, ethnicity, gender, and length of service are assumed to be internal influencers.

Related Research Findings

Community-Based Programming

A review of the current literature revealed that community-based programming (CBP) articles and studies primarily are descriptive in nature and either focused on specific, individual cases or several discipline-specific programs. Likewise, the term “model” is used broadly throughout the literature to describe individual CBP approaches rather than general frameworks within particularized fields. For example, professors at one Massachusetts Medical Center are
encouraged to use GNOME, a five-step process for community-based educational planning (Roberts, 1996), in designing curricula for pediatric medical residents and a Redlands, California police department uses a community-based crime prevention model called Communities that Care (Weber, 1999). In the context of this study, however, the term “model” refers to a comprehensive conceptual and procedural framework that, when followed, leads to a standard of practical excellence and is broadly applicable across a general field of study or line of work. No CBP system or process approaching the complexity and comprehensiveness of the ACCLAIM Model was identified.

Several well-known databases were used to conduct the literature review. A keyword search of CBP was performed using Academic Search Elite via EBSCOhost, an electronic database and search engine of 3,200 scholarly journals from a variety of subject areas dating back to 1984. Fifty records referencing CBP were identified from a variety of disciplines including criminal justice, education, health care, human services, psychology, and technology (Anderson, 1997; Aquila, R., Santos, G., Malamud, T. J., & Mccrory, D., 1999; Boone, 1997; Barker, 1994; Edelman, 2000; Fisher & Chamberlain, 2000; Hulsey-Killacky & Killacky, 1997; Manzo, 1997; Metzer & Delgado, 1995; Pierce & Green, 1992; Shirley, 1995; Travis, 1995; Tyler, 2000; Van Wormer, 1999; Welsh & Harris, 1996). After reviewing abstracts of the 50 records, 14 were selected as relevant for further review. In general, the selected documents address CBP in one of three contexts: (a) CBP outside the community college setting, (b) CBP within the community college setting, and (c) CBP directly related to ACCLAIM.

**CBP Research outside the Community College Setting**

Typical treatments of CBP literature outside the community college setting are evidenced in several articles (Barker, 1994; Shirley, 1995; Welsh & Harris, 1996) that describe specific
centers, projects, and programs in which CBP has been and is being used to meet the needs of diverse populations such as the mentally ill, over-represented minorities in the juvenile justice system, and the medically underserved. While no particular CBP methodology or model is reported, the consensus among these articles is that CBP, in general, is an effective, valid methodology that involves practitioners moving away from traditional service delivery approaches.

CBP Research within the Community College Setting

Of the articles related to CBP within the community college setting, most address specific components or skills necessary for improving upon existing CBP initiatives such as effective coalition-building (Hulsey-Killackey & Killackey, 1997), strength of diversity (Pierce & Green, 1992), realistic evaluation (Edelman, 2000), and leadership training initiatives (Anderson, 1997). A number of articles specifically cite the ACCLAIM Model, describing its development, importance, and potential impact on community colleges and communities (Anderson, 1997; Boone, 1992; Kobran, 1996; Manzo, 1997). While no evidence of long-term outcomes is offered, these articles, like those addressing CBP outside the community college arena, present CBP as an appropriate, effective, and worthwhile approach. Kubisch et al. (as cited in Edelman, 2000) explains that the difficulty of evaluating CBP outcomes, “CCIs (comprehensive community initiatives) are operating at so many levels . . . and across so many sectors that the task of defining outcomes can be formidable” (p.14).

CBP Research Associated with ACCLAIM

A similar keyword search also was conducted using Dissertation Abstracts, an indexing and abstracting service for doctoral dissertations and masters' theses from participating colleges and universities in the U.S., Canada, and selected international institutions dating back to 1861.
Five doctoral dissertations dealing with CBP were identified (Anderson, 1995; Ingram, 1995; Pettit, 1993; Ryan, 1995; Sheffield, 1996). A general search of the North Carolina State University library catalog yielded an additional CBP thesis (Ning, 1995) as well as three CBP books, one authored by Boone (1992), one edited by Boone and associates (1997), and one edited by Boone, Pettitt, & Weisman (1998). All of these publications specifically address CBP as constructed by the ACCLAIM Model.

Of the dissertations and thesis conducted, three were qualitative case studies and all were limited to populations that included top community college leaders. Most examined how CBP has been implemented at ACCLAIM Region institutions and how its implementation relates to leadership style and the process of change. The best insight into CBP, however, is provided in Community-Based Programming in Action: The Experiences of Five Community Colleges (Boone, Pettitt, & Weisman, 1998) a companion to the first ACCLAIM book. This compilation of qualitative case studies “documents the learning experiences gained by the ACCLAIM faculty and five of its pilot colleges in implementing . . . community-based programming” by providing “real-life examples of successes and obstacles experienced by five community colleges between 1992 and 1996” (p.ix). The editors assert that these recorded successes provide “convincing evidence that [the ACCLAIM Model of CBP allows] the community college [to] greatly enhance its status, visibility, and effectiveness as a community leader” (p.ix).

Two of the five college case studies described in the second ACCLAIM book are NCCCS institutions, one rural and one urban. Despite obvious geographic and demographic relationships, however, both colleges share distinct commonalities in their CBP experiences. For example, the first three and arguably the most important processual tasks outlined by the ACCLAIM Model involve institutionalizing the concept and process of CBP into the college
culture. Institutionalization is defined as “the process an institution goes through to incorporate changes into the structured and often highly formalized systems that constitute the community college as an organization” (Vaughan as cited in Boone et al., 1998, p.71). Both colleges took similar approaches to institutionalization, including conducting comprehensive institutional training, adopting organizational structural changes, and aligning CBP with existing institutional planning systems. Both institutions report positive outcomes chief among which is that CBP made them more effective institutions by providing a better understanding of and sensitivity for community issues, group processes, and formal and informal community power structures. The positive outcomes did not occur without challenges, however, and both colleges report needing significant resources to keep CBP on track. For example, CBP required an infrastructure of multiple committees and subcommittees (environmental scanning committees, CBP management teams, coalition groups, etc.) equipped to communicate progress internally and externally. This required considerable administrative support as well as substantial facilitation skills to keep committee focus. Both colleges found it necessary to bring in experts to assist with key facilitation events and environmental scanning projects. While the need for outside expertise diminished over time as skills were developed among institutional and community participants, a sizeable monetary outlay was required up front. In addition to money, CBP requires a major commitment of time, time devoted to committee work and, more importantly, time devoted to waiting for long-term outcomes. While after four years both colleges report making progress toward identified community issues, they also indicate uncovering many underlying sub-issues that also must be addressed and measured.
The Mid-level Manager (MLM)

Keyword searches for “middle or mid-level manager” and “middle or mid-level management” were conducted using the previously mentioned databases. Two hundred two records were identified in keyword searches of the Academic Search Elite database and 19 dissertations published since 1992 were identified using Dissertation Abstracts. While significantly more published work exists for mid-level manager (MLM) subjects than was identified for CBP, specific research relating to educational mid-level managers remains meager. Furthermore, no study or investigation was identified that included both academic and non-academic mid-level managers.

After reviewing abstracts of the 202 records, 34 were selected as relevant for further review. Among the selected records, mid-level manager and management subjects were dealt with on several levels: (a) general task-related level, (b) industry-specific level, and (c) public sector level including educational settings. In general, the literature across all levels concurs that middle managers hold positions critical to achieving organizational goals yet also asserts that middle managers are confronted by contradictory roles, lack of upward mobility, and poor preparation (Allerton, 1998; Anand, 1996; Brandt, 1994; Chanick, 1992; Foote, 1999; Gillett-Karam, 1999; Gillett-Karam et al., 1999; Gleeoson & Shain, 1999; Ireland, 1992; Landauer, 1999; McDermott, 1995; Zemke, 1994).

General, Task-Related Perspective of MLM

A current management textbook defines middle managers as “. . . occupy[ing] positions of considerable autonomy and importance. In general, middle managers are responsible for implementing the strategies, policies, and decisions made by top managers” (Ebert & Griffin, 1998, p.138). Ireland (1992) expands on this.
Middle-level managers work in between a firm’s first-level and top-level managers. A mid-level manager integrates the intentions of top-level managers with the day-to-day operational realities experienced by first-level managers. To do this, mid-level managers translate missions, broad objectives, and strategies into specific objectives and plans for first-level managers. As integrators, mid-level managers review the work plans of various groups and coordinate across the entire organization the actions necessary to fulfill those plans. Of all personnel, mid-level managers are in the best positions to absorb and understand the qualities of a firm’s culture. (p.18-19)

Therefore, by virtue of their central organizational positions, mid-level managers have firsthand and, therefore, may have more accurate knowledge of the practical application of CBP. Because they are closer to the action, mid-level managers’ perceptions about the practical application of CBP may be closer to reality than administrators who are farther-removed from day-to-day practice. These perceptions may provide a more accurate assessment of the effectiveness with which colleges currently are implementing CBP.

This central position also presents mid-level managers with their greatest challenges. For example, British mid-level secondary education managers describe being “caught in the middle” and “squeezed from the top and underneath” (Gleeson & Shain, 1999, p. 468). Caught in the middle, mid-level managers “juggle” competing expectations of three different groups: senior managers, staff, and customers (McDermott, 1995).

Bushher & Harris (1999) identify four work roles or dimensions that illustrate the “complementary yet potentially competing demands” placed upon mid-level managers (p. 309). These include (a) a bridging or brokering role that involves “translat[ing] the perspectives and policies of senior staff into . . . individual practices,” (b) “a shaping and managing role that
fosters collegiality within the group by . . . establishing a shared vision,” (c) a monitoring and mentoring role that “concerns improving staff and student performance,” and (d) a liaison or representative role that requires them to be in touch with a variety of actors and sources of information in the external environment . . . and to negotiate, where necessary on behalf of the members of the department” (pp. 308-309).

Industry-Specific Perspective of MLM

Much of the current mid-level manager literature relates to business and industry-specific treatments of mid-level management. Clearly reflected in the literature is the turbulent effect of economic and market changes over the past 25 years on mid-level managers. Increased global competition, the Total Quality Management movement, and a period of recession, have left scores of private sector mid-level managers downsized, outsourced, and reengineered out of jobs (Allerton, 1998; Anand, 1996; Brodsky, 2000; Byrne, 1994; Cohn, 1995; Capell, 1992; Caminiti & Schonfield, 1994; Labich & Erdman; McDermott, 1995; Parry, 1991).

Public-Sector Perspective of MLM

While public sector mid-level managers largely have been protected from layoffs, they too have experienced increased scrutiny and expectations associated with the quality and accountability movement often referred to as reinventing government (Cohn, 1995; Fielding, 1998; Gillett-Karam, 1999; Landauer, 1999). A good portion of the limited educational mid-level manager literature relates to international segments, primarily secondary education segments (Bennett, 1999; Bushher & Harris, 1999; Gleeson & Shain, 1999; Hannay & Ross, 1999). Great Britain, for example, recognizes mid-level managers as critical “mediators of change in the reconstruction of professional and managerial cultures in the Further Education sector” (Gleeson & Shain, 1999, p.461) and as “hav[ing] a major contribution to play in managing cultural change
at both the department and whole school level” (Bushher & Harris, 1999, p.305). One study of
Canadian secondary schools highlights the historical importance of mid-level managers within
secondary education, describing the establishment of a “middle management organizational
model” (Hannay & Ross, 1999, p. 345) dating back to the early twentieth century. Likewise,
mid-level managers are deemed important to “reculturing and restructuring” (p.305) schools in
the current environment.

The literature related to higher education mid-level managers is limited primarily to
academic managers (chairs) and mirrors the previously mentioned findings, namely mid-level
managers hold key institutional positions but, likewise, face conflicting roles with a seeming lack
of support (Filan, 1999; Foote, 1999; Gillett-Karam, 1999; Gillett-Karam et al., 1999; Pettitt,
1999; Smith & Stewart, 1999; Spangler, 1999; Yamasaki, 1999). Three of the 19 dissertations
identified through keyword searches of mid-level managers and management involve studies
within higher educational settings and conform to this narrow definition of mid-level manager,
limiting study populations to managers of academic rank (Hutchens, 1999; Smith, 1995; Zonn,
1995).

Research Hypotheses

The problem addressed by this study was to determine if any statistically significant
relationships existed between NCCCS mid-level manager perception mean scores among four
ACCLAIM Model conceptual components and mid-level manager age, ethnicity, gender, and
length of service within NCCCS institutional location, size, and unit. Three primary hypotheses
were tested at the .05 significance level as follows:
**Primary Research Hypotheses**

\( H_{01} \): There will be no statistically significant relationships between mid-level managers’ perceived utility of community-based programming and NCCCS institutional location, size, and unit.

\( H_{02} \): There will be no statistically significant relationships between mid-level managers’ perceived practice of community-based programming and NCCCS institutional location, size, and unit.

\( H_{03} \): There will be no statistically significant relationships between mid-level managers’ perceived encouragement to participate in community-based programming and NCCCS institutional location, size, and unit.

