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Abstract

Changes affecting community colleges are becoming more difficult because of fewer available resources and because the pace of change is accelerating in the external environment. These realities mean that community colleges are now at a crossroads where managing the change process has become more important, more complicated, and involving. Faculty is perhaps the most pivotal employee group in guaranteeing that the change process proceeds smoothly.

The purpose of this study was to identify attitudes of community college faculty toward readiness to change through insight into whether their levels of organizational commitment and job involvement function as predictors of their readiness to change. A survey research method was used and produced responses from 729 full-time Illinois community college faculty. Results indicate no significant correlation between overall commitment and readiness to change. Affective and continuance commitment levels showed positive correlations, while normative commitment levels were negatively correlated. In short, overall commitment was of lesser value in predicting faculty readiness to change than were the discrete commitment categories. The positive connection between job involvement and readiness to change was a strong indicator that the more involved faculty were in their work, the more likely they were to be open to change.

Two control variables, gender and tenure, also emerged as important predictors of readiness to change. Of particular interest is the relationship between gender and readiness to change. These data indicated that female faculty tend to have a higher degree of readiness to change than male faculty. Tenure also showed a moderate yet negative
relationship to readiness to change. Additional findings indicated that as both affective commitment levels and normative commitment levels increased, readiness to change increased, and as job involvement increases, readiness to change also increased. Job involvement also showed a positive yet moderate correlation to overall commitment.

This study contributes to the literature on community college change and policy by increasing awareness about the attitudes toward change that are held by full-time faculty.
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

Whether large or small, local or global, profit or nonprofit, governmental, or non-governmental, no organization is immune to change (Jensen, 2003; Kotter, 1998; McLagan, 2002). Community colleges are no exception. For over a century community colleges arguably have responded positively to changing needs and expectations of students, communities, businesses, and government interests. Foote (1999) posits that organizational change in community colleges is inevitable and that these institutions are predisposed to transformation. This change imperative is well documented for the domains of shared governance, the unique culture of an academy, its relative independence from the external environment, employee commitment and tenure, goal ambiguity, and multiple power and authority structures (Kezar, 2001).

Looking forward, the community college faces an uncompromising reality in which the need to change will be ever more pressing (Romero, 2004; Roueche, Johnson, & Roueche, 2002). Today, it is generally accepted by leaders in community colleges that social, economic, and political pressures in the external environment are arriving faster and demanding more operationally from employees, including the faculty, and from their organizations. This is especially the case with decreasing funding, erratic enrollments, and elevated expectations from students, communities, and industries. Chen (2008) affirmed that as society evolves, community colleges must accommodate intensifying challenges or risk becoming obsolete organizations. Riggs (2009) concurs that dramatic
changes for community colleges are inevitable. He further states that if community colleges do not take charge of their own futures and reinvent themselves, they will become shaped and reinvented by strong external social, political, and economic forces. State legislatures, accreditation committees, state and federal education officials, 4-year institutions, local business leaders, and voters are strong forces that are on the verge of taking control of the future of community colleges, just as they have done with the public schools.

Yet, the dynamics of organizational change have always been challenging for organizations, employees, and change managers (van den Heuval & Schalk, 2009). The intensification of outside pressures, moreover, makes the internal adaptation process within community colleges more complicated, furthering the possibility that this process will break down. In addressing this gap, the best place to start is the non-academic organizational change literature. In this regard, the good news is that community colleges are not alone in confronting change and its subsequent challenges. The 21st century has already posed adaptation challenges to non-academic institutions, and building an understanding of how these institutions have prepared for, managed, and processed change is relatively well documented. This body of change literature potentially holds important insights into the change process in community colleges. At a universal level, community colleges and non-academic institutions share common characteristics, including a workforce comprised of administrators and front-line employees and operational structures that deliver goods and services. Both organizational types have multiple stakeholder groups and face market competition.
In its earlier phase, the non-academic change research focused on macro-level or organizational-level phenomena, as opposed to focusing on individuals (Wanberg & Banas, 2000). However, a more recent stream of research has focused on individual-level factors. Notably, the literature is especially rich in addressing the role of employees in organizational change success, demonstrating that it is more likely where employees endorse the change process.

The determinants of employee readiness to change also have been charted. One important determinant is work motivation, a construct that has been defined and operationalized as having two components: organizational commitment and job involvement (Caillier, 2012). Further, these two work motivation components have been determined to be important predictors of organizational performance (Chen & Francesco, 2003; Chughtai, 2008; Hunter & Thatcher, 2007; Shih, Chiang, & Hsu, 2010). More importantly for the present research project, research indicates that organizational commitment is a stronger predictor of behavioral intentions than job satisfaction within a change context (Iverson, 1996; Iverson & Roy, 1994).

In summary, researchers have established that employees are key to change success. The focus on community college faculty in this research project is important in part because community college faculty are underrepresented within the current body of literature. To date, the literature on the role that faculty play in organizational change in community colleges is very thin. Moreover, a faculty-focused study will contribute to a better understanding of a neglected stakeholder group. In their review of the extant literature on community colleges, Twombly and Townsend (2008) noted that there is a dearth of knowledge about community college faculty. As also suggested by the non-
academic change literature, the particular correlational focus of this research project will be on how organizational commitment and job involvement influence community college faculty readiness to change. Again, these relationships have not been previously explored.

Another important employee group to explore in regard to their attitude toward change is institutional administration/leadership. Within the change literature, leadership is commonly cited as factoring into how employee’s perceive change and influence their attitude towards change. A couple of examples include Shah and Shah’s (2010) study on employees’ readiness for change. They identified that readiness to change is influenced by employees’ beliefs of self-efficacy, appropriateness, management support, and personal valence (Shah and Shah, 2010). In an earlier study, Miller et al. (2006) focused on employees’ readiness for change by examining three workplace factors – management/leader relationships, job knowledge and skills, and job demands – and found a significant influence on employees’ readiness for change.

**Conceptual Framework**

Many factors can contribute to the measure of successful organizational change. While these factors are important to gaining a deeper understanding of how and why organization change is successful or not successful, my study isolated only two factors, organizational commitment and job involvement, in order to understand faculty readiness to change. Other common antecedents to change include organizational identification, mutual respect and trust, and leadership behaviors.
The conceptual framework guiding this study posits that organizational commitment, as comprised of continuance, affective, and normative dimensions, and job involvement which all function as distinctive antecedents of readiness to change, are important factors to understanding faculty members’ readiness to change. The conceptual framework (Figure 1) represents my research hypotheses based on those factors determined to best understand readiness to change among faculty.

**Organizational Commitment Levels**
- Overall Commitment ($H_1$)
- Affective Commitment ($H_{1a}$)
- Continuous Commitment ($H_{1b}$)
- Normative Commitment ($H_{1c}$)
- Job Involvement ($H_2$)

**Readiness to Change**

*Figure 1. Author. Conceptual Framework.*

**Description of Readiness to Change Factors**

This section offers a brief definition of organizational commitment, followed by an overview of important attitudinal and behavioral outcomes with which it has been associated, not least of which is readiness to change.

**Organizational Commitment**

Organisational commitment is typically linked to work motivation, one of many antecedents of readiness to change. Work motivation can best be defined with reference to constituent dimensions, namely organizational commitment and job involvement. A number of research studies (Anderfuhren-Biget et al, 2010; Locke, 1997; Moynihan &
Pandey, 2007) have established that work motivation can best be defined with reference to constituent dimensions, namely organizational commitment and job involvement.

Organizational commitment has been broadly defined in the organizational behavior and human resource literature as an individual employee’s state of psychological attachment to his or her organization. Past research has linked organizational commitment to many variables. For example, several researchers have linked organizational commitment to the strength of job involvement (Brown, 1969; Hall & Schneider, 1972; Mowday, Steers, & Porter, 1979). Other examples of employee attitudes impacted by organizational commitment include job satisfaction (Kovach, 1977) and employee perceptions of workplace equity and justice (Hassan, 2002). At the group level, organizational commitment has been shown to impact organizational culture (Legge, 1995, Peters & Waterman, 1982; Tichy, 1983).

Most recently, organizational commitment has been linked to organizational change. In this regard, organizational commitment is best explored and defined through the work of Meyer and Allen (1991). These researchers empirically synthesized the body of commitment research into a multidimensional model that includes the three dimensions of affective commitment, continuance commitment, and normative commitment. Rather than referring to separate constructs, Meyer and Allen viewed affective, continuance, and normative commitment as constituting three separate dimensions of the organizational commitment construct. Consequently, an employee might reflect varying degrees of all three components. The two researchers also have linked these dimensions to employee readiness to support organizational change.
In summary, a growing body of work attempts to strengthen and frame organizational commitment as a key influencer of readiness to change. At least one empirical study has confirmed that organizational commitment is correlated positively with such readiness (Kohler, Munz, & Grawitch, 2006). Other research studies have suggested that employee readiness to change is a critical driver of change success (Cunningham, et al., 2002). Herscovitch and Meyer (2002) have asserted that readiness to change also may lead to specific discretionary behaviors supportive of organizational change, such as cooperating with the change process and serving as a champion of the change. Other researchers concur that dimensions of organizational commitment are critical to organizational change success, as committed employees will provide many benefits to the organization undergoing change (Visagie & Steyn, 2011). It appears, then, that organizational commitment is essential to organizational change success.

**Job Involvement**

The component of job involvement is defined as the extent to which a person identifies psychologically with his/her work or the degree to which his/her work is essential to one’s self-image (Lodahl & Kejner, 1965). According to Konrad (2006), high job involvement work practices can develop the positive beliefs and attitudes associated with employee engagement, and that these practices can generate the kinds of discretionary behaviors that lead to enhanced performance. Other researchers operationalize job involvement as being absorbed in work (Reid, Riemenschneider, Allen, & Armstrong, 2008) and satisfying vital needs (Moynihan & Pandey, 2008). Job involvement is “dependent on the extent to which his or her job satisfies his or her own needs” (Word & Park, 2009, p. 109). It also is established in the literature that job
involvement is an essential organizational objective because organizational researchers cite it as a primary source of organizational effectiveness (Pfeffer, 1994), employee commitment (Ketchand & Strawser, 2001; Mathieu, & Zajac, 1990; Meyer, Paunonen, Gellaty, Goffin, & Jackson, 1989) and motivation (Hackman & Lawler, 1971).

The literature has shown job involvement to be a second critical dimension of work motivation and that it is correlated positively with organizational commitment. For example, job involvement is considered an important job-related behavior and has been defined as an employee’s psychological identification or commitment to the job (Kanungo, 1982). A range of literature has confirmed that job involvement significantly contributes to the motivational sphere of human resources (Hackett, Lapierre, & Hausdorf, 2001; Mcelroy, Morrow, Crum, & Dooley, 1995). This means that high job involvement brings in additional commitment and motivation to work and subsequently enhances organizational performance. Consequently, it is also plausible that it functions similarly to organizational commitment and positively influences readiness to change. It follows, then, that through their effects on change readiness, both organizational commitment and job involvement can provide a better understanding of the change process in community colleges, thereby helping, at least in part, to bridge the apparent gap in the literature regarding how change occurs in community colleges and the role employees play in the process.

**Readiness to Change**

Organizational development efforts began to identify the concept of readiness to change as early as the 1940s with Knickerbocker and McGregor suggesting that an awareness of the need to change and an acceptance of the reasonableness of the change
effort was needed if the change was to succeed (as cited in Bernerth, 2004). Researchers concur that employee willingness and receptivity is essential for an organization to implement change successfully (Jansen, 2000; Madsen, Miller, & John, 2005; Rafferty & Simon, 2006). The literature is growing in the non-academic realm exploring possible employee readiness predictors that might influence the effective and successful implementation of organisational change (Bernerth, 2004; Eby, Adams, Russell, & Gaby 2000; Hanpachern, Morgan, & Griego, 1998; Holt, Armenakis, Harris, & Field, 2007; Madsen, Miller, & John, 2005). Among the predictors of employee readiness to change are organization participation, culture, belief, environment, and organizational commitment (Cunningham et al., 2002; Madsen et al., 2005; Rafferty & Simons, 2006).

**Statement of Problem**

Community colleges are a great American invention (Boggs, 2003), and throughout their history arguably have adapted well in continually being true to an open access mission and comprehensive approach to serving students and community. According to the American Association of Community Colleges (2013), when World War II veterans using the GI Bill packed campuses at the same time industries needed skilled workers to convert from armaments to consumer goods, community colleges added workforce training to their academic repertoire. When the optimism of the 1960s made education the preferred method of remedying social inequities, hundreds of community colleges were built to accommodate new students. Today, if community colleges’ ability to adapt is any indication of their enrollments, arguably they continue to show a strong ability to hold true to their founding mission. Katsinas and Tollefson
(2009) projected that community colleges will see even higher enrollments in the next 10 years due to an increase in the number of college-aged Americans looking for a low-cost postsecondary education.

Bracing for continued growth, it is common knowledge that today changes are becoming more difficult because fewer resources are available and because the pace of change is accelerating in the external environment. For example, Kasper (2004) says that technology is one factor affecting most of the demographic, economic, and academic challenges that community colleges face. At a time of growing economic globalization, community colleges are also seen as a critical element in the strategy to address the skills and education gap to meet the emerging needs of industries in the new knowledge economy (Bridging the Education Divide, 2013). In 2012, the 21st-Century Commission on the Future of Community Colleges cited seven changes with three categories required by community colleges.

The first category, redesign students’ educational experiences, involves increasing completion rates by 50% by 2020 while preserving access, dramatically improving college readiness, and closing the skills gap by focusing career and technical education on job preparation. The second category, reinvest institutional roles, involves refocusing the community college mission to meet 21st-century education and employment needs, and investing in collaboration between community colleges and partners among philanthropic organizations, government and the private sector. The third category, reset the system, involves targeting public and private investments strategically to create new incentives for colleges and students, and encouraging rigor, transparency, and accountability.
These new realities mean that while they have historically faced change productively, community colleges are now at a crossroads where managing the change process has become both more important and more complicated, involving and requiring more from their employees in meeting the challenges ahead. A central employee group required to contribute to addressing these new changes are faculty. According to Levin, Kanter, and Wagoner (2011), community college faculty have become objects of managerial expectation for increased usage of new technologies and increased workloads, and as Rhoades (1998) said, both faculty work and faculty identity can be viewed as not only highly managed but also corporatized.

**Research Questions**

To address the research problem that community colleges are now at a crossroad where managing the change process has become both more important and more complicated, this study explored whether faculty organizational commitment and job involvement each separately determine faculty readiness to change. The following questions and corresponding hypotheses were asserted and tested:

*RQ1:* What is the relationship between levels of organizational commitment and readiness to change among community college faculty?

*H1:* As levels of organizational commitment increase, faculty readiness to change also increases.

*H1a:* As levels of affective commitment levels increase, faculty readiness to change also increases.

*H1b:* As levels of continuous commitment increase, faculty readiness to change also increases.

*H1c:* As levels of normative commitment increase, faculty readiness to change also increases.

*RQ2:* What is the relationship between job involvement and readiness to change among community college faculty?
$H_2$: As job involvement increases, faculty readiness to change also increases.

Significance of the Study

It is a common reference in the academic literature that faculty play a key role in education (Cohen & Brawer, 1990; Grubb, 1999). An important aspect to support this role is ensuring faculty are satisfied and motivated by their work and work environment (Gappa & Austin, 2007), especially while facing increased changes and demands in the workplace. Levin, Kater and Wagoner (2011) suggest, for example, that community college faculty work is entwined with social, political, and economic forces beyond the institution. Further, as changes continue to challenge institutions of higher education, and in particular community colleges, it is essential to develop a better understanding of the faculty work experience as it relates to change, thereby addressing several gaps in the current literature.

The first gap is the short shrift given to the topic of change in community colleges. Some studies have been completed. For example, Van Wagoner’s (2004) work examined the influence of certain factors on the employee perception of organizational change in 12 community colleges within a single state community college system. Gonzalez and Padilla (1999) investigated how faculty members become engaged in and sustain their commitment to organizational reform. This particular study was based on interviews with 17 faculty members and identified two components of faculty engagement: goal congruence and perceived viability of achieving change. Gonzalez and Padilla concluded that if faculty and institutional goals are congruent, faculty are willing to engage in the process of creating change. Kezar (2001), however, notes that no
specific studies have offered clear understanding of how successful change occurs in community colleges. The question becomes not if community colleges will be required to continually adapt, but how successful they will be in modifying internal systems, policies, and procedures to better align with the outside world.

The second gap is the lack of attention provided to community college faculty members based on the lack of scholarly literature available (Twombly & Townsend, 2008). According to Levin, Kater, and Wagoner (2006), what is being expected from community college faculty in the future will continue to evolve. They assert:

faculty will be asked to do more with less, serve students across widening spectrum—educationally, from adult basic education to individuals with doctoral degrees interested in changing careers; and demographically, from students with diverse ethnic backgrounds with multitudes of cultural nuances which may affect learning, to traditional aged students whose numbers are also growing in community colleges (p. 141).

In addition, ancillary pressures on faculty work – electronic technologies, new student populations, new rhetoric and assumptions about student learning (Levin, et al.), not to mention that more and more university and community college faculty are designated as “managed professionals” (Rhoads, 1998).

Answers cannot be derived from the existing literature on community college faculty. A study of the community college faculty experience with change is especially important given the suggestion from the non-academic change literature that employees are key to change success and that employee work motivation is positively linked to readiness to change. Examining these relationships also will contribute to the relatively neglected topic of organizational change in community colleges. Addressing these apparent literature gaps will contribute to a well-rounded understanding of change in the
community colleges, the community college faculty experience with change, and what factors contribute to their openness to change.

In conclusion, to date, there is little understanding of the dynamics of the change process in community colleges and, more importantly, the role of faculty in the change process has been effectively overlooked and merits attention. This study addressed gaps in the literature by examining faculty attitudes that influence meaningful participation in change initiatives. More narrowly, it focused on how the work motivation factors of organizational commitment and job involvement correspond with faculty openness to change in community colleges. Through better understanding these relationships, administrators can collaborate with faculty to institute improved institutional change processes. Further, the study’s conceptual model can be applied in studies of other community college groups, such as part-time or adjunct faculty, in an effort to better understand how to fruitfully engage them in the change process.

**Definitions**

For the purposes of this study, key terms were defined. This study only focused on full-time faculty in community colleges employed at public, two-year community colleges in Illinois.

*A community college* is defined as any institution regionally accredited to award an associate in arts or associate in science as its highest degree. The definition includes the comprehensive two-year college as well as many technical institutes, both public and private (Cohen & Brawer, 2003).

The identity and role of *full-time community college faculty* has experienced a superfluity of definitions, debate, and scrutiny. Townsend and Twombly (2007) argue
that community college faculty are both underrepresented and underappreciated. Levin et al. (2007) describe community college faculty as educators as well as corporate workers employed within an organization that encompasses cultural, economic, educational, and social missions. Levin (2003) asserts that full-time faculty are recipients and promulgators of such actions and changes. A full-time community college faculty member is defined as an employee with an average work week of not quite 50 hours, including paid and unpaid institutional tasks and tasks outside the community college, and who spends about 85% of his or her time on instruction, including advising students, grading papers, and preparing for classes (Rosser & Townsend, 2006).

Work motivation refers to the construct that is confirmed to affect many important employee attitudes and behaviors, not least readiness to change. A definition of work motivation includes the internal factors that compel action and the external factors that can act as inducements to action. The three aspects of action that motivation can affect are direction (choice), intensity (effort), and duration (persistence) (e.g., Locke & Latham, 2004).

Readiness to change refers to organizational members' change commitment and change efficacy to implement organizational change. This definition followed the ordinary language use of the term 'readiness,' which connotes a state of being both psychologically and behaviorally prepared to take action (i.e., willing and able) (Weiner, Amick, & Lee, 2008). According to Weiner (2009), readiness for change is not only a multi-level construct, but also a multi-faceted one. Also commonly referred to in the literature as openness to change (Wanberg & Banas, 2000), readiness to change, for this
study, is defined as a state of mind during the change process that reflects a willingness or receptiveness to changing the way one thinks and acts (Bernerth, 2004).

*Organizational commitment* is defined, according to Newstrom and Davies (2002, 2011), as the degree to which an employee identifies with the organization and wants to continue actively participating in it. Hellriegel, Slocum, and Woodman (2001) emphasize that organizational commitment goes beyond loyalty to include an active contribution to accomplishing organizational goals.

*Affective commitment* is defined as an employee having an emotional attachment to the organization based on his or her bonding with and connection to colleagues, supervisors, or projects (Meyer & Allen, 1997).

*Continuance commitment* is defined in terms of an employee’s understanding that leaving the organization is associated with specific costs to the company and to themselves, and therefore they remain committed due to the high cost of leaving. In the past, continuance commitment has been shown to emerge from the recognition that one would lose valued benefits, such as pension and insurance premiums, upon leaving the organization (Becker, 1960).

*Normative commitment* is defined as an employee’s sense of moral obligation to be supportive of their organization (Herscovitch & Meyer, 2002; Tett & Meyer, 1993; Wiener, 1982).

*Job Involvement* is the extent to which a person identifies psychologically with work or the degree to which work is essential to one’s self-image (Lodahl & Kejner, 1965, p. 24).

Because employees as the target of change are central to the success of the change
process and because their attitudes, skills, motivations and basic knowledge form a significant component of the organizational environment in which change is to be attempted (Smith, 2005), organizational change is defined by Van de Ven and Poole (1995) as “an empirical observation of difference in form, quality, or state over time in an organizational entity. The entity may be an individual’s job, a work group, an organizational strategy, a program, a product, or the overall organization” (p.512).

**Delimitations and Limitations**

Every study has a number of delimitations that prevent research findings from being generalizable and true for all people at all times (Bryant, 2004). This study was delimited to full-time community college faculty who are employed in community colleges within the state of Illinois. The extent of the bias was examined by contrasting demographic and organizational characteristics of my sample with similar nationwide data for community college faculty drawn from entities like the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES). Arguably, the study was limited because I am not contrasting the responses of faculty to management/administration or other employee groups. While a study that looks at other groups of employees would be more comprehensive, they can be included in a future research project.

This research focused on the relationship between respondent levels of organizational commitment and job involvement and their readiness to change. The sample included full-time faculty from community colleges located in Illinois. The research was subject to causal limitations because it only confirmed whether the
independent and dependent variables were statistically correlated. It determined neither the existence nor the direction of causality between the variables. A further limitation was that moderator variables related to dimensions of organizational commitment were not incorporated into the analysis. As suggested in the literature, there might be moderators like a faculty member’s knowledge of the benefits associated with change that can influence the connections between organizational commitment and readiness to change. My research study, however, represents a first attempt to look at how organizational commitment and job involvement influence faculty readiness to change. Future research can build upon this study by modeling the impact of moderator variables.

Sample size did pose limitations. Responding full-time faculty were also self-selecting and, therefore, the sample was subject to sample bias because the survey results only included faculty who chose to reply and not those who opted out or who may have missed the opportunity to participate. Because the study did not include faculty who chose not to participate, the results could have provided a varying perspective of the Illinois community college faculty experience with change based on a broader participant sample. Finally, the responses came from a certain segment of geographical population and type of college – large, medium, small; focus (technical versus comprehensive) and funding – further skewing the sample.

An advantage to use a survey method approach is that it is an efficient means of capturing attitudes, opinions, behaviors, or characteristics of a population (Creswell, 2005). Also, survey research designs usually pose fewer ethical dilemmas than do experimental or field research designs. Potential respondents to a survey can easily decline to participate (Blair, Czaja, & Blair, 2013). Still every research method has
strengths and limitations. First, some faculty, for example, might be on sabbatical during the period that the survey is administered and this study would not capture those faculty experiences. The survey was also perceptional in nature and self-representative, and not necessarily reflective of the entire institution’s attitude about change. Another limitation to using a questionnaire is the reliance on a high response rate. A low response rate may not adequately represent the population being sampled. Additionally, the results generated from a survey are only as generalizable to the population as the sample is representative of the population (Creswell, 2005). Using an online survey may limit responses to individuals with access and competence using a computer (Dillman, 2000). However, when the population to be surveyed has a high rate of Internet use, the Web makes possible fast and effective surveys (Dillman, 2000).