Where significant relationships were found to exist between dependent (utility, practice, encouragement to participate) and primary independent variables (location, size, unit) as hypothesized in Hypotheses 1-3, additional bivariate analyses were utilized to identify significant relationships existing between correlated primary independent and dependent variables and secondary independent variables (age, ethnicity, gender, length of service). The following hypothesized relationships were predicted in twelve secondary hypotheses:

**Secondary Research Hypotheses**

\( H_{04} \): There will be no statistically significant relationships between mid-level managers’ perceived utility of community-based programming and age within NCCCS institutional location, size, and unit.
H0₅: There will be no statistically significant relationships between mid-level managers’ perceived utility of community-based programming and ethnicity within NCCCS institutional location, size, and unit.

H0₆: There will be no statistically significant relationships between mid-level managers’ perceived utility of community-based programming and gender within NCCCS institutional location, size, and unit.

H0₇: There will be no statistically significant relationships between mid-level managers’ perceived utility of community-based programming and length of service within NCCCS institutional location, size, and unit.

H0₈: There will be no statistically significant relationships between mid-level managers’ perceived practice of community-based programming and age within NCCCS institutional location, size, and unit.

H0₉: There will be no statistically significant relationships between mid-level managers’ perceived practice of community-based programming and ethnicity within NCCCS institutional location, size, and unit.

H0₁₀: There will be no statistically significant relationships between mid-level managers’ perceived practice of community-based programming and gender within NCCCS institutional location, size, and unit.

H0₁₁: There will be no statistically significant relationships between mid-level managers’ perceived practice of community-based programming and length of service within NCCCS institutional location, size, and unit.
H0_{12}: There will be no statistically significant relationships between mid-level managers’ perceived encouragement to participate in community-based programming and age within NCCCS institutional location, size, and unit.

H0_{13}: There will be no statistically significant relationships between mid-level managers’ perceived encouragement to participate in community-based programming and ethnicity within NCCCS institutional location, size, and unit.

H0_{14}: There will be no statistically significant relationships between mid-level managers’ perceived encouragement to participate in community-based programming and gender within NCCCS institutional location, size, and unit.

H0_{15}: There will be no statistically significant relationships between mid-level managers’ perceived encouragement to participate in community-based programming and length of service within NCCCS institutional location, size, and unit.

Summary

The conceptual basis of the proposed study design was predicated upon CBP as constructed by the ACCLAIM Model. The ACCLAIM Model is a theoretical and practical service approach for the contemporary community college constructed within a framework of fifteen processual tasks guided by a number of central concepts. Study design focused on four fundamental conceptual components (FCCs) formulated from foundational ACCLAIM Model concepts and processual tasks and implied that mid-level manager perception is influenced by specific institutional and individual characteristics. Study design was founded upon mid-level community college manager perceptions of FCCs in three separate perceptual subscales as measured by Likert scale items on a
survey instrument designed to identify perceptions related to current and future CBP implementation behaviors.

A review of the current literature revealed that CBP articles and studies primarily are qualitative in nature and are either focused on specific, individual cases or several discipline-specific individual programs. Likewise, the term “model” is used broadly to describe individual approaches rather than general frameworks like that constructed by the ACCLAIM Model. While significantly more published work exists for “mid-level manager,” specific research relating to the educational mid-level manager is meager. No identified study or investigation included a mutual treatment of academic and non-academic mid-level managers. No research relating mid-level manager perception to CBP was identified. Therefore, because no quantitative research examining CBP as constructed by the ACCLAIM Model within the context of mid-level manager perception as defined by this study is identified, this study attempted to identify significant relationships between existing NCCCS mid-level manager perception among ACCLAIM Model FCCs and individual mid-level manager characteristics within NCCCS institutional location, size, and unit.
CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this study was to measure the degree to which community-based programming as modeled by the ACCLAIM Model (Boone, 1997) is perceived and practiced among North Carolina Community College System (NCCCS) mid-level managers. This chapter provides an overview of the procedures used to develop research methodologies that were used to test the stated hypotheses. Chapter 3 contains sections dealing with (a) research design, (b) sample, (c) instrumentation, and (d) analysis procedures.

Research Design

After consulting with experts in CBP and completing a comprehensive review of the literature, the ACCLAIM Model was chosen as the construct that was used to drive the development of the conceptual design of this study. The quasi-experimental correlational research design chosen for this study includes bivariate analysis, an analysis protocol that identified correlational relationships between variables existing within a correlation matrix. A significant correlational relationship between two variables indicates relationships in the distribution of the dependent variable, depending on the categories of the independent variable. Once identified, relationships can then be explained within the conceptual context of the study. After all significant relationships have been identified and explained, linear regression utilizing all existing significant correlation coefficients were used to establish criterion-related validity of ACCLAIM Model fundamental conceptual components (FCCs). Results then were used to extrapolate the degree to which ACCLAIM Model, as defined by four FCCs, is being utilized, practiced as structured, and encouraged (socially marketed) within NCCCS institutions.
The two sets of variables considered in this study included the following:

1. **Dependent variables**: Mid-level manager perception of ACCLAIM Model FCCs within three perceptual subscales: utility, practice, and encouragement to participate.

2. **Independent variables**: Mid-level manager individual characteristics (age, ethnicity, gender, and length of service) within institutional characteristics (location, size, and unit.)

**Analysis Protocol – Phase 1 – Generate Mean Scores**

The first phase of this study’s analysis protocol required the generation of mean scores or mathematical averages for all possible model components as derived from Likert Scale responses on CBPI items. The Statistical Program for the Social Sciences (SPSS) was used to perform all statistical analyses associated with this study. Given the complexity of design, mean scores were generated at two levels as diagrammed by Columns 1 and 2 in Figure 3.1 on the following page.

**Primary Mean Scores**

Primary mean scores or total sample mean scores, as labeled and represented in the diagram’s second column, were generated for each of the three dependent variables or perceptual subscales: (1) perceived utility, (2) perceived practice, and (3) perceived encouragement to participate. Total mid-level manager responses to all CBPI items within each perceptual subscale were used to generate three total sample mean scores or primary mean scores for each perceptual subscale.

**Secondary Mean Scores**

Secondary mean scores, labeled and represented in the first column, were generated for all demographic subsets of independent variables within institutional
Figure 3.1. Phase 1 of the analysis protocol involved generating mean scores for all subsets of dependent and independent variables.
characteristics: location, size, and unit. Mid-level manager responses to each institutional characteristic variable were categorized in one of two demographic response subsets as follows:

• **Institutional location** responses were categorized as “rural,” “urban,” or mixed based on Bureau of the Census 2000 population density. (Institutions located in counties with overall density of 500 people or more per square mile were classified as urban. Institutions located in counties with overall population density of less than 500 people per square mile were classified as rural. Institutions located in counties with both rural and urban population densities were classified as “mixed.”) Mid-level manager mean scores then were computed for each of the three perceptual subscales (denoted in the diagram’s first column by the abbreviations U, P, and E) within rural, urban, and mixed categories, yielding nine separate mean scores within institutional location.

• **Institutional size** responses were categorized as either “small,” “medium,” or “large” as determined by Total Combined Curriculum and Extension Full Time Equivalent Enrollment (FTE). (Institutions with enrollments of less than 2,000 FTE were categorized as small, institutions with enrollments of more than 2,000 but less than 4,000 FTE were categorized as medium, and institutions with enrollment of 4,000 FTE or more were categorized as large.) Mid-level manager mean scores then were computed for each of the three perceptual subscales (denoted in the diagram’s first column by the abbreviations U, P, and E) within small, medium, or large categories, yielding nine separate mean scores within institutional size.

• **Institutional unit** responses were categorized as either “academic” or “non-academic.” Mid-level manager mean scores were then computed for each of the three perceptual
subscales (denoted in the diagram’s first column by the abbreviations U, P, and E) within academic or non-academic categories, yielding six separate mean scores within institutional unit.

A total of 24 mid-level manager mean scores were generated from institutional demographic subsets as described above. In the Phase 2 bivariate analyses, primary mean scores were compared with the 24 secondary mean scores to identify significant relationships between mid-level manager perceptual subscale mean scores and mid-level manager mean scores within institutional location, size, and unit subsets. Where significant relationships were identified within institutional mean score subsets, mean scores for individual characteristics -- age, ethnicity, gender, and length of service -- were generated and additional bivariate analyses were conducted to isolate specific relationships within identified institutional mean score subsets.

**CBPI “Cheater” Items**

Analysis protocol mean scores for both primary and secondary mean scores were calculated using all mid-level manager responses on each CBPI item excluding designated CBPI “cheater” items. Because a series of highly related, sequenced questions like those associated with the CBPI may enhance the possibility of redundant or scripted subject responses, several cheater items or questions were inserted into the CBPI to avoid experimenter effect. Cheater items were inserted throughout the instrument to break the flow of the conceptual form of ACCLAIM Model components. As such, mid-level manager responses associated with the ACCLAIM Model did reflect a certain consistency while cheater items were noticeably different. CBPI cheater items were designated as CBPI items 3, 6, and 9 and appeared as the following Institutional Statements:
• CBPI Institutional Statement 3: “The community college is better qualified and skilled at resolving critical issues than other service area agencies and organizations.”

• CBPI Institutional Statement 6: “The community college waits for an invitation from the appropriate community agency or organization before involving itself in critical service area issues.”

• CBPI Institutional Statement 9: “The community college’s primary examples of community partnership include institutional membership in civic organizations, involvement in public service events, and the provision of cultural event programming.”

Analysis Protocol – Phase 2 – Conduct Bivariate Analysis

Figure 3.2 on the following page diagrams the dependent and independent variable mean scores that comprised the correlation matrix utilized in Phase 2 of this study’s research design. This correlation matrix utilized the 24 secondary mean scores (Column 1) and the three primary mean scores (Column 2) or total sample means generated in Phase 1 to conduct a series of bivariate analyses to identify significant relationships between mid-level manager perceptual subscale mean scores (dependent variables) and mid-level manager mean scores within institutional characteristics (independent variables). A total of 72 bivariate analyses (three primary mean scores x 24 secondary mean scores) were conducted to screen out any significant relationships. Where significant relationships existed, additional bivariate analyses were conducted. These bivariate analyses examined mid-level manager age, ethnicity, gender, and length of service to further explain where significant relationships exist within institutional location, size, and unit as indicated by Phase 2 bivariate analyses.
Figure 3.2. Phase 2 of the analysis protocol involved conducting multiple bivariate analyses from a correlation matrix utilizing mean scores generated in Phase 1.
Phase 3 of this study’s research design involved conducting a linear regression utilizing all significant relationships identified in the Phase 2 correlational matrix. This facilitated the rank ordering of ACCLAIM Model fundamental conceptual components (FCCs) by producing r-factor scores for each of the four FCCs that anchored the conceptual basis of this study’s design. R-factors were used to identify the contribution of each FCC to the overall ACCLAIM Model. This analysis protocol allowed, beyond inference alone, the validation and testing of component contribution to the model.

Study Population

The population selected for this study included the total population of 1,684 mid-level managers employed at NCCCS institutions during the 2001-2002 academic year. Mid-level manager was defined as any NCCCS manager holding the title of dean, director, or coordinator and charged with translating and “implementing the strategies, policies, and decisions made by top managers” (Ebert & Griffin, 1998, p. 138).

Data Collection Procedures

The NCCCS electronic mail network listing (GroupWise) was used to identify, select, and contact study respondents. An email transmittal message (see Appendix A) was delivered to 1,684 individuals on the NCCCS GroupWise list holding the title of dean, director, or coordinator. The email message briefly explained the study and requested their participation by directing respondents to click on a highlighted Internet address linked directly to the Community-based Programming Instrument (CBPI see Appendix B).

HTML formatting was used to place the questionnaire online where it was linked to the North Carolina Community College Planning and Research Organization (CCPRO) web site at
Response data were entered into a file using Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) software for analysis and manipulation.

**Instrumentation**

The instrument used in this study was the CBPI (See Appendix B). This instrument was developed to reflect the concepts of CBP as constructed by the ACCLAIM model. Consultations with Edgar J. Boone, author of the ACCLAIM Model, allowed the culling out of fundamental or core conceptual components (FCCs), which then were formulated as ten Institutional Statements or items appearing on the instrument. Three additional Institutional Statements or cheater items, representing concepts contrary to ACCLAIM Model FCCs were formulated and interspersed among CBPI items to mitigate experimenter effect. Each item was stated within three different but related contexts or perceptual subscales: (a) **Perceptual Subscale 1 – Utility**: the degree to which a community college *should practice* a concept, (b) **Perceptual Subscale 2 – Practice**: the degree to which a respondent’s current community college *does practice* a concept, and (c) **Perceptual Subscale 3 - Encouragement to Participate**: the degree to which a respondent is *encouraged to participate in activities that characterize* a concept.

Using a five-point Likert scale, respondents were asked to quantify their perceptions of CBPI Institutional Statements as they applied in each of the three perceptual subscales. Eight demographic questions were included to measure institutional location, institutional size, and institutional unit as well as respondent age, ethnicity, gender, and length of service.

To ensure validity and reliability, the CBPI was reviewed by a panel of experts and pilot tested with a cohort of mid-level managers at Calhoun Community College (CCC) in Decatur, Alabama, a community college outside the ACCLAIM region. Calhoun Community College is the largest of the 32 two-year institutions within the Alabama College System. Offering 57
associate degree programs and 49 career/certificate programs, CCC serves approximately 7,500 students. Of Calhoun's 308 full-time employees, 129 serve on the college faculty of whom 80 percent possess at least a master's degree with approximately 15 percent holding doctorate degrees.

Statistical Procedures Used to Analyze Study Results

Data results were analyzed using bivariate analysis, correlational, and linear regression techniques as described below:

1. **Generation of mean scores:** Using Likert Scale-derived mid-level manager responses for all CBPI items, mean scores were generated for each of the three independent variables or perceptual subscales (primary mean scores) and for six demographic subsets of dependent variables within institutional location, size, and unit (secondary mean scores).

2. **Bivariate analyses:** Seventy-two bivariate analyses were conducted utilizing the 24 secondary mean scores and the three primary mean scores to identify any significant relationships between total mid-level manager perceptual subscale mean scores (dependent variables) and mid-level manager mean scores within institutional characteristics (independent variables). Where significant relationships existed, additional bivariate analyses were conducted utilizing mid-level manager age, ethnicity, gender, and length of service to further explain where significant relationships existed within institutional location, size, and unit.

3. **Linear regression:** Linear regression was conducted utilizing all significant relationships identified above to facilitate the rank ordering of ACCLAIM Model fundamental conceptual components (FCCs). This analysis protocol allowed, beyond inference alone, the validation and testing of component contribution to the model.
Summary

The methodology proposed for this study was a quasi-experimental correlational research design utilizing bivariate analysis and linear regression techniques. A thirteen-item online survey instrument (CBPI) was distributed electronically to a population of 1,684 NCCCS mid-level managers via the NCCCS electronic mail network. Respondents used Likert scale responses to quantify their perceptions of ACCLAIM Model FCCs as constructed by thirteen CBPI institutional statements. Response data were entered into a file using Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) software for analysis and manipulation. A series of 72 bivariate analyses were utilized to correlate mid-level manager perceptual subscale mean scores (dependent variables) and mid-level manager mean scores within institutional location, size, and unit (primary independent variables) for the purpose of identifying significant relationships. Where significant relationships were identified between dependent (utility, practice, encouragement to participate) and primary independent (institutional location, size, and unit) variables, additional bivariate analyses were utilized to further explain relationships by correlating individual characteristics (age, ethnicity, gender, and length of service) with perceptual subscale mean scores. Once identified and explained, all significant relationships were utilized to conduct a linear regression that facilitated the rank ordering and model contribution of ACCLAIM Model FCCs.

In summary, the results of this investigation allowed for the transposition of significant variables into a correlation matrix in order to establish correlational validity for ACCLAIM Model fundamental conceptual components. This investigation did so by expanding upon previous qualitative studies by providing for the quantitative scientific testing of the model. To this end, results reveal the extent to which ACCLAIM Model components are perceived to be
working in NCCCS institutions. Furthermore, results may be used to (1) improve CBP practice by identifying and benchmarking institutional and individual characteristics associated with effective CBP implementation, (2) improve social marketing of CBP by identifying characteristics associated with ACCLAIM Model receptivity, and (3) build professional development agendas to broaden CBP awareness among middle managers and other NCCCS administrators for the purposes of better serving emerging community issues.
CHAPTER FOUR

RESULTS

The purpose of this study was to measure the degree to which community-based programming (CBP) as constructed by ACCLAIM Model fundamental conceptual components (FCCs) is perceived and practiced by North Carolina Community College System (NCCCS) mid-level managers (MLMs). This chapter presents and interprets results generated utilizing the research design described in Chapter 3 including (a) a general overview of summary responses and related sample return rate associated with the internet-based survey, the Community-based Programming Instrument (CBPI), (b) a description of results generated in analysis protocol phase 1 of the research design: generation of frequencies and mean scores, (c) a description of results generated in analysis protocol phase 2: bivariate analysis including hypotheses testing, (d) a review of procedures for and results generated by the post hoc analysis protocol associated with analysis protocol phase 2, (e) a description of results generated in analysis protocol phase 3: linear regression, and (f) a summary review of all results generated by analyses protocols 1, 2, and 3.

CBPI Instrumentation and Return Rate

An email message (see APPENDIX C) transmitting an invitation to participate in the study with the Internet link to the CBPI survey instrument was delivered to 1,684 mid level managers employed during the 2001-2002 academic year within the 58 NCCCS comprehensive community colleges via the NCCCS GroupWise network. A total of 688 usable survey responses were received representing a return rate of 41 percent. After data were collected the instrument was subjected to a reliability analysis resulting in an alpha coefficient of .91.
Results of Analysis Protocol Phase 1: Generation of Frequencies and Mean Scores

Phase 1 of the analysis protocol described in Chapter 3 called for calculating frequencies and mean scores for the study’s dependent and independent variables. Results of these measures were then used in a series of bivariate correlational analyses (analysis protocol phases 2) to test for significant relationships between primary independent variables (location, size, unit) and dependent variables (utility, practice, encouragement to participate). Where significant relationships were identified, additional bivariate analyses using secondary independent variable mean scores were conducted to test for relationships with secondary independent variables (age, ethnicity, gender, length of service).

Dependent variables (utility, practice, encouragement to participate) were measured using mean scores computed from MLMs’ responses to a series of CBPI institutional statements developed to reflect CBP as formulated by ACCLAIM Model FCCs. MLMs were asked to use a 5-point Likert scale (1=lowest, 5=highest) to rank the degree to which each CBPI statement applied in the community college setting in three perceptual contexts or subscales: (1) **Utility**: To what degree should a community college subscribe to the concept or activity as described by the CBPI statement, (2) **Practice**: To what degree does your current community college subscribe to the concept or activity as described by the CBPI statement, and (3) **Encouragement to participate**: To what degree are you *encouraged to participate* in the concept or activity as described by the CBPI statement? Primary independent variables (location, size, unit) and secondary independent variables (age, ethnicity, gender, length of service) were measured using frequencies computed from MLMs’ responses to a set of demographic questions.
Primary Mean Scores for Dependent Variables: Perceptual Subscales (Utility, Practice, Encouragement to Participate)

Dependent variables (utility, practice, encouragement to participate) were measured by a 5-point Likert scale that MLMs used to rank individual CBPI items in three perceptual contexts or subscales. Results (Table1) demonstrated that mean scores were highest for utility (45.83), indicating that MLMs perceived CBP to have a high degree of utility in the community college setting. Mean scores were slightly lower for practice (39.27), indicating that MLMs perceived CBP to be practiced within their current institutions but at degrees lower than perceived utility. Mean scores were lowest for encouragement to participate (38.60), indicating that MLMs perceived comparatively lower degrees of encouragement to participate at their current locations.

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Frequencies</th>
<th>Missing</th>
<th>Primary Mean Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Utility</td>
<td>657</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>45.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practice</td>
<td>662</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>39.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouragement to Participate</td>
<td>661</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>38.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Frequencies for Primary Independent Variables: Location, Size, Unit

MLMs were asked to report the locations and sizes of their colleges as well as the units within which they worked. Results (Tables 2-4) indicated that most MLMs were located in medium-sized, rural colleges and held mid-level management positions evenly distributed across academic and non-academic units.
MLMs selected from among three choices to describe their institutional locations: (1) locations serving rural populations, (2) locations serving urban populations, or (3) locations serving mixed (both rural and urban) populations. Results indicated (Table 2) that a majority (320, 47.1%) of MLMs were in locations serving rural populations followed by MLMs (292, 43.0%) in locations serving mixed (both rural and urban) populations and MLMs (67, 9.9%) in locations serving urban populations.

MLMs reported college size by selecting one of three choices approximating college size according to enrollment (total combined curriculum and extension FTE): (1) Small = enrollment less than 2,000, (2) Medium = enrollment more than 2,000 but less than 4,000, or (3) Large = enrollment of 4,000 or more. Results indicated (Table 3) that almost half (302, 43.9%) of all MLMs reported that their institutions were medium in size, followed by approximately one third (208, 30.2%) who reported that their institutions were large in size and one quarter (166, 24.6%) who reported that their institutions were small in size.

MLMs reported administrative areas of responsibility by selecting one of nine categories including one academic (curriculum/instruction) and eight non-academic (basic skills, business & industry, business office, Human Resources Division-HRD, institutional effectiveness, occupational extension, Learning Resources Center- LRC, student services) categories. Results (Table 4) indicated that MLM respondents were distributed consistently across academic and non-academic units. A total of 178 (26.4%) or a little more than one quarter of all MLMs identified their current position as existing within the academic unit category of curriculum & instruction. A total of 495 (73.6%) MLMs identified their current position as existing within one of eight non-academic units: a total of 54 (8.0%) in basic skills, a total of 64 (9.5%) in business & industry, a total of 55 (8.2%) in business office, a total of 21 (3.1%) in HRD, a total of 51
(7.6%) in institutional effectiveness, a total of 93 (13.8%) in occupational extension, and a total of 118 (17.5%) in student services. When grouped within the major institutional divisions of administrative support, continuing education, educational support, and student services, MLMs occupied positions across an even distribution of non-academic units: 15.8% within administrative support services (business office, institutional effectiveness), 18.4% within continuing education services (business & industry, HRD, occupational extension), 21.8% within educational support services (LRC and basic skills), and 17.5% within student services.

Table 2

Mid-Level Manager Frequencies: Institutional Location

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Location</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>47.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>43.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>673</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3

Mid-Level Manager Frequencies: Institutional Size

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Size</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>24.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>43.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>30.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>676</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4

Mid-Level Manager Frequencies: Institutional Unit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Unit</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Academic</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum &amp; Instruction</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>26.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-Academic</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic Skills</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business &amp; Industry</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Office</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources Division</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Effectiveness</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Resources Center</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupational Extension</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Services</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>673</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Frequencies for Secondary Independent Variables: Age, Ethnicity, Gender, Length of Service

**Age**

Frequencies for secondary independent variables (age, ethnicity, gender, length of service) were calculated using MLM responses to a series of questions that provided a demographic profile of respondents. Results (Tables 5-8) indicated that most MLMs were white females aged 41 and older who had been in the community college setting for eleven or more years.
Table 5 contains data indicating that a majority of all MLM respondents (559, 81.7%) reported ages of 41 years and older. Within this majority, almost half of all respondents (309, 45.2%) reported ages of 51 years and over, followed by a total of 156 (22.8%) who reported ages of 46-50 years and a total of 94 (13.7%) reporting ages of 41-45 years. An appreciably smaller proportion of MLM respondents (125, 18.3%) reported ages of 40 years and younger. Within this proportion, a total of 2 (.3%) reported ages of less than 24 years, followed by a total of 13 (1.9%) reporting ages of 25-30 years, a total of 46 (6.7%) reporting ages of 31-35 years, and a total of 64 (9.4%) reporting ages of 36-40 years of age.

Table 6 contains data indicating that MLMs of Caucasian ethnicities accounted for an appreciably larger proportion (577, 85.2%) of the studied population, followed by MLMs reporting ethnicities of Black (75, 11.1%), Other (12, 1.8%), American Indian (5, .7%), Asian (4, .6%), and Hispanic (4, .6%).

Table 7 contains data indicating that female MLMs (389, 57.8%) accounted for slightly more CBPI survey responses than did male respondents (284, 42.2%). A large proportion of mid-level manager respondents (280, 40.7%) reported that their length of service exists within the more than 15 years category, followed by a total of 148 (21.5%) within the 6-10 years category, 105 (15.3%) within the 11-15 years category, 98 (14.2%) within the 3-5 years category, and 54 (7.8%) within the 1-2 years category.
Table 5

Mid-Level Manager Frequencies: Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 24 years</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-30 years</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-35 years</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-40 years</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-45 years</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-50 years</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>22.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 and older</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>45.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>684</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6

Mid-Level Manager Frequencies: Ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>577</td>
<td>85.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>676</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7

Mid-Level Manager Frequencies: Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>42.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>389</td>
<td>57.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8

Mid-Level Manager Frequencies: Length of Service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Length of Service</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-2 years</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-5 years</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 years</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>21.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15 years</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 15 years</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>40.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>685</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results of Analysis Protocol Phase 2: Bivariate Analyses Including Testing of Hypotheses

Phase 2 of the analysis protocol described in Chapter 3 utilized mean scores computed in Phase 1 to conduct a series of bivariate correlational analyses to test for significant relationships between dependent and independent variables as formulated in study hypotheses. Three primary hypotheses (Hypotheses 1-3) were tested to identify relationships between dependent variables (utility, practice, encouragement to participate) and primary independent variables (location,
size, unit). Results identified significant relationships between encouragement to participate and location. Additional analyses of these findings identified significant correlations between location and five of 10 encouragement to participate CBPI items: 2, 7, 11-13 (empower, team effort, ownership, promote, direction).