The validity and reliability of this study was influenced by the use of self-reported data. The questionnaire did require that participants reflect upon their experiences honestly and accurately. Written surveys are subject to bias where the intended respondent seeks input from others in the pool of potential respondents in completing the survey. Finally, written surveys are subject to item nonresponse where some questions may be inadvertently or intentionally skipped (Salant & Dillman, 1994).
CHAPTER 2
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

This chapter offers an overview of multiple empirical and conceptual studies shedding light on the organizational change process in community colleges and the factors that might facilitate its successful implementation. The chapter is divided into four sections. The first section provides a brief description of literature sources. The second section focuses on material specifically pertinent to the community college arena including a brief history of community colleges. The third section opens by exploring the question, “What is organizational change?” and then turns to a brief review of the important concept of readiness to change and the factors that have been associated with fostering constructive engagement in organizational change among organizational stakeholders, especially employees. This section will focus attention on the linkages between organizational commitment and job involvement, and employee readiness to change. The third section provides a review of additional common factors contributing to readiness to change that are not included as variables in my study. The fourth section turns back to the literature on higher education employees, reviewing what we know about the links between organizational commitment and job involvement and faculty behaviors and attitudes.

The main search criteria for this literature review draws upon material found in primary and secondary sources covering peer-reviewed journals, books, articles, dissertations, as well as research studies presented at academic and professional conferences. The ProQuest digital dissertations database, the ERIC database, and the
Google web search engine were especially important compendium search sources. The following terms were used in database searches: organizational commitment, strategic planning, change, change readiness, faculty, faculty and change, faculty work, faculty satisfaction, measuring commitment, motivation, commitment relating to change resistance, strategy execution, employee change resistance, strategy in higher education, implementation factors, faculty work, and many combinations of these terms.

Community Colleges and Organizational Change

A Brief History of the Community College

Vaughan (2006) describes the community college as an educational institution that provides open-access education, offers comprehensive education, serves the community, offers devotion to teaching and learning, and, finally, fosters life-long learning opportunities. The American Association of Community Colleges (AACC, 2006) has emphasized both the unique goals and animating idealism that have come to play an important role in community college success:

The network of community, technical, and junior colleges in America is unique and extraordinarily successful. It is, perhaps, the only sector of higher education that truly can be called a “movement,” one in which the members are bound together and inspired by common goals. From the very first, these institutions, often called “the people’s colleges,” have stirred an egalitarian zeal among their members. (p. 5)

In a similar vein, community colleges in the United States have been described over the years, as “democracy’s college,” the “open door college,” and the “people’s college.”

The current purposes and ideals of community colleges are the consequence, at least in part, of a number of key historical legislative interventions. The Morrill Act of
1862 was an important early stimulus in higher education. This congressional act expressed the principle that higher education should be made accessible to all citizens and it helped to establish land grants for each state to build colleges and universities (Phillippe & Sullivan, 2005). In 1900, William Rainey Harper, president of the University of Chicago, suggested, “many students who might not have the courage to enter upon a course of four years’ study would be willing to do two years of work before entering business or the professional school” (Brick, 1963, p. 18). At this time, commentators conceived the purpose of a community college education to be one of delivering the curriculum typically offered to first- and second-year students at 4-year colleges and universities (Cohen & Brawer, 2003). This purpose provided community colleges with a unique niche, and as noted in Cohen and Brawer, community colleges also earned the reputation of being alternative institutions that prevented poorly prepared students from inundating 4-year colleges and universities.

Among the most important influences on community college growth was the Servicemen’s Readjustment Act of 1944, also known as the GI Bill. This legislation sparked exponential growth in the number of community colleges and expanded the original community college mission by provided living expenses for veterans returning home from World War II (Cohen & Brawer, 2003, 2008). The Act was conceived in part out of fear among political leaders that the chaotic and revolutionary conditions that characterized the decades of the 1920s and 1930s after World War I would return after World War II (Vaughn, 2006). The Act supported 2.2 million veterans to attend two-year and four-year colleges and universities, while another 3.5 million attended vocational schools (Greenberg, 2008). The Truman Commission of 1947 also encouraged
postsecondary education for all citizens and advocated the establishment of community colleges on a national level (Phillippe & Sullivan, 2005). The GI Bill and the Truman Commission laid the groundwork for what ultimately would be an extraordinary expansion of the community college system. Community college growth from the time of the Truman Commission Report through the 1990s resulted in the transformation of many community colleges (Conover, 2009).

The most recent phase in the evolution of community college occurred during the late 1960s, when they were transformed into comprehensive institutions. During the 1960s, the notion of higher education for all who aspired to attend college took root across the nation. During this decade, two-year colleges were created at an average of one new college per week (Palmer & Katsinas, 2005). This vision was primarily due to the Higher Education Act of 1965, which provided funding that made it possible for nearly every American to attend college (AACC, 2010). The total number of two-year institutions increased from 328 to 910 between the years 1947 and 1972 (Cohen & Brawer).

While enrollment in two-year colleges rapidly expanded during the 1970s, enrollment declined during the 1980s due to the decreasing number of 18-year olds in the United States (Cohen & Brawer, 2003). Community colleges affirmed their resilience by offering programs to attracting non-traditional students. In addition, there was an influx of career and job-training programs providing workers with the opportunity to improve their job skills while they attended college part-time (Cohen & Brawer). Although enrollment continued to grow, the total number of community colleges plateaued after the 1970s.
Today, however, community colleges are the largest and fastest-growing sector of higher education in the U.S. and they are the gateway to higher education for a growing number of students (Cohen & Brawer, 2003). According to the American Association of Community Colleges (2008), there are approximately 1,180 regionally accredited community colleges located throughout the country, serving more than 11.5 million students (approximately 46% of all U.S. undergraduates).

The modern community college provides postsecondary education at an affordable cost, promotes personal growth, and enriches the local community (Cohen & Brawer, 2008). The mission of community colleges is expanding (Ayers, 2005), and the demand for services is at an all-time high (Boggs, 2004). Levinson (2005) describe five generations of U.S. community colleges: (a) from 1900 to 1930, the extension of the secondary school; (b) from 1930 to 1950, the junior college generation; (c) from 1950 to 1970, the community college generation; (d) from 1970 to 1985, the comprehensive community college generation; and (e) from 1985 to the present, an era that is not yet assigned a name.

Chen (2008) associates the current era with seven important trends in community colleges: increased distance learning, great number of baccalaureate degrees awarded, increased partnerships between community colleges and four-year institutions, greater recruiting of baby boomers, increased enrollment across different student groups, increased partnerships with business, and increased response to globalization. Further, Chen points out the possibility that these trends might generate ongoing and continuous pressure toward change within community colleges if they are to survive into the future. Others generalize Chen’s observations to the whole academy, arguing that the 21st
century will require further adaptations and new paradigms for all institutions of higher education and their faculty and administrators (Hermanowicz, 2011). Community colleges are central to the debate of knowing how to respond and serve the dynamic and changing demands of students, local, and regional communities, a national workforce, and funding constituencies.

Higher education excellence is a function of those it serves (Zhou & Volkwein, 2004). Historical record suggests that in their own ways, community colleges have adapted well in the face of turbulent times and new realities. They will only continue to serve as important cornerstones of higher education to the extent they continue a pattern of adaptation into the future.

**Current and Future Pressures**

Slaughter and Rhoades (2004) argue that simultaneous with becoming more deeply entrenched in the new economy during the 21st century, community colleges will face declining funding, changing student demographics, lack of students’ preparedness for postsecondary studies, increased staff and faculty retirements, and an intensifying institutional accountability to legislative and governing bodies that will pose new challenges to community colleges. Harbour (2003), Evans (2001), and Shannon and Smith (2006) concur in this assessment. Former American Association of Community College’s President George Boggs (2004) identifies many of the same sources of challenge, but particularly is concerned by the increasing numbers of students who require remedial work before they can take college level classes. Even more alarming to some commentators is the fact that the pace of change has accelerated within the broader socio-economic landscape, placing even more pressures on community colleges. Carter
and Alfred (1996) assert the existence of three major forces across North America today: changing community contexts, new competition, and changing student expectations – that underpin a mandate for transformation in community colleges and signal a very different future for the institutions. Van Ast (1999) has also put forward three basic challenge categories: a) the growing range of student ability and preparation; b) overcoming the high attrition rate; and c) contending with the often-contradictory perceptions of stakeholders such as administrators, other faculty, and students. Even more alarming to some is the fact that the pace of change has accelerated within the broader socio-economic landscape, placing even more pressures on community colleges.

Among the trends that have received the most concentrated attention are the rapid growth in the target student population and the changing composition of this population. The National Center for Education Statistics (2005) predicts that college enrollments will increase between 9–16% (between 9.4 and 20.6 million new students) by 2017. Assuming that past enrollment patterns hold true for future enrollments, nearly half of these future students will enroll in community colleges. Taking this one step further is the inherent challenge created when most growth in higher education over the next century, 85% to be exact, will come via “nontraditional” students – older, working adults, or ethnic minorities. Increasingly these individuals will attend institutions that are nonselective and admit the vast majority of applicants (Kamenetz, 2010).

The other most often cited factor is the steadily declining level of federal and state funding for public education. Public support has declined dramatically in the past decade and given the current status of the U.S. economy, the future forecast for public education funding is grim (Kelderman, 2008). Community colleges, which rely on receiving a
significant portion of their total operational budgets from state appropriations and local tax dollars, are in a precarious position (Diaz, 2009).

The good news is that community colleges have a past record of successfully meeting the challenges posed by the outside world. While remaining true to open access, community responsiveness, and a clear focus on teaching and learning (Boggs, 2004), constructive organizational change has occurred. Yet, Carter and Alfred (1996) argue that the changes required of community colleges in the 21st century are more challenging than those faced in the past. Hofland (2011) observes that the change required of community colleges today is of a more comprehensive nature than was required in the past. Pusser and Levin (2009) posited that the 21st-century community college must adopt fundamentally new ways of operating, ideally becoming “a fluid organization, with little reverence for academic traditions, little evidence of a dominant professional class of faculty and more evidence of a professional managerial class, and greater reliance upon technology and less upon full-time labor” (p. 25).

A number of studies have been completed that offer more exacting analyses of the desired outcomes of change, what particular processes and policies require modification, and the extent of actual change efforts (Augustine & Rosevear, 1998; Carter & Alfred, 1996; Evans, 2001; Lorenzo, 1998; O’Banion, 2003; Reichard, 1995). Nevertheless, many researchers remain skeptical about the current state of and capacity for change within community colleges. Bolman and Gallos (2011) have argued that community colleges fail completely to realize how social and economic forces relate to their strategy and purpose, thereby affecting their ability to meet continually the challenges of the new era. Bolman and Gallos further identify this problem as but one example of the
“architecture of disconnection” (p. 52). Within the broader context of higher education, Gioia and Thomas (1996) said, “There is growing insistence not only that change occur but that it must be accomplished quickly in institutions that historically have been comfortable only with slower, self-paced, incremental change” (p. 352). Pusser and Levin (2009) concur:

Change in community colleges has historically occurred at the margins, through assistance to student populations, which has made a difference to individuals but not to large groups, institutions, or systems. Practitioners and policymakers are used to doing more or less of the same in higher education, depending on the resources available. They are accustomed to thinking of higher education institutions as fixed organizations that contribute to the stability of the postsecondary system.

Other researchers continue to make community colleges the subject of unfavorable scrutiny (Moore & Shulock, 2007), not least of all questioning the costs of continual adaptation. Dougherty (2002), Eaton (2005), Townsend (2005), and Wattenbarger (2000) argue that through continuous and substantive adjustment – in becoming “all things to all people” – community colleges risk losing their open access focus.

Central to the question of whether community colleges can make meaningful and deep ongoing change are their employees. Community colleges serve the most widely varied group of students in higher education (Green & Ciez-Volz, 2010), placing even more weight on the important role of faculty and support staff within these institutions.

**Community College Faculty**

There is a clear indication in the literature that faculty play an important role within higher education. Committed faculty members carry the work of the university or college out each day – including teaching, research, creative endeavors, community
involvement, professional service, and academic decision-making (Gappa & Austin, 2010). Faculty serve as essential intermediaries between the work of the academy – teaching and learning – and the ongoing process of developing an institutional mission (Levin, Kater, & Wagoner, 2006). Gappa and Austin (2010) also assert that while important traditions of the academic profession have been retained, faculty members themselves, their work, and their institutions have changed dramatically. For example, continuous expansion of technology impacts faculty workloads, today’s faculty work longer hours than predecessors, and faculty see their expanding workloads as a major source of stress and dissatisfaction in their academic career (Gappa et al., 2007). Gappa and Austin (2010) suggest that it is important to ensure that faculty members are satisfied and motivated by their work and work environment because this can be critical to the institution’s quality and wellbeing.