Four secondary hypotheses (Hypotheses 12-15) also were tested to identify significant relationships between significant encouragement to participate CBPI items and secondary independent variables (age, ethnicity, gender, and length of service) within location. Significant relationships were identified between all five significant encouragement to participate CBPI items and gender within location.

Tests of Hypotheses 1 through 3

Results of bivariate analyses (Table 9) utilized to test Hypotheses 1-3 indicated that only one primary independent variable was significantly correlated with any of the study’s dependent variables. A significant correlation was found to exist between location and one of the three dependent variables: encouragement to participate. After examining mean scores (Table 10) for response categories within location (rural, urban, mixed), the correlation coefficient of -.089 was interpreted to indicate that MLMs at rural institutions perceived higher degrees of encouragement to participate followed by lower degrees among MLMs at urban institutions and lowest degrees of encouragement to participate among MLMs at mixed locations.

Additional analyses (Table 11) were conducted to identify significant correlations existing between location and specific CBPI statements within the encouragement to participate perceptual subscale. Location was significantly correlated with five of ten CBPI items as follows:
1. CBPI item 2 (empower): “Developing and improving the service area by educating and thus empowering the people of the community is a major focus of the community college mission” (.098).

2. CBPI item 7 (team effort): “The community college works with other service area agencies and organizations as part of a larger team effort to develop and improve the community” (.081).

3. CBPI item 11 (ownership): “Community college employees feel a collective ownership for developing and improving the service area” (.092).

4. CBPI item 12 (promote): “The community college promotes itself in the service area as a leader and catalyst for community development and improvement” (.84).

5. CBPI item 13 (direction): “People who live in the area (public leaders, business leaders, religious leaders, etc.) turn to the community college for direction when addressing and resolving critical community issues” (.099).

Tests of Hypotheses 12 through 15

Because significant correlations were identified between location and encouragement to participate, additional bivariate analyses were utilized to test Hypotheses 12-15 in order to identify significant correlations existing between location and secondary independent variables (age, ethnicity, gender, and length of service) within the encouragement to participate subscale. Results indicated (Table 12) that gender is significantly correlated with encouragement to participate (correlation coefficient = .159) within location.
Table 9

Bivariate Correlations Existing between Independent (Location, Size, Unit) and Dependent (Utility, Practice, Encouragement to Participate) Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Utility</th>
<th>Practice</th>
<th>Encouragement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Independent</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Pearson</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td><strong>.442</strong></td>
<td>.068</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>-.032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.079</td>
<td>.923</td>
<td>.411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>679</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>664</td>
<td>649</td>
<td>655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size</td>
<td>Pearson</td>
<td><strong>.422</strong></td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>-.043</td>
<td>.039</td>
<td>.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.266</td>
<td>.321</td>
<td>.884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>676</td>
<td>661</td>
<td>646</td>
<td>652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit</td>
<td>Pearson</td>
<td>.068</td>
<td>-.043</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>-.009</td>
<td>.030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.079</td>
<td>.266</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.814</td>
<td>.316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>664</td>
<td>661</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>643</td>
<td>648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dependent</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility</td>
<td>Pearson</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.039</td>
<td>-.009</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td><strong>.335</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.923</td>
<td>.321</td>
<td>.814</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>649</td>
<td>646</td>
<td>643</td>
<td>657</td>
<td>646</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practice</td>
<td>Pearson</td>
<td>-.032</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.039</td>
<td><strong>.335</strong></td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.411</td>
<td>.884</td>
<td>.316</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>655</td>
<td>652</td>
<td>648</td>
<td>646</td>
<td>662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage-</td>
<td>Pearson</td>
<td>*-.089</td>
<td>-.022</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td><strong>.332</strong></td>
<td><strong>.834</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>-ment</strong></td>
<td>Correlation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.022</td>
<td>.583</td>
<td>.696</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>654</td>
<td>651</td>
<td>648</td>
<td>644</td>
<td>655</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)

**Significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)
Table 10

Mean Scores for Specific Location Response Categories within Encouragement to Participate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Location</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>39.34</td>
<td>306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>38.74</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>37.74</td>
<td>283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>38.59</td>
<td>654</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 11

Bivariate Correlations Existing between Institutional Location and Specific Encouragement to Participate CBPI Items: Empower, Team Effort, Ownership, Promote, Direction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable or CBPI Item</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Empower</th>
<th>Team Effort</th>
<th>Ownership</th>
<th>Promote</th>
<th>Direction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Pearson</td>
<td>-.098</td>
<td>-.081</td>
<td>-.092</td>
<td>-.084</td>
<td>-.099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correlation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>.036</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td>.029</td>
<td>.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>679</td>
<td>677</td>
<td>675</td>
<td>678</td>
<td>676</td>
<td>678</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CBPI Encouragement Item**

| Empower              | Pearson  | -.098   | **.597**    | **.578**  | **.585** | **.495**  |
| Correlation          |          |         |             |           |         |           |
| Sig. (2-tailed)      | .010     | -       | .000        | .000      | .000    | .000      |
| N                    | 677      | 686     | 682         | 685       | 683     | 685       |

| Team Effort          | Pearson  | -.081   | **.597**    | **.554**  | **.639** | **.543**  |
| Correlation          |          |         |             |           |         |           |
| Sig. (2-tailed)      | .036     | .000    | -           | .000      | .000    | .000      |
| N                    | 675      | 682     | 684         | 683       | 681     | 683       |

| Ownership            | Pearson  | -.092   | **.578**    | **.554**  | 1.000   | **.663**  | **.574**  |
| Correlation          |          |         |             |           |         |           |           |
| Sig. (2-tailed)      | .017     | .000    | .000        | -         | .000    | .000      |
| N                    | 678      | 685     | 683         | 687       | 684     | 686       |

| Promote              | Pearson  | -.084   | **.585**    | **.639**  | **.663** | 1.000     | **.670**  |
| Correlation          |          |         |             |           |         |           |           |
| Sig. (2-tailed)      | .029     | .000    | .000        | .000      | -       | .000      |
| N                    | 676      | 683     | 681         | 684       | 685     | 684       |

| Direction            | Pearson  | -.099   | **.495**    | **.543**  | **.574** | **.670**  | 1.000     |
| Correlation          |          |         |             |           |         |           |           |
| Sig. (2-tailed)      | .010     | .000    | .000        | .000      | .000    | -         |
| N                    | 678      | 685     | 683         | 686       | 684     | 687       |

*Significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)

** Significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)
Table 12

Bivariate Correlations Existing between Institutional Location, Encouragement to Participate, and Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Institutional Location</th>
<th>Encouragement to Participate</th>
<th>Gender</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Location</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>-.089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>679</td>
<td>654</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouragement to</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>*-.089</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participate</td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.022</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>654</td>
<td>661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>-.029</td>
<td>**.159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.457</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>664</td>
<td>647</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)

**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

Post Hoc Analyses Associated with Analysis Protocol Phase 2

Phase 2 of the analysis protocol called for additional bivariate analyses to single out significant correlations existing between specific response categories of gender (male, female) and location (rural, urban, mixed) within encouragement to participate. Problems conducting bivariate analyses at this level were encountered, possibly due to the weak mathematical nature of the correlations between response categories of the independent variables (location, gender), which may have affected the SPSS program’s ability to render a complete analysis. Therefore, a two-tiered post hoc analysis procedure utilizing mean scores and analysis of variance (ANOVA) to identify relationships between location and gender response categories within the five significant encouragement to participate CBPI items (2, 7, 11-13) was conducted: (1) mean...
scores for response categories within location and gender were examined and (2) one-way analyses of variance (ANOVA) were used to identify significant differences between specific response categories of location (rural, urban, mixed) and gender (male, female) within encouragement to participate. Post hoc analyses data (Tables 13-32) indicated that significant differences existed between response categories of gender (male, female) and location (rural, urban, mixed) within the five significant encouragement to participate CBPI items. These results were interpreted as the following relationships:

1. **Empower**: Rural, female MLM respondents perceived a higher degree of encouragement to participate in CBP activities and concepts reflected in CBPI item 2: “Developing and improving the service area by educating and thus empowering the people of the community is a major focus of the community college mission.”

2. **Team effort**: Rural, female MLM respondents perceived a higher degree of encouragement to participate in CBP activities and concepts reflected in CBPI item: “The community college works with other service area agencies and organizations as part of a larger team effort to develop and improve the community.”

3. **Ownership**: Rural MLM respondents perceived a higher degree of encouragement to participate in CBP activities and concepts reflected in CBPI item 11: “Community college employees feel a collective ownership for developing and improving the service area.”

4. **Promote**: Rural, female MLM respondents perceived a higher degree of encouragement to participate in CBP activities and concepts reflected in CBPI item 12: “The community college promotes itself in the service area as a leader and catalyst for community development and improvement.”
5. **Direction**: Rural, female MLM respondents perceived a higher degree of encouragement to participate in CBP activities and concepts reflected in CBPI item 13: “People who live in the area (public leaders, business leaders, religious leaders, etc.) turn to the community college for direction when addressing and resolving critical community issues.”

**Significant Differences between Response Categories of Location and Gender within Encouragement to Participate: Empower**

Mean scores and ANOVA for response categories of location within encouragement to participate: **empower**.

Mean scores (Table 13) were examined for response categories of location (rural, urban, mixed) within encouragement to participate as reflected in CBPI item 2: “Developing and improving the service area by educating and thus empowering the people of the community is a major focus of the community college mission.” Mean scores indicated that rural respondents’ (4.27) perceived degrees of encouragement to participate in CBP concepts or activities as reflected in CBPI item 2: empower was greater than that of urban respondents (4.15) and respondents who perceived their institutions as serving mixed (4.07) populations. Rural mean scores (4.27) also were higher than that of the total sample population (4.17) and had a lower standard deviation (.95) than that of the total sample population (1.00). These data indicated that responses among the rural category of location were higher than in other response categories and indicated that MLMs in rural locations perceived highest degrees of encouragement to participate followed by respectively lower levels of encouragement among MLMs in urban and mixed locations.
Table 13

Mean Scores for Response Categories of Location (Rural, Urban, Mixed) within Encouragement to Participate CBPI Item 2: Empower

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Location</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>677</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An analysis of variance (ANOVA) (Table 14) was utilized to determine if significant differences existed within response categories of location (rural, urban, mixed) within encouragement to participate: empower. Results indicated that one of the response categories was significantly different from the others when combined (F= 3.308, df 2, p = .037) and response categories were significantly different when treated as freestanding groups (weighted) with varying sample sizes (F = 6.593, df 1, p = .01). Data indicated that response categories of the location were significantly different and that, as indicated by Table 13 mean scores, rural respondents’ perceived degree of encouragement to participate was greater than levels reported by urban and mixed respondents.
Table 14

Analysis of Variance for Response Categories of Location (Rural, Urban, Mixed) within Encouragement to Participate: Empower

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups (Combined)</td>
<td>6.515</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.308</td>
<td>.037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear Term Weighted</td>
<td>6.492</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.593</td>
<td>.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>663.610</td>
<td>674</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>670.124</td>
<td>676</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean scores and ANOVA for response categories of gender within encouragement to participate: empower:

Mean scores (Table 15) for response categories of gender (male, female) within encouragement to participate: empower were examined. Mean scores indicated that female respondents’ (4.29) perceived degrees of encouragement to participate were greater than that of male respondents (4.01). Female mean scores (4.29) also were higher than that of the total sample population (4.17) and had a lower standard deviation (.93) than that of the total sample population (1.00). Responses among the female category of gender were higher than in the male category thereby indicating that females perceived greater levels of encouragement to participate than males.
Table 15

Mean Scores for Response Categories of Gender (Male, Female) within Encouragement to Participate CBPI Item 2: Empower

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>671</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An analysis of variance (ANOVA) (Table 16) was utilized to determine if significant differences existed between response categories of gender (male, female) within encouragement to participate: empower. Results indicated that the response categories of gender were significantly different from the others when combined (F = 13.243, df 1, p = .000) and when treated as freestanding groups (weighted) with varying sample sizes (F = 13.243, df 1, p = .000). The data indicated that response categories within the independent variable gender were significantly different and that, as indicated by Table 15 mean scores, female respondents’ perceived degrees of encouragement to participate were greater than those reported by male respondents.
Table 16

Analysis of Variance for Response Categories of Gender (Male, Female) within Encouragement to Participate Item 2: Empower

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>12.888</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13.243</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear Term</td>
<td>12.888</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13.243</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>651.058</td>
<td>669</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>663.946</td>
<td>670</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significant Differences between Response Categories of Location and Gender within Encouragement to Participate:

Encouragement to Participate: **Team Effort**

Mean scores and ANOVA for response categories of location within encouragement to participate: team effort.