In spite of the clear and important role that faculty play within their institutions, it has been difficult for community college faculty to attain status as part of the academic profession within higher education (Rifkin, 1997). For example, in 1977, Cohen and Brawer observed that community college faculty at that time lacked a coherent identity as a profession. Arguably, over the past several decades the professional identity of the community college professoriate has advanced in some areas and not in others. Areas in which the continuing professionalization of the community college faculty is evident are higher levels of educational attainment, a growing number of professional organizations exclusive to community college faculty, expressed levels of commitment to the profession, autonomy from students and the institution, and service orientation to students (Rifkin).
Faculty and support staff hold different interests and values and approach work differently because of the distinctive roles and responsibilities they perform. These differences can divide the institution on important issues where a common understanding is important for institutional advancement. Community college leaders need to work with faculty and staff to affirm core values and to ensure an institution-wide understanding and allegiance to these values (Alfred & Carter, 2013).

The available research on faculty primarily centers on faculty outside community colleges and typically identifies faculty members as an institution’s intellectual capital. Where research is conducted on community college faculty, it is conducted and published by professors who work at four-year institutions, and who, therefore, tend to use frameworks that have been devised for four-year schools. These scholars regard research university faculty as the “norm of all faculty” (Townsend & Twombly, 2007, p. 4). Still, with the changing nature of faculty work (Sorcinelli, Austin, Eddy, & Beach, 2006), and the demands to educate increasing numbers of Americans (Lumina Foundation, 2009), there is a new pressure placed on community college faculty (Eddy, 2010), warranting at some level a better understanding of this group’s unique and changing experiences.

Within the community college context, faculty are cited as an honored but invisible component of the college (Grubb, 1999), and many argue that in order for community college faculty to establish a professional identity, they must act to assert themselves more forcefully into the decision-making process of the institution (Levin et. al., 2006). As previously mentioned, ongoing budget cuts mean they are routinely asked to do more with less, and stress and dissatisfaction often follow in the wake of expanding workloads (Gappa et al., 2007). They also serve an increasingly wide spectrum of
students with unique educational requirements – from adult basic education to individuals with doctoral degrees interested in changing careers. They teach students from increasingly diverse racial and ethnic backgrounds characterized by myriad cultural nuances and shadings, all of which can affect the learning process. They also must address the needs of traditional-aged students whose numbers are also growing at community colleges (Levin et. al, 2010). It is also worth noting that community college faculty provides instruction for around 37% of all undergraduates including about half of all freshman and sophomores (Chronicle of Higher Education, 2005).

Ironically, for all the demands on community college faculty skills and resources, community college faculty historically lacked a clear sense of professional identity (AACC, 2013). This confusion persisted until the 1990s (Cohen & Brawer, 2003), but during this decade and continuing beyond, the community college professoriate advanced. For example, greater professionalization is evident in higher levels of educational attainment, a growing number of professional organizations exclusive to community college faculty, expressed levels of commitment to the profession, autonomy from students and the institution, and a deepening service orientation to students (Rifkin, 1997). At the same time, many come into the profession remaining unacquainted with the challenges of teaching in an open-door institution (Watts & Hammons, 2002).

What we know about faculty is that age is a well-established factor in research on individuals or employees, including faculty (Stagner, 1985). NSOPF (2005) reports that the average age of faculty at community colleges was 48.3. Age has been shown to influence organizational commitment (Cohen, 1993). Gender is frequently an independent variable in studies of community college faculty (Townsend & Twombly,
Gender effects on commitment or work attitudes have received some attention in the literature, but this line of research is limited at best. One non-academic study by Vander Velde, Bossink, and Jansen (2003) investigated gender differences and the influence of professional tenure on work attitudes. Much of the research prior to their study primarily focused on professional tenure among men only; hence, they included a large sample of both men and women. Another example is Caselman and Brandt (2007) who argued that gender influenced the self-perceptions of both men and women not only in organizational settings but in their personal and social settings as well. Ultimately, however, those studies investigating the specific relationship between gender and organizational commitment are uncommon in studies focused on change. Such studies are uncommon within a context of higher education. Of the current studies that were available, there are inconsistent results regarding the relationship between gender and organizational commitment.

Community college faculty has a primary teaching function. According to Levin, Kater, and Wagoner (2006), there are several primary teaching areas in community colleges, humanities, social sciences, and science; core professional areas such as business, computing, and nursing; and vocational (or occupational) areas such as industrial arts, drafting, or childcare specialties. In addition, faculty can focus on developmental or remedial education. Other faculty function as librarians or counselors. Research by Seidman (1985) reported that vocational faculty indicated that they felt less empowered than their peers outside their discipline. Interestingly, faculty in occupational areas feel more marginalized than academic faculty who, according to Grubb (2005), often assume faculty leadership or administrative functions. Occupational faculty also
are often located away from academic buildings and hence are less engaged or involved in work outside of their immediate department or function. Although past research has not demonstrated similar effects on faculty attitudes and behavior, in my research the variable of tenure status and years of full-time service were included as control variables for exploratory purposes.

In conclusion, Twombly and Townsend (2008) assert that during the last decade, the faculty role in successful service delivery has received marginally greater attention in the scholarly literature. Much of what has become known is primarily based on results from small-scale quantitative and qualitative studies conducted at the institutional or state level (Twombly & Townsend). In addition, Levin, Kater and Wagoner (2006) argue that the community college professoriate is in peril and that community college faculty ties to campus and institutional mission are diminishing.

Research on Organizational Change in a Non-academic Setting

What is Organizational Change?

Duck (2001) identifies the process of change, from the human viewpoint, as a difficult for most people to endure. It is said that we are currently experiencing more rapid change than any other period in time (Duck). Change creates upheaval, stress, and anxiety corresponding with fear of the future, whether it is welcomed or not, because it requires a questioning of assumptions and rethinking of beliefs and actions. It is also important to consider the critical role that learning plays in the overall organizational change process, a role that is even further enhanced within an organization like a
community college in which ongoing learning is the heart and center of its mission (Karabell, 2000; McClenny, 1998).

Burke (2011) presents an organizational change process consisting of pre-launch, launch, and post-launch stages, and he suggests certain activities that are appropriate for each phase. A pre-launch phase involves critical activities such as establishing the need for change and providing clarity of vision, and the launch phase consists of communicating the change to all stakeholders and dealing with initial resistance. It is the post-launch phase where implementation starts. During this stage, the change process is likely to take on a life of its own (Burke, 2011; Giffords & Dina, 2003). The dynamics of change have always been challenging for organizations, employees and change managers to address (van den Heuval & Schalk, 2009). Holbeche (2006) cited four types of organizational change: transactional, incremental, radical, and transformational.

Transactional change is the type of change that involves significant shifts in environmental forces or market place requirements in order for it to be successful. It is about replacement, not improvement. Some common examples of this type of change involve reorganizations, simple mergers, divestitures, installation of computers or new technology, and creation of new policy systems, products, and procedures. Incremental change is defined as a step-by-step approach to re-designing an organization (Thompson, 2005). The idea is that each small increment that is changed produces changes in other parts of the organization. By changing specific processes or details in portions, the entire organization changes over time.

Radical change refers to a type of particularly challenging change, in which the risks are often high (Huy, 1999). This type of change cannot occur without the
organization having: 1) sufficient understanding of the new conceptual destination, 2) the skills and competencies required to function in that new destination, and 3) the ability to manage how to get to that destination (Carnall, 1990; Clarke, 1994; Fombrun, 1992; Nadler & Tushman, 1989; Tichy, 1983).

Transformational change differs from the other change-related concepts in terms of the philosophical nature of the new vision for the organization, the required level of involvement (commitment) from internal stakeholders (employees), and the prominence of transformation in the business environment (Ackerman & Anderson, 2001; Cummings & Worley, 2001; Gouillart & Kelly, 1995; Jick & Peiperl, 2003). Further, change can be measured and has been assessed in several ways. For example, it can be measured according to the different impacts of change, as Holbeche did, but also according to the perception of employees regarding change (Freese, 2007).

Researchers have established that organizational change influences employee perceptions of change (Zhao et al., 2007), and that it is instructive to gain more information about how employees perceive reality and how they react to it in an environment of change within organizations (Freese, 2007). Oreg, Vakola and Armenakis (2011) assert that it is also important to note that a surge in recent studies centered on organizational change demonstrated the meaningfulness of change recipients’ attitudes toward change for understanding the organizational change process (e.g. Caldwell, Herold, & Fedor, 2004; Fugate, Kinicki & Prussia, 2008; Oreg, 2006; Rafferty & Griffin, 2006).
Key Factors to Change

In the work of Guy & Beauman’s (2005), they identified that successful change management can be placed into three categories: (1) knowledge and competency of leadership, (2) capability or competence, (3) the resources. Alignment and engagement are associated with an extensive list of factors, the top three being: (1) commitment, (2) employee involvement, and (3) a tie between sponsorship and link to mission and values. Competitive pressure is split between: (1) burning platform and (2) market pressure.

As mentioned in chapter one, there are many common antecedents or factors that can influence or determine change. Several of the more common factors include organizational identification, mutual respect and trust, management support, and leadership behaviors. Several of these factors are explored below. A discussion follows that reviews readiness to change factors with emphasis on organizational commitment and job involvement.

Organizational Identification

Organizational identification can affect both the satisfaction and behavior of employees and the effectiveness of the organization (Albert et al., 2000). Organizational identification describes individuals’ identities based on their group memberships, specifically their sense of belonging to a group and the processes by which belonging is determined and changes (Ashforth, 2001; Tajfel, 1974). It is further cited that organizational change can be affected by changes in attitude at the individual level (Tannenbaum & Hanna, 1985), or in other words based on an individual’s experience within the organization. These experiences often link to how well an individual identifies or connects with the organization.
Mutual Respect and Trust

The factor of trust has long been an important factor in organizational success. For example, trust relationships enable employees to make emotional investments into the organization because they believe in the intrinsic virtue of such relationships and that these sentiments are reciprocated (Lewis & Weigert, 1985). Most importantly, trust in leadership contributes to a successful change process (Caetano & Neves, 2006). Additional research has revealed that the trust of employees is linked to their working attitudes and behaviors (Aryee, Budhwar & Chen, 2002).

Leadership Behaviors

Often times an organization’s measure of successful change is directly linked to its leadership. According to the literature, leading organizational change effectively is associated with leadership creativity, transformational leadership and effective communication by leadership. In research conducted by Matthew (2009), organizational change is about leaders being creative and inspiring new paths that motivate and consider employee reactions, both social and emotional, to change.

Peus et al. (2009) claim that a transformational leader’s role in organizational change is the creation and communication of a change’s compelling vision. In work by Allen and colleagues (2007), they assert that when leadership communicates a clear and effective vision for change it can connect employees to the change in a more meaningful way through a process they call creating a sense-making experience. This perspective is also supported in the work of Kavanagh and Ashkanasy (2006) that cites communication and leadership competence as two important determinants of employee acceptance of change. In their study of several Australian universities and colleges, they reported that
when leaders involve employees in decision-making there is an increase in employee acceptance of change. In work conducted by Armenakis and Harris (2009) on organizational change, the role of particular management influence strategies including active participation, communication and human resource management practices emerge as central to successful change within an organization. In other words, a leader’s own behavior can be a central factor in whether employees embrace and participate in a change effort.