Mean scores (Table 17) for response categories of location (rural, urban, mixed) within encouragement to participate: team effort as reflected in CBPI item 7: “The community college works with other service area agencies and organizations as part of a larger team effort to develop and improve the community” were examined. Mean scores indicated that rural respondents’ (4.26) perceived degrees of encouragement to participate were greater than that of urban respondents (4.10) and that of respondents who responded that their institutions as serving mixed (4.09) populations. Rural mean scores (4.26) also were higher than that of the total sample population (4.17) and had a lower standard deviation (.96) than that of the total sample population (1.00). Data indicated that responses among the rural category of location were higher than in other response categories and indicated that MLMs in rural locations perceived highest
degrees of encouragement to participate followed by respectively lower degrees of encouragement among MLMs in urban and mixed locations.

Table 17

**Mean Scores for Response Categories of Institutional Location (Rural, Urban, Mixed) within Encouragement to Participate CBPI Item 7: Team Effort**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Location</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>675</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An analysis of variance (ANOVA) (Table 18) was utilized to determine if significant differences existed within response categories of location (rural, urban, mixed) within encouragement to participate: team effort. Results indicated that while response categories were not significantly different from the others when combined (F = 2.361, df 2, p = .095), they were significantly different when treated as freestanding groups (weighted) with varying sample sizes (F = 4.422, df 1, p = .036). Data indicated that response categories of the independent variable location were significantly different and that, as indicated by Table 17 mean scores, rural respondents’ perceived degree of encouragement to participate was greater than levels reported by urban and mixed respondents.
Table 18

Analysis of Variance for Response Categories of Location (Rural, Urban, Mixed) within Encouragement to Participate CBPI Item 7: Team Effort

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>(Combined)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.361</td>
<td>.095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear Term</td>
<td>Weighted</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.422</td>
<td>.036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td></td>
<td>672</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>674</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean scores and ANOVA for response categories of gender within encouragement to participate: team effort.

Mean scores (Table 19) for response categories of (male, female) within encouragement to participate: team effort were examined. Mean scores indicated that female respondents’ (4.29) perceived degrees of encouragement to participate were greater than those reported by male respondents (4.00). Female mean scores (4.29) also were higher than that of the total sample population (4.17) and had a lower standard deviation (.95) than that of the total sample population (1.00). Responses among the female category of gender were higher than the male category thereby indicating that females perceived greater levels of encouragement to participate than males.
Table 19

Mean Scores for Response Categories of Gender (Male, Female) within Encouragement to Participate CBPI Item 7: Team Effort

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>669</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An analysis of variance (ANOVA) (Table 20) was utilized to determine if significant differences existed between response categories of gender (male, female) within encouragement to participate: team effort. Results indicated that the response categories of gender were significantly different from one another when combined (F= 13.891, df 1, p = .000) and when treated as freestanding groups (weighted) with varying sample sizes (F = 13.891, df 1, p = .000). The data indicated that response categories of the independent variable gender were significantly different and that, as indicated by Table 19 mean scores, female respondents’ perceived degrees of encouragement to participate was greater than levels reported by male respondents.
Table 20

Analysis of Variance for Response Categories of Gender (Male, Female) within Encouragement to Participate CBPI Item 7: Team Effort

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups (Combined)</td>
<td>13.817</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13.891</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear Term</td>
<td>13.817</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13.891</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>663.415</td>
<td>667</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>677.232</td>
<td>668</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significant Differences between Response Categories of Location and Gender within Encouragement to Participate: Ownership

Mean scores and ANOVA for response categories of location within encouragement to participate: ownership.

Mean scores (Table 21) were examined for response categories of location (rural, urban, mixed) within encouragement to participate as reflected in CBPI item 11: “Community college employees feel a collective ownership for developing and improving the service area.” Mean scores indicated that rural respondents’ (3.71) perceived degrees of encouragement to participate was greater than that of urban respondents (3.57) and that of respondents who reported their institutions as serving mixed (3.49) populations. Rural mean scores (3.71) also were higher than that of the total sample population (3.60) and had a lower standard deviation (1.09) than that of the total sample population (1.14). Data indicated that responses among the rural category of location were higher than in other response categories and indicated that MLMs in rural locations perceived highest degrees of encouragement to participate followed by respectively lower degrees of encouragement among MLMs in urban and mixed locations.
An analysis of variance (ANOVA) (Table 22) was utilized to determine if significant differences existed between response categories of location (rural, urban, mixed) within encouragement to participate: ownership. Results indicated that while response categories were not significantly different from the others when combined (F = 2.916, df 2, p = .055), they were significantly different when treated as freestanding groups (weighted) with varying sample sizes (F = 5.769, df 1, p = .017). Data indicated that response categories of location were significantly different and that, as indicated by Table 21 mean scores, rural respondents’ perceived degree of encouragement to participate was greater than levels reported by urban and mixed respondents.
Table 22

Analysis of Variance for Response Categories of Location (Rural, Urban, Mixed) within Encouragement to Participate CBPI Item 7: Ownership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups (Combined)</td>
<td>7.590</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.916</td>
<td>.055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear Term Weighted</td>
<td>7.508</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.769</td>
<td>.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>878.475</td>
<td>675</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>886.065</td>
<td>677</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean scores and ANOVA for response categories of gender within encouragement to participate: ownership.

Mean scores (Table 23) for response categories of gender (male, female) within encouragement to participate: ownership were examined. Mean scores indicated that female respondents’ (3.68) perceived degrees of encouragement to participate were greater than that of male respondents (3.52). Responses among the female category of gender were higher than the male category thereby indicating that females perceived greater levels of encouragement to participate than males.
Table 23

Mean Scores for Response Categories of Gender (Male, Female) within Encouragement to Participate CBPI Item 11: Ownership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>672</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An analysis of variance (Table 24) was utilized to determine if significant differences existed within response categories of gender (male, female) within encouragement to participate: ownership. Results indicated that the response categories of gender were not significantly different from the others when combined (F= 2.852, df 1, p = .092) nor when treated as freestanding groups (weighted) with varying sample sizes (F= 2.852, df 1, p = .092). Data indicated that response categories of gender (male, female) were not significantly different within encouragement to participate and, therefore, categories within gender did not account for a significant portion of the variance within encouragement to participate: ownership.
Table 24

Analysis of Variance for Response Categories of Gender (Male, Female) within Encouragement to Participate CBPI Item 11: Ownership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>(Combined)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.852</td>
<td>.092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear Term</td>
<td>Weighted</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.852</td>
<td>.092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>873.910</td>
<td>670</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>877.629</td>
<td>671</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significant Differences between Response Categories of Location and Gender within Encouragement to Participate: **Promote**

Mean scores for response categories of location within encouragement to participate: **promote**.

Mean scores (Table 25) were examined for response categories of location (rural, urban, mixed) within encouragement to participate as reflected in CBPI item 12: “The community college promotes itself in the service area as a leader and catalyst for community development and improvement.” Mean scores indicated that rural respondents’ (3.98) perceived degrees of encouragement to participate in CBP concepts or activities as reflected in CBPI item 12: promote were greater than those of urban respondents (3.92) and of respondents who reported their institutions as serving mixed (3.78) populations. Rural mean scores (3.98) also were higher than that of the total sample population (3.89) and had a lower standard deviation (1.05) than that of the total sample population (1.11). Data indicated that responses among the rural category of location were higher than in other response categories and indicated that MLMs in rural locations
perceived highest degrees of encouragement to participate followed by respectively lower
degrees of encouragement among MLMs in urban and mixed locations.

Table 25

Mean Scores for Response Categories of Institutional Location (Rural, Urban, Mixed) within
Encouragement to Participate CBPI Item 12: Promote

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Location</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>676</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An analysis of variance (ANOVA) (Table 26) was utilized to determine if significant
differences existed within response categories of location (rural, urban, mixed) within
effort to participate: promote. Results indicated that response categories were not
significantly different from the others when combined (F = 2.420, df 2, p = .090) but were
significantly different when treated as freestanding groups (weighted) with varying sample sizes
(F = 4.758, df 1, p = .030). Data indicated that response categories of the independent variable
location were significantly different and that, as indicated by Table 25 mean scores, rural
respondents’ perceived degree of encouragement to participate was greater than levels reported
by urban and mixed respondents.
Table 26

Analysis of Variance for Response Categories of Location (Rural, Urban, Mixed) within Encouragement to Participate CBPI Item 12: Promote

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups (Combined)</td>
<td>5.984</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.420</td>
<td>.090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear Term Weighted</td>
<td>5.881</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.758</td>
<td>.030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>831.916</td>
<td>673</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>837.899</td>
<td>675</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean scores and ANOVA for response categories of gender within encouragement to participate: **promote**.

Mean scores (Table 27) for response categories of gender (male, female) within encouragement to participate: promote were examined. Mean scores indicated that female respondents’ (4.00) perceived degrees of encouragement to participate were higher than that of male respondents (3.76). Female mean scores (4.00) also were higher than that of the total sample population (3.90) and had a lower standard deviation (1.07) than that of the total sample population (1.10). Responses among the female category of gender were higher than the male category thereby indicating that females perceived greater levels of encouragement to participate than males.
Table 27
Mean Scores for Response Categories of Gender (Male, Female) within Encouragement to Participate CBPI Item 12: Promote

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>670</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An analysis of variance (ANOVA) (Table 28) was utilized to determine if significant differences existed within response categories of gender (male, female) within encouragement to participate: promote. Results indicated that the response categories of gender were significantly different from the others when combined (F= 8.044, df 1, p = .005) and when treated as freestanding groups (weighted) with varying sample sizes (F= 8.044, df 1, p = .005). The data indicated that response categories of gender were significantly different and that, as indicated by Table 27 mean scores, female respondents’ perceived degrees of encouragement to participate was greater than levels reported by male respondents.
Table 28

Analysis of Variance for Response Categories of Gender (Male, Female) within Encouragement to Participate CBPI Item 12: Promote

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>9.642</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.044</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear Term</td>
<td>9.642</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.044</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>800.658</td>
<td>668</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>810.300</td>
<td>669</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significant Differences between Response Categories of Location (Rural, Urban, Mixed) and Gender (Male, Female) within Encouragement to Participate CBPI Item 13: Direction

Mean scores and ANOVA for response categories of location within encouragement to participate: direction.

Mean scores (Table 29) were examined for response categories of location (rural, urban, mixed) within encouragement to participate: direction as reflected in CBPI item 13: “People who live in the area (public leaders, business leaders, religious leaders, etc.) turn to the community college for direction when addressing and resolving critical community issues.” Mean scores indicated that rural respondents’ (3.60) perceived degrees of encouragement to participate were greater than that of urban respondents (3.39) and respondents who perceived their institutions as serving mixed (3.36) populations. Rural mean scores (3.60) also were higher than that of the total sample population (3.67) and had a lower standard deviation (1.09) than that of the total sample population (1.15). Data indicated that responses among the rural category of location were higher than in other response categories and indicated that MLMs in rural locations perceived highest
degrees of encouragement to participate followed by respectively lower degrees of
effortment among MLMs in urban and mixed locations.

Table 29

Mean Scores for Response Categories of Institutional Location (Rural, Urban, Mixed) within
Encouragement to Participate CBPI Item 13: Direction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Location</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>1.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>678</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An analysis of variance (ANOVA) (Table 30) was utilized to determine if significant
differences existed within response categories of location (rural, urban, mixed) within
effortment to participate: direction. Results indicated that response categories were
significantly different from each other when combined (F= 3.520, df 2, p = .030) and also were
significantly different when treated as freestanding groups (weighted) with varying sample sizes
(F = 6.660, df 1, p = .010). Data indicated that response categories of location were significantly
different and that, as indicated by Table 29 mean scores, rural respondents’ perceived degree of
effortment to participate was greater than levels reported by urban and mixed respondents.
Table 30

Analysis of Variance for Response Categories of Location (Rural, Urban, Mixed) within Encouragement to Participate CBPI Item 13: Direction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>9.281</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.520</td>
<td>.030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear Term</td>
<td>8.780</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.660</td>
<td>.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>889.793</td>
<td>675</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>899.074</td>
<td>677</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean scores and ANOVA for response categories of gender within encouragement to participate: direction

Mean scores (Table 31) for response categories of gender (male, female) within encouragement to participate: direction were examined. Mean scores indicated that female respondents’ (3.67) perceived degrees of encouragement to participate were greater than that of male respondents (3.22). Female mean scores (3.67) also were higher than that of the total sample population (3.48) and with a lower standard deviation (1.08) than that of the total sample population (1.14). Responses among the female category of gender were higher than those reported in the male category thereby indicating that females perceived greater levels of encouragement to participate than males.
Table 31

Mean Scores for Response Categories of Gender (Male, Female) within Encouragement to Participate CBPI Item 13: Direction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>389</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>672</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An analysis of variance (ANOVA) (Table 32) was utilized to determine if significant differences existed within response categories of gender (male, female) within encouragement to participate: direction. Results indicated that the response categories of gender were significantly different from the others when combined ($F = 33.593$, df 1, $p = .000$) and when treated as freestanding groups (weighted) with varying sample sizes ($F = 33.593$, df 1, $p = .000$). Data indicated that response categories of gender were significantly different and that, as indicated by Table 31 mean scores, female respondents’ perceived degrees of encouragement to participate were greater than levels reported by male respondents.
Table 32

Analysis of Variance for Response Categories of Gender (Male, Female) within Encouragement to Participate CBPI Item 13: Direction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>(Combined)</td>
<td>33.593</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26.665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear Term</td>
<td>Weighted</td>
<td>33.593</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26.665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td></td>
<td>844.073</td>
<td>670</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>877.665</td>
<td>671</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results of Analysis Protocol Phase 3: Linear Regression

Phase 3 of this study’s research design involved conducting a linear regression utilizing results of phase 2 correlational analyses for the purposes of (1) constructing an estimated model comprised of all significantly correlated CBPI items in order to compare the mathematically determined “fit” with the total hypothesized model and (2) rank ordering of ACCLAIM Model fundamental conceptual components (FCCs) to determine FCC model contribution.