**Readiness to Change and Its Antecedents**

It is well known from the literature that regardless of the particular form of organizational change, employees determine the ultimate success of change efforts (Bartunek, et al., 2006). Further, researchers have suggested that employee readiness to change is a critical driver of change success (Cunningham et al., 2002). Herscovitch and Meyer (2002) have asserted that readiness to change leads to specific discretionary behaviors supportive of organizational change, such as cooperating with the change process and serving as a champion of the change. Bernerth (2004) notes, “Readiness is more than understanding the change, readiness is more than believing in the change, readiness is a collection of thoughts and intentions toward the specific change effort” (p. 40). In a similar vein, Backer (1995) explained:

> Individual readiness for change is involved with people's beliefs, attitudes, and intentions regarding the extent to which changes are needed and their perception of individual and organizational capacity to successfully make those changes. Readiness is a state of mind about the need. It is the cognitive precursor to behaviors of either resistance or support...readiness for change is not a fixed element of individuals or system. It may vary due to changing external or internal
circumstance, the type of change being introduced, or the characteristics of potential adopters and change agents. Thus, interventions to enhance readiness are possible...change can occur under conditions of low readiness, of course, but behavioral science research indicates that the probability of success is reduced when low readiness leads to low motivation to change or to active resistance. (p. 22)

Gauging any level of organizational change success or failure generally can be linked to assessing readiness for that change at an individual level. Wanberg and Banas (2000) suggest that openness to change is a critical element to creating employee readiness to change. They state that a high level of openness to organizational change is suggestive of increased cooperation and may deter change resistance behavior. Elias (2009) defines attitudes toward organizational change as an employee’s overall positive or negative judgment of a change initiative implemented by their organization. For example, several researchers (Glick, Huber, Miller, Harold, & Sutcliffe, 1995; Monge, 1995; Rafferty & Griffin, 2006) posited that organizational members make judgments about whether change initiatives are occurring too frequently and, if so, may experience negative reactions toward the change(s).

Organizational development efforts began to identify the concept of change readiness as early as the 1940s, with Knickerbocker and McGregor suggesting that an awareness of the need to change and an acceptance of the reasonableness of the change effort was needed if change were to succeed (as cited in Bernerth, 2004). Over the years, a number of research studies explored this point about change and considered those factors before, during, and following change that contribute to an employee’s role in supporting and participating in change initiatives within an organization. For example, one non-academic study focused on a state government department about to implement a new computer system; the study attempted to demonstrate how readiness for change
could mediate the relationship between organizational change management strategies and the success of change efforts. The particular results of this study suggested a relationship between individual perceptions of the organization’s focus on human relations values and their readiness for change, which, in turn, was found to be related to their use of the new computer system, at a subsequent point in time (Jones et al., 2005).

At the individual level, employee acceptance of change is enhanced by characteristics of the change process (Dent & Goldberg, 1999; Oreg, 2006). Further, it is not uncommon to hear that organizational changes, when initiated, must be implemented through altering the actions and work of the organizational members – a commonly expressed thought in current change literature (e.g., Eby, Adams, Russell, & Gaby, 2000; George & Jones, 2001; Judge et al., 1999). Armenakis and Harris (2002) focused their study on the organization’s attempts to establish readiness in the minds of its employees for a change in strategy. The study results showed that there is a need for an active effort on the part of management to facilitate the strategic change throughout the organization. As noted in the research, managers increase the likelihood of a successful change effort through a variety of strategies. These strategies include engaging organizational members to participate in implementing the change, being aware of the symbolic nature of manager behaviors and organizational rituals, utilizing the human resource practices, as well as other institutionalization strategies, and managing readiness throughout the implementation of the change initiative (Armenakis & Harris).

Getting a change off the ground for any organization requires a sense of connection to the idea of the change by employees. In considering this idea, the fundamental process of implementing or facilitating change can generally be categorized
into three intersecting stages: 1) readiness, when the organizational environment, structure, and member’s attitudes are receptive to a proposed change; 2) adoption, the members of the organization temporarily alter their attitudes and behaviors to conform with the expectations of the change; and 3) institutionalization, when the change becomes a established element of the employee’s permanent behavior (Holt, 2000).

Definitions available in the literature conceptualize the term “readiness” as a necessary precondition for a person or an organization to succeed in facing organizational change (Holt et al., 2007). In his work, Holt synthesized a number of existing definitions of readiness as they relate to both individuals and organizations generating the following definition of readiness:

Readiness for change is a comprehensive attitude that is influenced simultaneously by the content (i.e., what is being changed), the process (i.e., how the change is being implemented), the context (i.e., circumstances under which the change is occurring), and the individuals (i.e., characteristics of those being asked to change) involved, and that collectively reflects the extent to which an individual or a collection of individuals is cognitively and emotionally inclined to accept, embrace, and adopt, a particular plan to purposefully alter the status quo. (p. 32)

Readiness for change is commonly affected by levels of trust, support, organizational identification and commitment, social relationships in the organization, and an organizational environment that is conducive to innovation (Huy, 2002; Madsen, Miller, & John, 2005). Oreg (2006) asserts that everyone has different internal tendencies to support or resist change and that these differing dispositions affect the views that people have of change. Trust in management (Oreg), job autonomy (Watson, 1971), and the abundance and quality of information provided to subordinates (Miller et al., 1994), are common variables often linked to successful change. Most organizations,
however, do a poor job of implementing large-scale change because of resistance within the organization (Fandray, 2002).

Desplaces (2005) argued that the extent of certain individual and workplace characteristics might lead to developing positive attitudes and behaviors for change readiness. These factors are associated with personal, social, environmental, cultural, and organizational services. Employee readiness has been associated with individual attitudes and behaviors that may define support or resistance (Armenakis & Bedeian, 1999). Bernerth (2004) defined readiness as a state of mind during the change process that reflects a willingness or receptiveness to changing the way one thinks.

Over the last few decades, myriad predictors of employee readiness have been identified. In their survey study, Miller et al. (2006) found that three workplace factors – management/leader relationships, job knowledge and skills, and job demands – significantly influenced employees’ readiness for change. Hanpachern et al. (1998) asserted that demographic variables correspond with employee readiness for change. Their list of variables included job knowledge and skills, social relations in the workplace, organizational culture, and management leadership relationships. Cunningham et al. (2002) examined logistical and occupational risks of change, ability to cope with change and to solve job-related problems, social support, and active vs. passive job construct. All were found to influence readiness for healthcare organizational change. Current research conducted by Holt et al. (2007) found that readiness for change is influenced by employees’ beliefs of self-efficacy, appropriateness of change, management support, and personal valence. Their study involved over 900 participants. van Dam and colleagues (2008) identified a number of individual variables such as
openness to job changes and organizational tenure (longevity) that showed important relationships with how an employee experienced and was open to change. They also identified the quality of leader-member exchange and the daily organizational context to be important to change. Along these lines, work by Jones (2005) suggests that an employee’s response to the change process will vary depending on their place in the organizational hierarchy and level of authority, as well as the point at which they become engaged in the change process. For example, because of their awareness and involvement early in the change process, an employee in a supervisory role may be more open or involved in a change. Among executives, research shows that there is a tendency to focus more on outcomes and process, as opposed to being open or prepared for change based on emotional and attitudinal reactions. At the general employee level, which could include support staff and/ or entry level management, the emotional and attitudinal reaction to changes are much more determinate and of greater concern. In turn, these employees have a different reaction or level of readiness than supervisors or executives (Jones).

Clearly, researchers have uncovered myriad factors – work environment and job characteristics, organizational position, and quality of leader-subordinate relations – that influence employee openness to change. However, among the most important attitudinal variables that have been shown to impact readiness are organizational commitment and job involvement.
Organizational Commitment and Job Involvement in Non Academics

Organizational Commitment

Since the 1970s, an expansive and influential literature has emerged on the topic of organizational commitment. Researchers have identified commitment as one of the most important work attitudes in the study of management and organizational behavior (Allen & Meyer, 2000). Most importantly, researchers have consistently shown organizational commitment to be an important predictor of organizational outcomes. Commitment is one of the most important work attitudes in the study of management and organizational behavior (Allen & Meyer).

Offering definitions of commitment is not difficult, but agreeing on a common definition is, in fact, a challenge. One accepted definition is that commitment is a psychological link between the employee and the organization that makes it less likely the employee will voluntarily leave the organization (Allen & Meyer, 1997). Within the literature, commitment is also narrowed down to two dominant conceptual approaches: attitudinal and, and behavioral (Mowday et al., 1982; Mowday et al., 1979). Attitudinal commitment refers to the relationship individuals have with their organizations and reflects their identification and involvement in the organization, their willingness to work toward organizational goals, and their desire to maintain membership in the organization (Mowday, et al., 1982). Attitudinal commitment research has often focused on identifying specific antecedents and consequences of commitment, and on understanding the relationship between commitment and organizational outcomes (Meyer & Allen,
The behavioral approach focuses on the behavioral actions and processes through which employees link “self” to the organization (Mowday et al., 1982).

Researchers have shown commitment to be a function of several variables such as job satisfaction, motivation, participative decision-making, organizational support, financial reward, communication, promotion prospects, and leadership styles (Alarape & Akinlabi, 2000; Salami & Omole, 2005). In a study of 238 nurses, Cohen (1996) demonstrated that having strong emotional bonds with colleagues, clients, and leaders positively influenced organizational commitment.

The results for job satisfaction’s link to commitment are mixed. On the one hand, Curry, Wakefield, Price, and Mueller (1986) found no significant relationship between job satisfaction and organizational commitment. On the other hand, Freund (2005) noted that job satisfaction was a significant predictor of organizational commitment. Despite such ambiguous results, job satisfaction now generally is seen as one of the determinants of commitment (Mannheim, 1997); it is thought to be inherently linked to how committed an employee is and to what degree they may resist change.

Another point for debate has been whether job satisfaction reflects immediate affective reactions to the job, while organizational commitment evolves slowly based on an individual’s comprehensive valuations of the employing organization, its values and expectations, and one’s own future in it. If the latter, organizational commitment is less likely to be significantly affected by day-to-day events than is the case for job satisfaction (Mowday et al., 1979).

Besides its antecedents, researchers also have examined outcomes associated with organizational commitment. Morrow (1993) has identified organizational commitment as
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a multidimensional construct that has the potential to predict organizational outcomes such as performance, turnover, absenteeism, tenure, and organizational goals (Meyer & Allen, 1997, p. 12). Early on, researchers confirmed that organizational commitment is an important determinant of organizational effectiveness (Steers, 1977). Greenberg and Baron (2003) agreed and asserted that an employee’s behavior can be predicted far into the future because of their level of commitment. Clearly, commitment is among the most important of work-related attitudes.

Mowday et al. (1979) suggested that employees who exhibit high commitment are also happier at their work, spend less time away from their jobs, and are less likely to leave the organization. Commitment also closely corresponded with a strong belief in an organization’s goals, and values, a willingness to exert considerable effort on behalf of an organization, and a strong desire to remain a member of the organization (Mowday et al., 1979). Silverthorne (2004) stated that along with the intention to remain with the organization, employee participation also positively correlates with organizational commitment. In a study of 232 employees, Irving, Coleman, and Cooper (1997) confirmed that commitment reduced turnover intentions.

Most recently, organizational commitment has also been linked to organizational change. In this regard, organizational commitment is best explored and defined through the work of Meyer and Allen (1991). These researchers have empirically synthesized the body of commitment research into a multidimensional model that includes the three dimensions of affective commitment, continuance commitment, and normative commitment. Rather than referring to separate constructs, Meyer and Allen viewed affective, continuance, and normative commitment as constituting three separate
dimensions of the organizational commitment construct. Consequently, an employee might reflect varying degrees of all three components. The two researchers also have linked all three of their dimensions to employee readiness to support organizational change. The specific definitions of the three organizational commitment dimensions offered by Herscovitch and Meyer (2002), as well as their arguments about how these dimensions link to organizational change are as follows.

Affective commitment is defined as an employee having an emotional attachment to the organization based on his or her bonding with and connection to colleagues, supervisors, or projects (Meyer & Allen, 1997). This attachment is about employees feeling a psychological attachment (Hartmann & Bambacas, 2000). In the past, affective commitment has been shown to correlate positively with desired organizational outcomes like regular attendance, less employee turnover, and increased productivity (Hawkins, 1998). Affective commitment has also been found to be favorable for individual and organizational outcomes in terms of satisfaction (Gautama, Van Dick, & Wagner, 2004; Trimble, 2006). Of particular relevance to this study, Meyer and Allen (1990) have suggested that because affective commitment implies a positive emotional bond to their work organization, it also sustains an interest in its ongoing welfare and sustainability. Further, they argue that affective commitment thereby makes employees more open to required organizational change. In empirical work conducted by Madsen, Miller, and John (2005), it was confirmed that affective commitment is positively correlated with readiness to change.

Continuance commitment is a second dimension of organizational commitment. Continuance commitment is defined in terms of an employee’s understanding that
leaving the organization is associated with specific costs to the company and to
themselves, and therefore they remain committed due to the high cost of leaving. In the
past, continuance commitment has been shown to emerge from the recognition that one
would lose valued benefits, such as pension and insurance premiums, upon leaving the
organization (Becker, 1960). In later research, continuance commitment has been
demonstrated to be an antecedent of readiness to change. Its effects can be moderated,
however, to the extent an employee possesses clear-cut information regarding the purpose
and benefits of change, or to the extent the employee is willing and able to meet new
challenges and the requirements of change (Herscovitch, 1999).