Comparison of Estimated Model “Fit” with Total Hypothesized Model

Using all of the significant relationships between response categories of location and gender within the five significant encouragement to participate CBPI items as an estimated model, a linear regression was conducted to determine the “best fit” of the significant individual components of the estimated model within the total model as originally hypothesized in Chapter 3. The total model incorporated all predicted variables and all conceptualized items and represented the researcher’s hypothesized view of how selected variables function within community-based programming. The linear or estimated model represents the true nature of the
data collected from the subjects. The linear regression process mathematically matches the estimated model to the hypothesized model to determine if the results “fit.” A high R-squared value indicates a good fit, while low values indicate a poor fit.

The estimated model was comprised of nine components: (a) five contributed by location within encouragement to participate items 2, 7, and 11-13 and (b) four contributed by gender within encouragement to participate items 2, 7, 12, and 13. These nine components contribute to the variation (values range from 0 to 100) accounted for by the total hypothesized model as presented in Chapter 3. As represented by data contained in Tables 33-37, $R^2$ represents accounted for variation (values range from 0 to 100) and $t$ represents the predictive capability of the predictor variable. Any $t$ score above plus or minus 2 has significant predictive value.

**Summary of Linear Regression Analysis Comparing “Fit” of Estimated Model**

In summarizing results of the linear regression, the predictive nature of the significant components existing within the estimated model were found to be as follows:

1. **Location** ($R^2 = .042$): As a discrete independent variable, location was a significant predictor for all five CBPI items (empower, team effort, ownership, promote, and direction). The estimated study model as predicted by location accounts for 4% of the total hypothesized model presented in Chapter 3.

2. **Gender** ($R^2 = .089$): As a discrete independent variable, gender was a significant predictor for four CBPI items (empower, team effort, promote, and direct). The estimated study model as predicted by gender accounts for 9% of the total hypothesized model presented in Chapter 3.
3. **Estimated Model:** Summing results of all linear processes undertaken, the $R^2$ for the total estimated model as predicted by location and gender is .163. The estimated model accounts for 16% of the total hypothesized model presented in Chapter 3.

Table 33

**Regression Analysis of CBPI Item 2: Location and Gender within **Empower**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>SoS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>6.492</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.603</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>-.103</td>
<td>-2.570</td>
<td>.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>12.888</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13.243</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.281</td>
<td>3.639</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 34

**Regression Analysis of CBPI Item 7: Location and Gender within **Team Effort**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>SoS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>4.431</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.426</td>
<td>.036</td>
<td>-8.55</td>
<td>-2.104</td>
<td>.036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.020</td>
<td>13.817</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13.891</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.291</td>
<td>3.727</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 35

**Regression Analysis of CBPI Item 11: Location and Gender within **Ownership**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>SoS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>7.508</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.777</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td>-.111</td>
<td>-2.404</td>
<td>.017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 36

Regression Analysis of CBPI Item 12: Location and Gender within **Promote**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>SoS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>5.881</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.764</td>
<td>.029</td>
<td>-9.83</td>
<td>-2.183</td>
<td>.029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>9.642</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.044</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>.243</td>
<td>2.836</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 37

Regression Analysis of CBPI Item 13: Location and Gender within **Direct**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>SoS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>8.780</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.666</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>-.120</td>
<td>-2.582</td>
<td>.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.038</td>
<td>33.593</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26.665</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.453</td>
<td>5.164</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Rank Ordering and Contribution of Fundamental Conceptual Components**

CBPI items were conceptualized from four fundamental conceptual components (FCCs) of CBP as constructed by the ACCLAIM Model. Of the five significant CBPI items identified in phase 2 analyses, one statement (2) was formulated from FCC1: expanded concept of community, one statement (11) was formulated from FCC4: institutional ownership, and three (7, 12, and 13) were formulated from FCC2: community college as leader/catalyst. It should be noted that CBPI items 7, 12, and 13 represent all of the statements formulated to conceptualize FCC2.

Although the estimated model accounted for only a small proportion of the originally hypothesized model, the proportion that was represented was significant. Using $R^2$ values to identify the amount contributed by each of the five CBPI items to the significant estimated model, the following rank ordering of statements was indicated.
1. FCC2: Direction (CBPI item 13) “People who live in the area (public leaders, business leaders, religious leaders, etc.) turn to the community college for direction when addressing and resolving critical community issues” (.048)

2. FCC1: Empower: (CBPI item 2) “Developing and improving the service area by educating and thus empowering the people of the community is a major focus of the community college mission.” (.029)

3. FCC2: Team Effort (CBPI Item 7) “The community college works with other service area agencies and organizations as part of a larger team effort to develop and improve the community.” (.027)

4. FCC2: Promote (CBPI Item 12) “The community college promotes itself in the service area as a leader and catalyst for community development and improvement” (.019)

5. FCC4: Ownership (CBPI Item 11) “Community college employees feel a collective ownership for developing and improving the service area.” (.008)

When summed, R² scores for each of the FCC2 items (.048 + .027 + .019 = .094) indicate that FCC2: community college as leader/catalyst accounts for 73.40% (9.40% of 16%) of the significant estimated model.

Summary of Chapter 4 Results

Summary of Phase 1 Analysis: Generation of Frequencies and Means

Phase 1 of this study’s analysis protocol called for the generation of frequencies and mean scores for study independent and dependent variables. The following results were noted:
1. **Institutional Location:** MLM respondents were located primarily in rural locations (47.1%) closely followed by mixed (43.0%) with an appreciably lower number in urban (9.9%).

2. **Institutional Size:** Almost half of all respondents were at medium-sized institutions (44.7%) followed by large (30.8%) and small (24.6%) institutions.

3. **Institutional Unit:** A little more than a quarter (26.4%) of all MLM respondents held academic positions while the remaining three quarters held a relatively even distribution of positions across non-academic units.

4. **Demographics:** Females accounted for a larger proportion (57.8%) of respondents than did males. Respondents also were primarily Caucasian (85.2%) An appreciable majority (81.7%) of respondents were 41 years and older with almost half (45.2%) at 51 years and older, and more than half (56.2%) had been in positions 11 years or more. Within this 56.2%, almost half reported tenures at more than 15 years old.

5. **Perceptual Subscales:** MLM mean scores were highest (45.83) for utility followed by practice (39.27) and encouragement to participate scores (38.60). Results indicated that MLMs perceived CBP concepts as constructed by the ACCLAIM Model to have high levels of utility yet perceived their colleges to practice CBP at lower levels and perceived even less encouragement to participate in CBP than otherwise indicated by their high perceived utility scores.

**Summary of Phase 2 Analysis: Bivariate Analysis Including Hypothesis Testing**

Phase 2 of this study’s analysis protocol called for the testing of Hypotheses 1-3 using bivariate correlational analyses to test for correlations between dependent variables (utility,
practice, encouragement to participate) and primary independent variables (location, size, unit) and. The following results were noted:

1. **Hypotheses 1-2**: Hypotheses 1 and 2 were not rejected since no significant correlations were identified between utility and NCCCS location, size, and unit or between perceptual practice and NCCCS location, size, and unit.

2. **Hypothesis 3**: Hypothesis 3 was rejected due to significant correlations found to exist between location and encouragement to participate. Additional bivariate analyses identified significant statistical relationships between location and five specific CBPI items: 2, 7, and 11-13 (empower, team effort, ownership, promote, direction).

3. **Hypotheses 12, 13, and 15**: Hypotheses 12, 13, and 15 were not rejected since no significant correlations were identified between encouragement to participate and age, ethnicity, or length of service within NCCCS location.

4. **Hypothesis 14**: Hypotheses 14 was rejected because significant correlations were found to exist between encouragement to participate and gender within NCCCS location.

**Summary of Post Hoc Analysis Associated with Phase 2 Protocol**

A post hoc analysis was undertaken to single out significant correlations existing between specific response categories of location (rural, urban, mixed) and gender (male, female) within the five significant perceived encouragement to participate CBPI items. The following results were noted:

1. **CBPI items 2, 7, 12, and 13 (empower, team effort, promote, direction)**: Rural, female MLM respondents perceived a higher degree of encouragement to participate in CBP activities and concepts reflected in CBPI items 2 (empower), 7 (team effort), 12 (promote), and 13 (direct).
2. CBPI item 11 (ownership): Rural MLM respondents perceived a higher degree of encouragement to participate in CBP activities and concepts reflected in CBPI item 11 (ownership).

Summary of Phase 3 Protocol: Linear Regression

A linear regression was conducted using the identified correlations between specific response categories of location and gender within the five significant CBPI items as an estimated model to determine if the model as estimated was a “good fit” as compared to the originally hypothesized model. The following results were noted:

1. “Fit” of estimated model: The estimated model accounts for 16% of the total hypothesized model set forth in Chapter 3.

2. FCC model contribution: FCC2 (community college as leader/catalyst) accounted for a major proportion (73.40%) of the statistically significant estimated model.
CHAPTER FIVE
CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This study measured the degree to which community-based programming (CBP) as constructed by ACCLAIM Model fundamental conceptual components (FCCs) is perceived and practiced by North Carolina Community College System (NCCCS) mid-level managers (MLMs). Three questions shaped study hypotheses:

1. To what degree do NCCCS MLMs perceive CBP to have utility?
2. To what degree do NCCCS MLMs perceive colleges to practice CBP?
3. To what degree do NCCCS MLMs managers perceive encouragement to participate in CBP at their colleges?

A thirteen-item questionnaire, the Community-based Programming Instrument (CBPI), was used to measure NCCCS MLM perceptions regarding community-based programming. In the context of this study, MLM was defined as any community college manager holding the title of dean, director, or coordinator who is charged with translating and “implementing the strategies, policies, and decisions made by top managers” (Ebert and Griffin, 1998, p.138). MLM responses to CBPI items as related to three perceptual subscales were calculated into composite mean scores that were used to: (1) test Hypotheses 1-3 by identifying significant correlations between MLM institutional characteristics (location, size, and unit) and perceived utility, practice, and encouragement to participate in CBP, (2) test Hypotheses 4-15 by identifying additional significant correlations between significant institutional characteristics (location, size, and unit) and personal characteristics (age, ethnicity, gender, and length of service), (3) compare, using all significant correlations as an estimated model, the mathematical “fit” of the estimated model within the total hypothesized model, and (4) determine, through a rank ordering process,
the amount contributed model by FCCs to the estimated model. This chapter contains conclusions and implications indicated from these results and offers recommendations associated with study findings.

Conclusions and Implications

Community-based programming, as formulated by ACCLAIM model FCCs, emphasizes the importance and centrality of “community” in the context of the community college mission. In this framework, community is the defining dynamic from which institutional mission, structure, and goals are continuously shaped and reshaped. CBP as defined by this study involves the community college acting as a proactive community leader and catalyst by providing the fulcrum upon which community stakeholders (individual citizens, citizen’s groups, social agencies, business and industry, local government, etc.) are drawn into democratic and participative discussions in which critical community issues are identified and resolved.

The major conclusion of this study is that NCCCS MLMs perceive CBP, as formulated by ACCLAIM model FCCs, to have a high degree of utility within the community college setting. Current NCCCS MLMs clearly are receptive to the conceptual underpinning of CBP, indicating that when promoted to positions of higher leadership, they have a good chance of becoming effective CBP implementers. Nonetheless, because MLMs also report that CBP is practiced less often than they perceive it should be and because MLMs report even less encouragement to participate in CBP, their receptiveness and ability to implement CBP may be diminished if not provided adequate development opportunities, which would allow MLMs to translate CBP concepts into the specific, systematic, task-oriented skills necessary for full and complete implementation. While they perceive CBP to have a high degree of utility, if it is not
practiced or encouraged, MLMs may not be motivated to pursue its practice. All utility is lost if CBP concepts are not translated into action and practice.