Normative commitment is the third dimension of organizational commitment.
Normative commitment refers to an employee’s sense of moral obligation to be
supportive of their organization (Herscovitch & Meyer, 2002; Tett & Meyer, 1993;
Wiener, 1982). This type of commitment acknowledges that employees have internalized
the values and goals of the organization. Thus, normative commitment is another form of
“human glue” that sustains a readiness to organizational change undertaken by
organizational leaders. Researchers have also suggested that its impact on readiness to
change is not as strong as that for affective commitment (Herscovitch & Meyer, 2002).
They argue that normative commitment motivates employees to embrace change not
because they value change in and of itself, but rather because their moral obligation to the
organization impels them to endorse the change process.

An emerging body of work attempts to strengthen and frame organizational
commitment as a key influencer of readiness to change. Indeed, at least two empirical
studies have confirmed that organizational commitment is positively correlated to such
readiness (Kohler, Munz, & Grawitch, 2006; Madsen et al., 2005). Other researchers concur that dimensions of organizational commitment are critical to organizational change success, as committed employees will provide many benefits to the organization undergoing change (Visagie and Steyn, 2011). It appears then that organizational commitment is essential to organizational change success.

**Job Involvement**

Joiner and Bakalis (2006) suggested that job involvement describes how interested, enmeshed, and engrossed the worker is in the goals, culture, and tasks of a given organization. Other researchers define the construct of job involvement as the extent to which a person identifies psychologically with their work or the degree to which their work is essential to one’s self-image (Lodahl & Kejner, 1965, p. 24). Still other researchers operationalize job involvement as being absorbed in work (Reid, Allen, Riemenschneider, & Armstrong, 2008) and satisfying vital needs (Moynihan & Pandey, 2008). Job involvement is “dependent on the extent to which his or her job satisfies his or her own needs” (Word & Park, 2009, p. 109).

Research studies over the past two decades, which have explored the construct of job involvement, have approached it from two different perspectives (Sekaran, 1989; Sekaran & Mowday, 1981). First, viewed as an individual difference variable, job involvement is thought to vary in relation to an individual’s needs, values, or personal characteristics. For instance, Rabinowitz and Hall (1977) in their review of literature on job involvement found that individual characteristics such as age, education, sex, tenure, need strength, level of control and values influence the level of job involvement. Second, another line of research examines how certain types of jobs or characteristics of the work
situation affect the degree to which an individual becomes involved in his/her job. For example, research has demonstrated that job characteristics such as task autonomy, task significance, task identity, skill variety, and feedback, and supervisory behaviors such as leader consideration, participative decision-making, and amount of communication, all function as important antecedents to job involvement (Brown, 1996). Brown’s work also showed that perceptions regarding psychological climate correspond to job involvement. More studies also show that effective management of human resources in an organization significantly related to job involvement and high productivity (Akpan, Ekpiken & Okon, 2007; Onyene, 2005; Lambert, 1991), and the joint direct and interactive influences of organizational commitment and job involvement on employee absence rates (Mathieu & Kohler, 1990). Past research also consistently found a moderate relationship between job involvement and turnover intention. A meta-analysis of job involvement by Brown (1996) reported a significant negative correlation between job involvement and actual turnover, as well as between job involvement and turnover intention. Further, Atkinson (1980) conducted a study that showed intrinsically motivated persons were more involved in their work than extrinsically motivated workers and further that job content more than job context characteristics were positively related to job involvement of employees.

Other researchers have examined the role of job involvement as a predictor variable. For example, job involvement is viewed as an essential organizational objective because organizational researchers cite it as a primary source of organizational effectiveness (Pfeffer, 1994), employee commitment (Meyer, Paunonen, Gellaty, Goffin,

In a 2002 study, Diefendorff et al. asserted job involvement functions as a significant predictor of supervisor ratings of in-role performance, and argued that two factors, measures and definition, led to the insignificant findings uncovered in Brown’s (1996) earlier work. To date, however, the findings on the relationship between job involvement and job performance remain inconclusive.

Job involvement is demonstrated in the literature as a second critical dimension of work motivation and it is correlated positively with organizational commitment. In one study, for example, researchers found a significant positive relationship between job involvement, organizational commitment, and job satisfaction (The Pennsylvania State University, 2011). Consequently, it is also plausible that job involvement functions similarly to organizational commitment and is correlated positively with readiness to change. It follows then that through their effects on change readiness, both organizational commitment and job involvement can provide a better understanding of the change process in community colleges, thereby helping, at least in part, to bridge the apparent gap in the literature regarding how change occurs in community colleges and the role faculty play in the process.
Organizational Commitment and Job Involvement in Academics

This section covers how organizational commitment and job involvement operate in the academic realm. Currently there is no existing evidence to confirm that organizational commitment and job involvement influence readiness to change in an academic environment. Nevertheless, results from other studies confirm that organizational commitment and job involvement positively affect a range of faculty attitudes and behaviors. An influential predictor role for organizational commitment and job involvement in an academic setting combines well with data from the non-academic realm linking organizational commitment and job involvement to change readiness. Taken together such evidence strengthens arguments that the two variables will have similar effects on faculty openness to change.

Organizational Commitment

While there is little evidence identifying specific factors that impact organizational commitment among educators (Chang & Choi, 2007; Chen et al., 2007; Freund, 2005; Obeng & Ugboro, 2003), a number of research studies explore organizational commitment in relation to organizational effectiveness. A common thread in much of the academic literature on organizational commitment links effective commitment to faculty and other staff members remaining with the institution and, consequently, being more involved within the organization itself.

Along these lines, Gaylor (2005) focused on the faculty shortage problem that business schools are experiencing nationally, and their research further examines organizational commitment and several other predictor variables. The researchers use
Meyer and Allen’s (1990) Three-Component Model, and organizational commitment, job satisfaction, organizational tenure, job embeddedness, and turnover intention are compared and contrasted among public business school faculty and private business school faculty in the southeastern region of the United States. Findings from this study suggest satisfied and embedded faculty members are less likely to leave the college. The findings also suggest that satisfaction with the supervisor leads to reduced turnover and more satisfaction on the job. Contrasting conventional knowledge, salary is not the primary motivator to work. In addition, and most importantly for present purposes, affective commitment was determined as a significant predictor of faculty intent to leave, confirming that if faculty members have an emotional attachment to the mission of the college, then they are less likely to leave the college. They tend to stay with the organization because they “want to” stay.

Choong and Wong (2011) studied how organizational commitment influences intrinsic motivation in Malaysian private universities. In this study, 271 academics from four Malaysian private universities participated. The research confirmed that organizational commitment is effectively comprised of the three components originally proposed by Meyer and Allen (1991), namely affective commitment, continuance commitment, and normative commitment. The results also demonstrated that organizational commitment positively influences intrinsic motivation.

In a comparable study, researchers studied highly committed faculty to understand better the correlation between commitment and performance. The research determined that highly committed employees have higher performance as compared to
those employees with less commitment to the organization (Muhammad, Ziauddin, Farooq & Ramay, 2010). In sum, commitment determined performance levels.

**Job Involvement**

The literature offers limited empirical support suggesting that job involvement influences workplace outcomes in an academic environment. A good deal of the literature is focused on job involvement as an outcome variable. One such study focused on how job involvement was influenced by academics’ career salience. In this study by Kiyani and colleagues (2011), career salience was defined as occupational choice, importance of career role compared to other life affairs, and career significance. Based on Athanasou’s (2003) conceptual arguments, the authors hypothesized that career salience would positively influence job involvement. The results of this study confirmed such a relationship for public and private university teachers. Gender also was shown to moderate the correlation between career salience and job involvement for male and female university’s teachers. To be specific, the career salience of female university teachers was associated with higher levels of job involvement than was the case for their male counterparts. Career awareness also influenced the job performance of all teachers, as well as their job stability or length of time with one employer.

Similarly, Shehan et al. (2007) demonstrated that career knowledge in females had stronger effects on their job commitment, personality growth, information sharing, professional maturity, and performance. In addition, Shehan et al. confirmed that the association between career salience and job involvement varied for lecturers, assistant professors, and associate professors.
Stark, Lowther, Sharp, and Arnold (1997) conducted a study grounded in the assumption that curriculum planning is the heart of academic work and central to understand the interpersonal dynamics or institutional contexts affecting faculty involvement. In their study, they examined the epistemological assumptions of faculty that they bring to their academic plans. A total of 59 faculty members from a small private college and a large public university were interviewed. They reported a number of factors influence curriculum planning, including involvement. They cited that specific discipline, student characteristics, workload, faculty interests, program goals, budget, college goals and faculty beliefs in student learning are some of the factors which strongly influence faculty involvement in curriculum planning activities.

In a study focused on faculty stagnation, Harnish and Creamer (1985) framed a grounded-theory method study that analyzed the impact of job routinization on community college faculty job attitudes, including job involvement. More specifically the research involved 34 full-time community college faculty who had spent at least 10 years or more in their current positions. According to the research, the sample included 9 female and 25 male faculty from 8 academic divisions. The research utilized Triandis’ (1971) work to describe two core dimensions of faculty attitudes toward involvement with their jobs. The two dimensions include: Job Affect, or the feelings or emotional responses of faculty toward various areas of their work, and Job Contact, or the efforts, actions, or willingness of faculty to participate in or devote time to their work. In sum, the research implied that as work tends to become increasingly routinized over time, this process could result in a loss of faculty interest in their work. Further, certain structural features of the academics’ jobs moderated the effect of routinization (Harnish &
Creamer). The good news, however, was that stagnation need not be an inevitable outcome of faculty remaining in the same job. Routinization can be minimized by identifying means of encouraging diversity in faculty tasks and skills, exposing faculty to new types of teaching opportunities, and supporting the expanding role of community college faculty (Harnish & Creamer, 1985 - 1986).

Although to date the greater emphasis may be on job involvement as an outcome variable, individual studies have examined it as a predictor variable. In work from Salami (2008), job involvement is demonstrated to be a predictor of enhanced job satisfaction, loyalty, and overall motivation levels for teachers. Further, Khan (2004) suggested that job involvement might be a factor in teachers’ levels of motivation and performance, the merit-based promotions they receive, and aspects like transparent employment mechanism and unbiased administration. On the other hand, Brown and Leigh (1996) argue that there is only a weak and inconsistent relationship between job involvement and performance; they further suggest that if job involvement affects performance at all, it does so by operating indirectly through other variables. At another level, job involvement is a central cause of worker outcomes (Diefendorff et al., 2002; Lawler, 1986). Hackman and Lawler (1971) theorized that job involvement is a salient factor in shaping the motivation of individual workers.

Akpan (2012) conducted a study of university lecturers in Nigeria. The results of this study suggested that the level of job involvement of university lecturers was, on average, high and that their engagement corresponded with the lecturers’ perceptions that university administrators effectively and efficiently managed human, physical/material, and financial resources components of their universities.
Finally, Thaxter and Graham (1999) studied community college faculty’s perceptions of their involvement in decision-making. Their study asked 100 faculty, randomly selected from six community colleges in different states, to rate their level of involvement in five institutional categories. The research concluded that faculty indicated real involvement in decision making in only one area – that of course content and curricular materials. Other involvement, but at a lower rate, included student outcomes assessment and program development. A broad conclusion from this research is that faculty has little sense of involvement in institutional goal setting, contributing to the budgeting process, or in formulating institutional policies.

**Conclusion**

One question that has not been tackled in the existing literature on community college faculty is how they engage in and experience organizational change. Clearly, faculty must play a central role in the organizational change process, yet their contributions to successful adaptation and the dynamics behind it remain unexplored. The more relevant literature in determining essential antecedents of faculty participation in organizational change comes from the non-academic domain. This literature delineates the organizational change process with greater precision and specifies a roster of individual-level variables, most particularly, organizational commitment and job involvement, which contribute to faculty openness to the change process. The argument that organizational commitment and job involvement hold the potential to positively affect attitudes toward change in an academic environment, however, is also strengthened by evidence that both variables influence other important outcomes in this arena.
CHAPTER 3
METHODS

The purpose of this study was to examine how faculty organizational commitment levels and job involvement predicts readiness to change. This chapter describes the methods used to answer the research questions and discusses the research design, population and sample, instrumentation, variables, data collection procedures, data quality (validity and reliability), and data analysis procedures.