**NCCCS MLMs are Extremely Receptive to CBP**

While no significant relationships were found to exist between MLM location, size, or unit and MLM perceptions regarding the utility of community-based programming as constructed by ACCLAIM Model FCCs, MLM perceptions about the utility of CBP in the community college setting in general were telling. Of the three measured perceptual contexts (utility, practice, encouragement to participate) MLM mean scores were highest for perceived utility of CBP. Combined Likert Scale scores (ranging from a lowest degree of 1 to highest degree of 5 on each CBPI item) for perceived utility were calculated as 45.83 out of a total possible composite score of 50. The high combined mean scores indicate that, as put forward by the first of three primary study questions (To what degree do NCCCS MLMs perceive CBP to have utility?), that NCCCS MLMs perceive CBP to have a high degree of utility.

These results are compelling and imply that MLMs across all institutional locations, sizes, and units and across all ages, ethnicities, genders, and lengths of service consistently perceive CBP to have a high degree of utility in the community college setting. Moreover, these results support and validate the fundamental conceptual basis of the ACCLAIM model as established in its first three of 15 processual tasks by demonstrating that current NCCCS MLMs are highly receptive to and supportive of CBP as constructed by ACCLAIM Model FCCs. Importantly, this is the first quantitative validation of its kind, since previous research related to ACCLAIM has been largely qualitative.
NCCCS MLMs are Poised to be Effective Implementers of CBP

According to Vaughan (1997, p.21), “Understanding the first three [ACCLAIM model] processual tasks is necessary for comprehending the remainder [of the model].” Processual Tasks 1-3 establish a conceptual foundation that allows for the successful interpretation and implementation of the model including (a) embracing CBP as both an integral conceptual component of the community college mission as well as an effective and efficient process for mission accomplishment, (b) understanding the environment in which a college exists through assimilation, a process Vaughan describes as “identifying educational solutions to ever-emerging, broad-based social issues” (p. 38) so that leaders can “successfully engage the institution in community-based programming” (p. 43), (c) adjusting institutional mission, organizational structure, and philosophy to reflect the CBP approach, and (d) institutionalizing CBP by making it part of the institutional culture by visibly integrating it into “existing and emerging” (p. 50) college operations. High utility mean scores indicate that current NCCCS MLMs have the conceptual foundation that will allow them to become effective CBP implementers. This implies that, if provided the necessary training, resources, and guidance, MLMs will be effective leaders and implementers of CBP as they rise to leadership positions left vacant by anticipated retirements among a large cohort of top administrators.

NCCCS MLMs Perceive that CBP is Practiced less than it should

While no statistically significant relationships were found to exist between MLM location, size, or unit and MLM perceptions regarding the current practice of CBP, MLM mean scores (39.27) on this perceptual subscale, when considered independently, were lower than MLM utility mean scores. When considered apart and separate from the correlational analysis, these mean scores address the second of three primary study questions (To what degree do
NCCCS MLMs perceive colleges to practice CBP, indicating that MLMs across all institutional locations, sizes, and units and across all ages, ethnicities, genders, and lengths of service consistently perceived CBP to be practiced at degrees lower than higher utility mean scores suggest it should be practiced. Because MLMs are charged with translating top administrators’ strategic visions into operational practices (Ebert & Griffin, 1998) and because MLMs provide key internal and external linkages in implementing institutional strategies, their perceptions regarding actual levels of current CBP practice hold a high degree of credence.

These results imply that NCCCS institutions are practicing CBP (as represented by CBPI institutional statements formulated from ACCLAIM Model FCCs) but at levels lower than MLMs perceived utility otherwise suggests. Not having opportunities to sharpen CBP skills through practice may leave MLMs under-prepared to effectively develop and lead CBP efforts as they rise to future positions of institutional leadership.

**NCCCS MLMs receive less Encouragement to Participate in CBP**

Of all the measured perceptual subscales, NCCCS MLMs reported lowest mean scores for encouragement to participate, indicating that MLMs believe that the amount of encouragement they receive to participate in CBP is less than it should be given higher utility mean scores and less than might be expected given higher perceived practice scores. Because MLMs may interpret lower degrees of encouragement to participate in CBP as being representative of organizational norms (Ajzen, 1991), these lower mean scores may indicate that MLMs believe that CBP is not an accepted organizational norm (is not institutionalized). MLMs, therefore, may not be motivated to develop and practice CBP approaches when elevated to leadership positions.
Rural, Female NCCCS MLMs Feel Most Encouraged to Participate in CBP

Significant relationships were found to exist between location and gender and MLM perceptions regarding encouragement to participate in community-based programming. These results indicated that MLMs located in rural colleges perceived receiving higher degrees of encouragement to participate than MLMs at urban and mixed locations, respectively. Within rural locations, female MLMs reported higher degrees of encouragement than males.

Several things may explain these results:

1. **Greater dependence of rural communities on community colleges:** Higher perceived degrees of encouragement to participate among MLMs in rural locations may be related to the fact that rural communities depend more heavily on their community colleges than urban and mixed communities. Rural North Carolina counties (NC Department of Commerce website, 2002) tend to have greater needs (higher unemployment, lower literacy rates, lower incomes) and fewer resources (less infrastructure, fewer community services) than urban counties. Therefore, by necessity, rural communities may turn to community colleges to provide needed resources and services. This may create an environment in which rural community college leaders feel compelled and empowered to be centrally involved in community issues encouraging their colleges to take on the CBP leader/catalyst role, which may explain why MLMs in rural locations perceive higher degrees of encouragement to participate. The community colleges in rural areas have become a nexus for cultural and enrichment activities for the community.

2. **Span of control issues:** Higher perceived degrees of encouragement to participate among MLMs in rural locations may be related to supervisory span of control issues. Span of control involves the number of subordinates reporting to a single supervisor as well as the amount of
supervision provided by supervisors to subordinates (Gooderham, 1991; “How to Establish,” 1993; Malley, 1998; Robbins, 2000). Because they serve larger populations, urban and mixed community colleges tend to be larger than rural institutions and are often divided across multiple campus sites. As a result, urban colleges may require greater numbers of MLMs to adequately staff institutions than those required to staff rural colleges. This may increase the span of control (e.g. the number of MLMs reporting to a single supervisor), which in turn may decrease the amount of supervision thereby limiting occasions to provide encouragement to MLMs. This lack of supervisory attention may in turn be perceived by urban and mixed MLMs as lower degrees of encouragement to participate. Because rural MLMs operate within smaller spans of control and may receive closer supervision, they may perceive greater levels of encouragement. These results imply that because MLMs at urban and mixed locations may receive overall less direct supervision (attention) from supervisors, they may be interpreting overall lower levels of supervisory attention to include less encouragement to participate in CBP.

3. Gender-related considerations: Within rural locations, female MLMs perceived higher degrees of encouragement to participate in CBP than males. This result may be related to several factors (a) increasing leadership opportunities for NCCCS women as well as to (b) the relationship-centered cultural socialization of women.

a. Generally encouraging environment for NCCCS women: Increasing numbers of women now hold top leaderships including presidencies and instructional deanships (DiCroce, 1995; Touchton & Davis, 1991; Vaughan, 1989). According to the NCCCS associate vice president for planning and research (J. K. Brown, personal communication, March 7, 2002), the numbers of women heading NCCCS institutions has grown from one to eight
since Martin Lancaster, NCCCS President, took over leadership in 1997. Within the state of North Carolina, women can choose from a number of leadership development opportunities. The NCCCS offers leadership development institutes for future presidents and senior administrators, and the North Carolina Community College Leadership Program (NCCCLP), an organization developed under the auspices of the NC Chapter of the American Association of Community College Women (NC-AAWCC) offers its own leadership development program. Therefore, women’s higher degrees of perceived encouragement to participate in CBP may be influenced by a current environment that is generally encouraging to women.

b. Cultural socialization of women makes them more tuned into CBP and CBP encouragement: Another factor possibly related to higher perceived degrees to participate among women MLMs, may be connected to research indicating that women are culturally socialized to be more participative and relationship-oriented than men (Entine & Nichols, 1997; Foels, Driskell, Mullen & Salas, 2000). Community-based programming is a democratic, participative, and relationship-oriented approach. These concepts are reflected in the specific CBPI items significantly correlated with location and gender: “empowering the people of the community,” working with other organizations as part of a team effort, “feeling a collective ownership,” “promoting the community college as leader/catalyst,” and “people turning to the community college for direction.” Because women may be more “tuned in” to CBP concepts, their perceptions may be sharper than their male counterparts. In other words, male and female MLMs may be receiving equal degrees of encouragement to participate in CBP, but because women are more culturally socialized and tuned in, they may perceive encouragement at higher
degrees. Consequently, women MLMs in rural locations may be more aware of and receptive to CBP and may be more comfortable applying CBP approaches, given the necessary training, resources, and guidance, when elevated to leadership positions.

**NCCCS Colleges Face Management Turnover Dilemma**

One of the premises upon which this study was based involved the predicted influence of NCCCS MLMs to pursue and practice CBP as they fill leadership positions left vacant by retirements among a large cohort of top administrators (Evelyn, 2001; Jenson 2000; Twombly & Amey, 1991; Wright, 1997). Study results, however, indicate that retirements among a similarly large cohort of MLMs may be an equally strong possibility. A majority (81.7%) of all MLMs reported ages of 41 years and older, and almost half (45.2%) of this majority reported ages of 51 years and older. In addition, MLMs reported equally long lengths of service: More than half (56.2%) reported lengths of service of 11 years or more, and almost half of this majority (40.9%) reported lengths of service of 15 years or more. This implies that, over the next ten years, the NCCCS may experience higher than usual turnover within top and mid-management levels. Furthermore, many of the mid-level managers that do assume retirement-driven leadership vacancies may only be in those positions for short periods of time before retiring out themselves.

**Leader/Catalyst Role Resonates with Rural, Female MLMs**

Statistically significant correlations accounted for 16% of the total hypothesized model. One ACCLAIM Model FCC accounted for more than half of the statistically significant estimated model: FCC2-community college as leader/catalyst. The concept of community college as leader/catalyst involves the community college positioning itself as a proactive collaborator and facilitator for community reform. This concept gets at the heart of CBP, but it also involves colleges moving into non-traditional and possibly uncomfortable territory.
the reminder that the “community college is an educational institution and not a social agency”

Vaughan (1997, p.39) makes a convincing case that the community college “can and should serve as catalyst and leader in resolving issues for which the solution is not always educational” (p.39). He explains that this can be accomplished by utilizing community college resources (educational services, staff support, and leadership) to assist in issue resolution while leaving “other organizations and agencies to play the major role” (p.39). These results indicate that FCC2 (community college as leader/catalyst) resonates with rural female MLMs, implying that they may be more open to a non-traditional approach whereby colleges become catalysts for resolving community issues even when educational solutions are not involved.

Recommendations

Based upon this study’s conclusions and implications, the following is recommended:

1. Revitalize and renew CBP as a primary vehicle for NCCCS institutional mission

accomplishment: Through work accomplished under the ACCLAIM Project, a comprehensive community college model for community-based programming practice was developed, implemented, and validated in community colleges in a four state area, NCCCS institutions among them. However, since ACCLAIM Project funding under the Kellogg Foundation ended, no additional efforts or resources have been invested to grow, cultivate or sustain the original seeds sown. The NCCCS can revive the ACCLAIM Project in a number of ways:

a. Designate an NCCCS Team of Experts to Assist, Coach, Train, and Develop CBP: There are a number of talented NCCCS individuals (college presidents, college administrators, and NCCCS staff) who are knowledgeable and skilled in CBP practice. CBP as formulated by the ACCLAIM Model is an effective and valid educational approach;
however it is also highly complex and requires structured facilitation and ongoing coaching and mentoring. The NCCCS should consider identifying and organizing a team of experts that would be available to assist, consult and help colleges develop, implement, and troubleshoot their CBP efforts.

b. **Make CBP a curricular focus of NCCCS leadership development institutes:** While NCCCS institutions are practicing CBP, results indicate that colleges should be doing more. NCCCS leadership development institutes, therefore, should examine their programs to ensure that CBP fundamental conceptual components and processes are a curricular focus. Curricula should emphasize how to make CBP an organizational norm through the process of “institutionalization” (Vaughan, 1997) and should address span of control issues and how they might negatively affect perceived encouragement to participate among MLMs at urban and mixed locations.

c. **Develop an NCCCS development institute for mid-level managers:** MLM ages and lengths of service suggest that many MLMs may be retiring along with the anticipated cohort of top administrators. Therefore, the NCCCS should consider adding a mid-level managers institute to its development institute offerings in order to develop future mid-level managers.

2. **Revitalize NCSU Graduate Programs to Include Additional CBP Courses:** Study results indicate that NCCCS MLMs perceive community-based programming to have a high degree of utility. Compared to utility, however, MLMs also perceive that colleges neither practice nor encourage MLMs to participate in CBP to the degree that they should. If MLMs do not see CBP in practice and do not receive encouragement to participate in CBP, their motivation to pursue its practice may be diminished. The NCSU Adult and Community College
Education (ACCE), therefore, should consider broadening its CBP course offerings to include courses devoted to practice. Currently there is only one CBP course among the ACCE graduate curricula, which provides a broad general overview of CBP-related concepts and tasks. ACCE administrators should consider adding courses that provide more in-depth treatments of how (specifically) to practice CBP by translating CBP concepts into action. These courses should focus on what good CBP practice looks like and how good practice can be achieved. ACCE could team with model NCCCS institutions to provide an internship or practicum wherein students are encouraged and guided to put what they have learned about CBP into practice.