Population and Sample

Target Population

The target population for this research was the entire population of full-time community college faculty in Illinois. The total number of community college faculty nationwide is in excess of 270,000 out of 976,000 full- and part-time faculty in the United States (National Center for Education Statistics, 2009). Approximately 112,000 of this total population are full-time faculty employed in community colleges (U.S. Department of Education, 2007). The fall 2011 Summary of Instructional Teaching Faculty report verifies that 4,681 full-time faculty (male, 2,151; female, 2,530) are employed in Illinois community colleges (Illinois Community College Board, 2011). There are 14,416 (male, 6,720; female, 7,696) part-time faculty reported as employed in Illinois community colleges (Illinois Community College Board). The Illinois community college system covers the entire state with 48 colleges and one multi-
community college center in 39 community college districts (Illinois Community College Board).

**Sampling method.** To access the target population, an e-mail message addressed to both chief academic officers and institutional research bureau officers was sent, inquiring whether a respective college required institutional permissions to access full-time faculty, as well as if the researcher could have access to a pre-developed faculty email listserv. Twenty colleges required additional human subjects permissions beyond the University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign Institutional Review Board approval, and 28 colleges did not require additional permissions. Two colleges did not participate in the study due to the unavailability of faculty in one instance and a recent difficult bargaining process in the other. In one case, no reason was provided by the non-participating college. This attrition accounted for 328 participations not participating from the original population.

The sampling method then involved the researcher sending email invitations to 4,353 faculty at 23 colleges. Twenty-two colleges sent the survey link on behalf of the researcher per internal institutional policy. The link to the survey was embedded in the body of a pre-developed e-mail. The link directed participants to the first page of the survey, which provided instructions for completing the survey as well as the option to consent to an invitation to participate. A total of 45 community colleges participated.

**Participant response rate.** Following two data collection rounds between late August and October 2013, 1,130 responses were received. Based on an exploratory analysis of descriptive data measures (e.g., outliers, skewness, kurtosis), responses with missing data and with unusual or invalid values were eliminated. Out of the original
responses, 411 cases were determined to be invalid. Using a recommendation by Hoaglin and Iglewicz (1987), the outlier labeling rule used $g = 2.2$. This labeling rule determined no obvious outliers in the dependent variable or factors. Of those 411 cases, 364 were part-time faculty, 46 consented but checked the “No thank you” box to opt out of participation, and 1 case was incomplete. After listwise deletion of 411 invalid cases, there were 729 usable cases, resulting in a 17% ($729/4,353$) response rate.

Data Quality and Collection

Data Quality

Given that survey respondents, whether intentionally or unintentionally, are known to provide biased responses to sensitive questions such as those that ask about salaries, tax payment, illicit drug use etc., the current research did not include any sensitive questions and was completely voluntary. This context leaves little incentive for respondents to falsify their responses. In spite of this, self-reported data can only be accurate to the extent that the respondents chose to provide accurate information. Data were collected electronically, providing strength to the data collection process. Although there could be a vulnerability of participants entering invalid data, motivation for such action is low.

Data Collection

Data was collected from the entire population of full-time community college faculty in Illinois. To gain insight into how levels of organizational commitment and job involvement among community college faculty determined their readiness to change,
survey research methods were used. The purpose of survey research is to generalize from a sample to a population to make inferences about some aspect of the population (Babbie, 1990). Further, in affording an examination of the relationships between the target independent variables and the dependent variable, a quantitative research design drawing upon inferential statistical techniques provided a strong test of the theoretical underpinnings of this study (Creswell, 1994). For this study, survey research was the preferred type of data collection because it grants the researcher the ability to gather and analyze data quickly, with a reasonable investment of time and money (Babbie, 1992).

**Respondent confidentiality.** Following a three-contact strategy presented by Dillman et al. (2009), two emails were sent to faculty. Once colleges approved contacting faculty to participate in the research, the first e-mail was sent. Contact information for the researcher was provided in the e-mail, as well as a statement disclosing the opportunity for respondents to be awarded one of six $50 gift certificates for participation in the study. The $50 gift certificates were offered to 5 randomly selected respondents who decided to take part in the lottery. Of the 729 respondents in my sample, 229 chose to participate in the lottery. The number of gift certificates was limited to one per winner. Thus, the probability of winning for lottery participants was 5/229 or about 2%. The link to the survey was embedded in the body of the e-mail. The link directed the participant to the first page of the survey, which provided instructions for completing the survey as well as the option for the respondent to either accept or decline the invitation to participate. There was no method of tracking who had participated or not in the survey. Therefore, notwithstanding their willingness to participate all faculty received a follow-up message requesting participation. No more
than two follow-up email messages were delivered over two months, at which point data
collection concluded.

During data collection the primary investigator did not have access to data or have
the ability to learn a participant’s identity. Furthermore, the primary investigator disabled
the storage of email addresses and disabled IP address collection for all collection
methods so that all data were collected anonymously. Additionally, no college names or
participant names were collected. Although this means that there is no possibility to
determine whether or not a participant completed the survey more than once, the security
of participant identity was a relatively more important protocol in this research study.
Demographic data collected could not be used to identify participants because surveys
were not coded with an existing data key to link codes to names. If participants chose to
enter the lottery drawing, email addresses were entered into a separate file from the
survey responses, and information from this file was not linked to the survey data file.
Copies of the first and second e-mails mentioned above can be found in Appendix B and
C.

Prior to conducting the research study appropriate Institutional Review Board
(IRB) approvals were obtained. There were 20 colleges requiring additional human
subjects permissions. These permissions were granted following additional application
processes with each college.

Summary statistics. The demographic variables were gender, age, teaching area,
tenure, and years of full-time service as a full-time faculty member. Of the 729
participants, 445 were female and 284 were male. The age ranged between 24 and 84 ($M$
$= 48.64$, $SD = 10.08$). Tenured faculty represented 585 participants. The remaining 144
participants were non-tenured with one participant reporting that their college offered no tenure system. The years of full-time service were reflected as follows: 24% \((n = 175)\) of participants reported having 5 or fewer years of experience; 25% \((n = 182)\) of participants reported having 6–10 years of experience; 22.2% \((n = 162)\) of participants reported having 11–15 years of experience, 12.8% \((n = 93)\) of participants reported having 16–20 years of experience; 8.9% \((n = 65)\) of participants reported having 21–25 years of experience; 3.4% \((n = 25)\) of participants reported having 26–30 years of experience, and 3.7% \((n = 27)\) of participants reported having 31 or more years of full-time service.

Years of fulltime service data are an important characteristic of community college faculty. Cumulatively, the results in this study indicate that 49% \((n = 357)\) of faculty members in the sample had 0 – 10 years of fulltime service at their institution. The years of fulltime service category showed between 11-15 years \((SD = 1.60)\). Ultimately, the years of fulltime experience category was collapsed into three separate 1, 0 dummy variables in regression ('1' if you have that level of experience; ‘0’ if you do not.)

A determination was made that the sample favorably represents the target population for this research. This determination is based on an evident alignment of the research sample with national demographic statistics of community college faculty. With regard to gender, previous research suggests that the proportion of male and female full-time community college faculty is evenly split (Townsend & Twombly, 2007). It is evident that the females may be slightly over-represented in the study. With regard to age, responses in this research conform to the 48.3 years average age reported in the National Study of Postsecondary Faculty (NSOPF) study (2005). In addition to the NSOPF data, Rosser and Townsend (2006) suggest the average age of full-time faculty
may be even closer to 50. The U.S. Department of Education (2005) presents another view, determining that 36% of all faculty were younger than 44; 32% were between the ages of 45 and 54; and 22% were between the ages of 55 and 64. Only 8% of faculty were older than 65. In regard to teaching area, Levin et al. (2006) reported that approximately 46% of all community college faculty teach in the liberal arts. Approximately 40% teach in professional areas (e.g., business and nursing); 8% in vocational areas, 4% in developmental education, and 2% in other areas.

The three Illinois community colleges that did not participate in the research study represented 328 full-time faculty. Each of the non-participating colleges were located in various parts of the state, close enough to other participating colleges, so that there was no concern that non-participating colleges would affect the representation of the sample. Also, the number of full-time faculty is representative of the numbers in similar colleges. There are an average of 98 (male, 45; female, 53) full-time faculty employed in the 48 community colleges in Illinois. In reference to the current research, other than one college, the representativeness of gender is on par with similar participating colleges. Colleges not participating included one college with 105 faculty (males, 44; female, 61), another with 178 faculty (males, 71; females, 107), and another with 45 faculty (females, 14; males, 31). The colleges excluded were all suburban community colleges. Two of the three colleges are among the larger in the state while one is among the smallest. The total reported population of full-time faculty is 4,681 in Illinois. There are no known reasons for non-response that may bias parameter estimates and their standard errors. The cases collected were based on population data provided through the Illinois Community College Board. Due to depending on institutions for distribution of the
survey to full-time faculty, an accurate count of full-time faculty members at each institution may have been inaccurate.

Table 1

Descriptive Statistics of Research Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender(^a)</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure(^b)</td>
<td>585</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>729</td>
<td>48.65</td>
<td>10.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of fulltime service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 – 5</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 – 10</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 – 15</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 – 20</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 – 25</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 – 30</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31+</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area of teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computing/IT</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial Arts</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drafting</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Childcare</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVOC</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developmental/Remedial Education</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Librarian</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselor</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. \(n = 729\). \(^a\)Reference category for gender is male. \(^b\)Reference category for tenure is tenured. The mean values for gender can be interpreted as the proportion of male faculty members. The mean values for years of fulltime service can be interpreted as the proportion of responses to each of the options on the survey. The mean value for areas of teaching can be interpreted as the proportion of responses for each option on the survey.
Instrument and Scales

Instrument Description

An Internet-based questionnaire developed by the researcher was used to collect data for this study. The survey incorporated multiple sections and each section was based on previously validated instruments. The survey was designed to take about 15 minutes to complete via an online service (http://www.surveymonkey.com). The survey consisted of six pages in the online version and required individuals to answer a statement indicating their consent to participate in this research project. Participants were required to respond to each item, otherwise they received a message indicating they missed an item that needed to be fixed before continuing. This step reduced the problem of having incomplete responses. Cases with empty item responses in the original data file were listwise deleted. Any cases were also removed in which the respondent indicated they were not fulltime faculty.

Scales

Organizational commitment. This scale was based on 24 items, specifically 8 items for each dimension of organizational commitment (affective, continuous, normative) that assessed community college faculty levels of organizational commitment. A sample question included, “It would be very hard for me to leave my organization right now, even if I wanted to.” Response categories ranged from 1 to 7, i.e., 1 (strongly disagree), 2 (disagree), 3 (slightly disagree), 4 (undecided), 5 (slightly agree), 6 (agree), and 7 (strongly agree). Commitment questions (3 – 26) were coded from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). Reverse coding for questions whose answers held the opposite meaning as the other questions was conducted. These questions were
commitment questions numbers 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 14, 20, 21 and 26 (Appendix A). As a result, the larger the average overall commitment score, the more committed the participant is to his/her organization.

**Job involvement.** This scale was based on Kanungo (1982) ten-item scale to gather information on community college faculty levels of job involvement. A sample question included, “I have very strong ties with my present job that would be very difficult to break.” The response categories ranged from 1 to 5, i.e., 1 (strongly disagree), 2 (disagree), 3 (neither agree/disagree), 4 (agree), and 5 (strongly agree). The questions whose answers held the opposite meaning as the other questions have reverse coding. These questions were 28 and 33 (Appendix A). As a result, the larger the average commitment score, the more involvement the participant has in his/her organization.