3. Make CBP a National Focus: The AACC should consider making CBP a national focus by investing resources for additional research, study, and implementation. Never before have community colleges been better positioned to take a national leadership role in addressing critical community issues. Community-based programming like that advanced by the ACCLAIM Model is a valid, effective process for bringing community groups together to solve critical issues. Other countries, most recently the United Kingdom, have recognized the value of the ACCLAIM Model and are putting it to work in their communities. The AACC should take advantage of the timing and the ACCLAIM Model tool.

4. Conduct additional CBP research: Additional research should be conducted to validate, clarify, and expand the results of this study.
   a. Research to validate study results This study was limited to NCCCS mid-level managers; therefore, results are not generalizable to MLMs outside North Carolina. Study results could be validated and extended by measuring perceptions among MLMs in other states.
A natural division from which to launch validation studies would be community college systems within the four states of the ACCLAIM Model region.

b. **Research to clarify the nature of CBP practice:** This study focused on CBP as formulated by ACCLAIM Model foundational concepts and processual tasks. These fundamental conceptual components (FCCs) are described in the first three ACCLAIM model processual tasks and provide the conceptual foundation upon which the remainder of the model is developed. Because this study was designed to measure the conceptual underpinnings of the model, it did not incorporate CBPI items reflecting specific, practical ACCLAIM Model tasks as described in processual tasks 4 through 15. While this study measured MLM perceptions regarding CBP practice, it was not intended to measure nor does it reflect specific levels of practice. Therefore, additional research is necessary to examine the extent to which CBP is practiced (within NCCCS institutions) as a formal, systematic and institutional process as described in ACCLAIM Model processual tasks 4-15. Additional quantitative and qualitative research is necessary to evaluate the subtleties of CBP practice at the institutional level. The CBPI could be revised to include more technical items related primarily to practice issues while a study using the participant-observer format, where the researcher immerses himself in the particular institutional milieu, also might be conducted. Such studies might begin with the two NC ACCLAIM Project colleges.

c. **Research to investigate relationships between utility, practice, and encouragement to participate:** Research limits must be defined for any study. While developed around three perceptual subscales (utility, practice, encouragement to participate), this study chose to limit its scope to investigating relationships between the three (separate) subscales and
institutional and personal characteristics. Additional research, therefore, could expand study findings by investigating relationships between the three subscales.
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Appendix A: Mid-level Manager Pilot Test Email Transmittal Letter

Mail Message

From: Betty Wilson
To: EDGECOMBE:[calhoun.cc.al.us]:list
CC: EDGECOMBE:[calhoun.cc.al.us]:rgc, EDGECOMBE:[calhoun.cc.al.us]:jlh
Subject: Survey Pilot Test
Message: Your president, Dr. Richard Carpenter, has given me permission to pilot test my dissertation survey with you and other Calhoun CC mid-level managers.

Your assistance in completing this 13-item survey will assist me greatly in completing my doctoral degree in Adult & Community College Education from North Carolina State University.

Completing the pilot survey should only require about 15 minutes of your time. Click on the link below to access the instrument online. Once you've completed the survey, press "submit" to register your answers.

http://ccpro.cc.nc.us/survey/cbpsurv.htm

I will contact some of you next week to discuss any problems you might have encountered with the instrument or with the process. If you do not wish to be contacted further, please just let me know with an email.

I am sincerely grateful for your help.

Thank you!

BETTY A. WILSON
COMMUNITY BASED PROGRAMMING: Perceived Levels of Utility, Practice, and Encouragement to Participate

A Survey of Mid-level NCCCS Community College Managers

Instructions:
Based on your NCCCS experience, read and consider the following 13 institutional statements. Using the scale indicated, rank the degree to which each Institutional Statement applies in each of the three contexts:

Context A: To what degree SHOULD a community college subscribe to the concept or activity described in the statement?

Context B: To what degree DOES your current community college practice the concept or activity described in the statement?

Context C: To what degree are you ENCOURAGED to participate in the concept or activity described in the statement?

A ranking of 1 = lowest degree, 5 = highest degree

1. The primary and driving force behind the community college mission is the concept of community, which involves developing the potential of and improving the quality of life for citizens and their communities.

A. The primary and driving force behind the community college mission SHOULD BE the concept of community, which involves developing the potential of and improving the quality of life for citizens and their communities. [5 Highest]

B. AT MY CURRENT COLLEGE, The primary and driving force behind the community college mission IS the concept of community, which involves developing the potential of and improving the quality of life for citizens and their communities. [4]

C. I AM ENCOURAGED TO PARTICIPATE in activities that demonstrate that the primary and driving force behind the community college mission is the concept of community, which involves developing the potential of and improving the quality of life for citizens and their communities. [3]

2. Developing and improving the service area by educating and, thus, empowering the people of the community is a major focus of the community college mission.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. Developing and improving the service area by educating and, thus, empowering the people of the community <strong>SHOULD BE</strong> a major focus of the community college mission.</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>B. AT MY CURRENT COLLEGE</strong> developing and improving the service area by educating and, thus, empowering the people of the community is a major focus of the community college mission.</td>
<td>1 Lowest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C. I AM ENCOURAGED TO PARTICIPATE</strong> in activities that develop and improve the service area by educating and, thus, empowering the people of the community.</td>
<td>5 Highest</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 3. The community college is better qualified and skilled at resolving critical issues than other service area agencies and organizations. |
|---|---|
| **A.** The community college **SHOULD BE** better qualified and skilled at resolving critical issues than other service area agencies and organizations. | 4 |
| **B. AT MY CURRENT COMMUNITY COLLEGE,** the college **IS** better qualified and skilled at resolving critical issues than other service area agencies and organizations. | 3 |
| **C. I AM ENCOURAGED TO PARTICIPATE** in activities that demonstrate the college is better qualified and skilled at resolving critical issues than other service area agencies and organizations. | 2 |

| 4. Community outreach extends the campus of a community college beyond its physical property limits to encompass the geographic boundaries of its service area. |
|---|---|
| **A. Community outreach **SHOULD** extend the campus of a community college beyond its physical property limits to encompass the geographic boundaries of its service area.** | 1 Lowest |
| **B. AT MY CURRENT COLLEGE,** Community outreach **DOES** extend the campus beyond its physical property limits to encompass the geographic boundaries of its service area. | 2 |
| **C. I AM ENCOURAGED TO PARTICIPATE** in activities that demonstrate that campus boundaries extend beyond physical property limits to encompass the geographic boundaries of its service area. | 3 |

| 5. The community college is committed to the education of all of the people in its service area. |
|---|---|
| **A.** The community college **SHOULD BE** committed to the education of all the people in its service area. | 4 |
B. AT MY CURRENT COMMUNITY COLLEGE, the college IS committed to the education of all the people in its service area. [5 Highest]

C. I AM ENCOURAGED TO PARTICIPATE in activities that demonstrate that my college is committed to the education of all the people in its service area. [4]

6. The community college waits for an invitation from the appropriate community agency or organization before involving itself in critical service area issues.

A. The community college SHOULD wait for an invitation from the appropriate community agency or organization before involving itself in critical service area issues. [3]

B. AT MY CURRENT COMMUNITY COLLEGE, the college DOES wait for an invitation from the appropriate community agency or organization before involving itself in critical service area issues. [2]

C. I AM ENCOURAGED TO wait for an invitation from the appropriate community agency or organization before involving itself in critical service area issues. [1 Lowest]

7. The community college works with other service area agencies and organizations as part of a larger team effort to develop and improve the community.

A. The community college SHOULD work with other service area agencies and organizations as part of a larger team effort to develop and improve the community. [1 Lowest]

B. AT MY CURRENT COMMUNITY COLLEGE, the college IS committed to working with other service area agencies and organizations as part of a larger team effort to develop and improve the community. [2]

C. I AM ENCOURAGED TO work with other service area agencies and organizations as part of a larger team effort to develop and improve the community. [3]

8. The community college has a formal system for gathering information that reveals the critical issues shaping the lives of people in the service area.

A. The community college SHOULD HAVE a formal system for gathering information that reveals the critical issues shaping the lives of people in the service area. [4]

B. AT MY CURRENT COMMUNITY COLLEGE, the college DOES HAVE a formal system for gathering information that reveals the critical issues shaping the lives of people in the service area. [5 Highest]
C. I AM ENCOURAGED TO PARTICIPATE in activities that help the college formally gather information that reveals the critical issues shaping the lives of people in the service area.

9. The community college’s primary examples of community partnership include institutional membership in civic organizations, involvement in public service events, and the provision of cultural event programming.

A. The community college’s primary examples of community partnership SHOULD BE institutional membership in civic organizations, involvement in public service events, and the provision of cultural event programming.

B. AT MY CURRENT COMMUNITY COLLEGE, the college's primary examples of community partnership ARE institutional membership in civic organizations, involvement in public service events, and the provision of cultural event programming.

C. I AM ENCOURAGED TO PARTICIPATE in community partnership activities that primarily include membership in local civic organizations, participation in public service events, and provision of cultural event programming.

10. Community college employees across the institution understand how their daily jobs contribute to developing and improving the service area.

A: Community college employees across the institution SHOULD understand how their daily jobs contribute to developing and improving the service area.

B. AT MY CURRENT COMMUNITY COLLEGE, community college employees across the institution DO understand how their daily jobs contribute to developing and improving the service area.

C. I AM ENCOURAGED TO PARTICIPATE in activities that help employees develop an understanding of how their daily jobs contribute to developing and improving the service area.

11. Community college employees feel a collective ownership for developing and improving the service area.

A: Community college employees SHOULD feel a sense of ownership for developing and improving the service area.

B. AT MY CURRENT COMMUNITY COLLEGE, employees DO feel a collective ownership for developing and improving the service area.

C. I AM ENCOURAGED TO PARTICIPATE in activities that help employees develop a collective ownership for developing and improving the service area.
12. The community college promotes itself in the service area as a leader and catalyst for community development and improvement.

A. The community college **SHOULD** promote itself in the service area as a leader and catalyst for community development and improvement. [5 Highest]

B. **AT MY CURRENT COMMUNITY COLLEGE**, the college **DOES** promote itself in the service area as a leader and catalyst for community development and improvement. [4]

C. **I AM ENCOURAGED TO PARTICIPATE** in activities that promote the college's position in the service area as a leader and catalyst for community development and improvement. [3]

13. People who live in the service area and their leaders (public leaders, business leaders, religious leaders, etc.) turn to the community college for direction when addressing and resolving critical community issues.

A. People who live in the service area and their leaders (public leaders, business leaders, religious leaders, etc.) **SHOULD** turn to the community college for direction when addressing and resolving critical community issues. [5 Highest]

B. **AT MY CURRENT COMMUNITY COLLEGE**, people who live in the service area and their leaders (public leaders, business leaders, religious leaders, etc.) **DO** turn to the community college for direction when addressing and resolving critical community issues. [3]

C. **I AM ENCOURAGED TO PARTICIPATE** in activities that invite people who live in the service area and their leaders (public leaders, business leaders, religious leaders, etc.) to turn to the community college for direction when addressing and resolving critical community issues. [1 Lowest]

---

**Demographic Profile**


15. What is your highest earned degree? [4. Master's Degree]

16. How many years (total) have you worked in the community college setting? [4. 11-15 years]

17. How many years have you worked in your current administrative position? [4. 11-15 years]
18. What is your age? 5. 41-45 years

19. What is your gender? 2. Female

20. What is your ethnicity? 4. Caucasian

21. What is your community college's zip code? 27520

22. Which of the following best approximates the population density of your college service area?

1. Rural: population density of less than 500 persons per square mile.

23. Which of the following best approximates your college size according to enrollment (total combined annual curriculum & extension FTE)?

2. Medium: more than 2,000 but less than 4,000
Appendix C: NCCCS Mid-level Manager Email Transmittal Message

Mail Message

From: Betty Wilson
To: NCCCS MLMs
Subject: NCCCS Online Survey
Message: You have been selected to participate in an anonymous and confidential online survey of NCCCS mid-level managers as approved by NCCCS President Martin Lancaster.

Your assistance in completing this brief 13-item survey will provide the NCCCS with valuable college assessment data and will assist me in completing the final stages of my doctoral degree in Adult & Community College Education from North Carolina State University.

The survey is short - requiring less than 15 minutes of your time. To access the online survey instrument, just click on the link below. Once you've completed the survey, press "submit" to register your answers.

http://ccpro.cc.nc.us/survey/cbpsurv.htm

I know that everyone is busy getting the new semester off the ground, but I hope you will take just a few minutes to complete your survey.

I am sincerely grateful for your help.

Thank you!

BETTY

Betty A. Wilson
Director of Institutional Effectiveness

Edgecombe Community College
2009 West Wilson Street
Tarboro, NC 27886

252.823.5166 extension 271