**Readiness to change.** The scale was based on 14 items that aimed to assess community college faculty readiness to change in a context scenario suggesting that their institution was soon undergoing substantial change, transactional or transformative in nature. This scale was based on a slightly modified version of Hanpachern’s (1997) 14-item scale. The stem question in the scale is “My willingness or openness to....” A sample statement included, “My willingness or openness to work more because of the change is.” The items underlying the readiness scale were measured on a Likert type scale with seven response categories ranging from 1 to 7, i.e. 1 (very unlikely), 2 (unlikely), 3 (slightly unlikely), 4 (undecided), 5 (slightly likely), 6 (likely), and 7 (very likely).” Questions with answers that held the opposite meaning as the other questions had reverse coding. These questions were 46 and 50. As a result, a large average readiness score implies a high level of readiness for change.
Reliability Analysis

Previous research attests to the reliability of each of the scales, with a Cronbach’s $\alpha$ of between .77 and .88 for affective commitment, .65 and .86 for normative commitment, and .69 and .84 for continuance commitment (Fields, 2002). For the job involvement items, Kanungo (1982) conceptualized the job involvement construct in terms of one’s psychological identification with work and his original uni-dimensional set of items demonstrated Cronbach’s $\alpha$ reliability scores of between .83 and .87. Kanungo’s measure also was reported to be valid in work by Blau (1985). Further, studies by Boshoff and Hoole (1998) found that the inventory designed by Kanungo was associated with both high construct validity and high internal reliability. In addition, this scale is cited as the clearest and most precise conceptualization of job involvement (Brown, 1996). The reliability of the Readiness to Change items is demonstrated by the Cronbach’s $\alpha$ of the instrument of .82 (Hanpachern, Morgan, & Griego, 1998). Subsequent studies have used the instrument and have continued to find good reliability (Madsen, Miller, & John, 2005). All questions offered the respondents the option of not answering by choosing “No response or N/A”. It is also important to note that Hanpachern piloted three versions of his scale and the Cronbach’s $\alpha$ of the final 14-item scale was measured to be .82, indicating favorable internal consistency (Hanpachern, et al., 1998).
Table 2

*Results from Reliability Analysis Using Cronbach’s α*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Cronbach’s α</th>
<th>Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective Commitment</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuance Commitment</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normative Commitment</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Involvement</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Readiness to Change</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Commitment is an average of the three commitment scales.

In order to assess reliability of the scales in my sample Cronbach’s α was calculated for each of scale included in this study. As reported in Table 2 all Cronbach’s α for the scales exceed .70, indicating strong reliability.

Table 3

*Collapsed Variables for Regression Models*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Lower</th>
<th>Upper</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job Involvement</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gendera</td>
<td>-0.33</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>-0.16</td>
<td>-4.50</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>-0.52</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>~0</td>
<td>~0</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>.436</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenureb</td>
<td>-0.19</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>-2.02</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td>-.44</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MST</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>-1.50</td>
<td>.135</td>
<td>-.36</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOC</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>.581</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 – 10</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>.754</td>
<td>-.27</td>
<td>.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 – 20</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>.038</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* n = 729. aReference category for gender is male. bReference category for tenure is tenured. MST = Math, Science, Technology; SOC = Social Sciences.
Table 3 provides the collapsed variables used in the research study’s linear regression models.

**Confirmatory Factor Analysis**

Another measure of validity of the final survey responses was provided by confirmatory factor analysis, a procedure recommended by Devellis (2003) to identify subscales within the constructs of academic, social, and personal adjustment that guided the development of the scales. Five constructs were considered in the research questions developed for this study: (a) affective commitment, (b) continuance commitment, (c) normative commitment, (d) job involvement, and (e) readiness to change.

### Table 4

*Eigenvalues and Percentages of Variance Associated with each Component*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Initial Eigenvalues</th>
<th></th>
<th>Cumulative %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Affective Commitment</td>
<td>7.37</td>
<td>21.67</td>
<td>21.67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Job Involvement</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>11.86</td>
<td>33.53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Continuance Commitment</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>8.01</td>
<td>41.54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Normative Commitment</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>7.22</td>
<td>48.76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4 represents the Eigenvalues and percentages of variance associated with each component. In the table, affective commitment explains the most variance out of all of the variables, specifically 21.67%. The four components explain 48.70%, or almost half, of the variance in the data. The Principal Axis Factoring (PAF) extraction was conducted on the survey questions associated with these constructs, and these factors were used as variables for the multivariate analysis. The sample size for this study was adequate to conduct confirmatory factor analysis ($n = 729$) based on Costello and
Osborne’s (2005) recommendation that 5 to 10 subjects per item be included in the analysis. Only one factor was extracted for each subscale. The purpose of this approach is that I justify the use of each scale based on prior research that used the same scales.

Principal axis factoring was conducted for the 34 survey items. The initial factoring revealed that six had eigenvalues greater than 1.0. All factors with eigenvalues greater than 1 would have been retained if the researcher had followed the Kaiser criterion. The reason for such logic is that if the eigenvalue is equal to 1.0, it contributes what any default generic variable would. If it is greater than 1.0, it contributes more than that generic variable. The scree plot also showed a significant elbow that proved to be interpretable.
Analytical Methodology

Table 5

*Statistical Methods used for Multiple Regression Model Building*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Question and Hypothesis</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Statistical Method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>RQ</strong>: What is the relationship between levels of organizational commitment and readiness to change among community college faculty?</td>
<td>Commitment, Affective Commitment, Normative Commitment, Continuance Commitment, Readiness to Change, Gender, Tenure Status, Areas of Teaching, Years of Full-time Service (Controls)</td>
<td>Correlation Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H1</strong>: As levels of organizational commitment increases, faculty readiness to change also increases.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Multiple Regression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H1a</strong>: As levels of affective commitment levels increases, faculty readiness to change also increases.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H1b</strong>: As levels of continuous commitment increases, faculty readiness to change also increases.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H1c</strong>: As levels of normative commitment increases, faculty readiness to change also increases.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RQ</strong>: What is the relationship between job involvement and readiness to change among community college faculty?</td>
<td>Job Involvement, Readiness to Change, Gender, Tenure Status, Areas of Teaching, Years of Full-time Service (Controls)</td>
<td>Correlation Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H2</strong>: As job involvement increases, faculty readiness to change also increases.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Multiple Regression</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5 displays a representation of the research questions and hypotheses, variables, and statistical tests preformed.

Analytical Approach

The researcher chose to use multiple regression whereas a multilevel model is more appropriate for the study dataset because it is of a nested structure with faculty members nested within colleges or colleges nested within broad geographical locations (Northern IL, Eastern IL, Central IL.). With a respondent-level multiple regression model, faculty members who come from the same college do not share any attributes,
which is not necessarily the case. As a matter of fact, faculty from the same college often share political views, have similar perceptions of effectiveness of college administration, tend to have similar research/teaching interests, are exposed to the same general environment, and are even located in geographical proximity. Given this possibility and because multiple regression is likely to generate relatively less accurate estimates, in order to guard against the possibility of making incorrect inferences a more stringent level of significance, \( \alpha = .01 \), instead of the customary .05, was employed.

**Regression Model Building Sequence**

The purpose of multiple regression is to understand the predictive relationship of the independent variables \((X)\) on the dependent variable \((Y)\). For the purposes of this study and to provide comparison across models, four linear regression models were created to test \(Y\) from \(X\). In order to see the contribution of demographic variables toward explaining variation in readiness, demographic controls were added to two of the models. The following regression models were used. Model one is \( R = f(\text{commitment} + \text{job involvement}) \); model two is \( R = f(\text{commitment} + \text{job involvement} + \text{demographic controls}) \); model three is \( R = f(\text{affective commitment, continuous commitment, normative commitment, } + \text{job involvement}) \); and model four is \( R = f(\text{affective commitment, continuous commitment, normative commitment, } + \text{job involvement} + \text{demographic controls}) \).

**Dummy Variables**

The remainder of the variables (gender, tenure, area of teaching, and years of full time service) were transformed into dummy variables. Below is a brief description for each control variable, and what each represents. The gender variable sought to identify...
the gender of participants. A categorical scale was employed utilizing a drop-down menu offering two options, male or female. (1 = male, 0 = female). The age variable was continuous and requested participants to enter their specific age asking, “What is your current age?” The teaching area variable requested participants to “choose all that apply” from 13 teaching area options that included an “other” space to write in an option that was not available in the roster of selections. Participants’ options included humanities, social sciences, science, math, business, computing/IT, nursing, industrial arts, drafting, childcare specialties, other vocational/occupational, developmental/remedial education, and/or other. The teaching area reference category is “Other,” and the years of full-time service category was replaced by six separate dummy variables in regression (‘1’ if you have that level of experience and 0 otherwise; all 0’s means 31+ years). A tenure variable required participants to identify their tenure status asking, “What is your tenure status?” Selections offered were tenured, non-tenured, or my institution does not offer tenure status (1 = tenured, 0 = non-tenured). Years of full-time service was also coded as an ordinal variable. Participants chose one from seven possible categories: 1 = 0 to 5 years, 2 = 6 to 10 years, 3 = 11 to 15 years, 4 = 16 to 20 years, 5 = 21 to 25 years, 6 = 26 to 30 years, 7 = 31+ years.

The interpretation of standardized factor scores is slightly different. When all regression variables are in the form of standardized factors, then: 1) a one-unit increase in the value of X is the same as a 1 SD increase in X and, 2) Partial slope coefficient (assume, b = 2.2) on an independent variable X can be interpreted as follows: An increase in 1 SD in the value of X raised Y by 2.2 SD.
Effect Size Cutoffs

For the purposes of this study, the researcher used effect size cutoffs recommended by Cohen (1992). These guidelines recommend that correlations < .20 are weakly correlated, between .20 and .40 are moderately correlated, and > .40 are considered strongly correlated. The researcher used $R^2$ scores, partial slope coefficients, and partial eta-squared values ($\eta^2_p$) to report effect size estimates.

Power Analysis and Sample Size Considerations

Priori power analysis. With $\alpha = .01$ power = .95, $f^2 = .15$, and 11 predictors, I obtained an a priori required sample size of 179, much smaller than $n = 729$. With $\alpha = .05$, power = .95, $f^2 = .15$, and 11 predictors, I obtained an a priori required sample of $n = 228$, still well below the $n = 729$ value. Other models have fewer predictors, thus the required sample sizes would be smaller. This means that there is more than the minimum number of cases required to detect a medium effect size. Keeping all of the settings above (except power) and using $n = 729$, a power value of approximately 1.0 was detected at both the $\alpha = .01$ and $\alpha = .05$ levels. This suggests that my multiple regression models are unlikely to miss an effect, even when small, if such an effect exists. Therefore, provided with power = .95, $\alpha = .05$, number of predictors = 11 and $n = 729$, it was determined that the data of this research could detect an effect size of .031 at $\alpha = .05$ level and an effect size of .038 at $\alpha = .01$ level.

Analysis of these data was structured to answer the research questions. All tests of significance were two-tailed and conducted at an alpha level of $\alpha = .01$ based on using multiple regression instead of a multilevel model such as a hierarchical linear model (HLM). A significance level of .01 was considered acceptable for controlling for Type I
and Type II errors (Green & Salkind, 2011). The research did not utilize a random sampling process, and the research was dependent on the good will of responding to the survey.

**Evaluation of model assumptions.** There are a number of statistical assumptions underlying the analytical methodology in this research. To determine the appropriateness of regression models and to be sure that assumptions are met or at least approximated to ensure reliable results, I evaluated a) normality of dependent and independent variables, b) heteroskedasticity, and c) multicollinearity and variance inflation factor ($VIF$).
Table 6

Collinearity Diagnostics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Collinearity Statistics</th>
<th>Tolerance</th>
<th>VIF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Job Involvement</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Job Involvement</td>
<td>0.985</td>
<td>1.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gender(^a)</td>
<td>0.982</td>
<td>1.018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>0.708</td>
<td>1.412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tenure(^b)</td>
<td>0.902</td>
<td>1.109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MST</td>
<td>0.686</td>
<td>1.459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SOC</td>
<td>0.676</td>
<td>1.478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 – 10</td>
<td>0.373</td>
<td>2.678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11 – 20</td>
<td>0.447</td>
<td>2.235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Affective</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Continuance</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Normative</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Job Involvement</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Affective</td>
<td>0.968</td>
<td>1.033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Continuance</td>
<td>0.942</td>
<td>1.062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Normative</td>
<td>0.971</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Job Involvement</td>
<td>0.985</td>
<td>1.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gender(^a)</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>0.703</td>
<td>1.422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tenure(^b)</td>
<td>0.875</td>
<td>1.142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MST</td>
<td>0.669</td>
<td>1.496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SOC</td>
<td>0.676</td>
<td>1.479</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 – 10</td>
<td>0.371</td>
<td>2.693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11 – 20</td>
<td>0.446</td>
<td>2.24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. \(^a\)Reference category for gender is male. \(^b\)Reference category for tenure is tenured. MST = Math, Science, Technology; SOC = Social Sciences.*

**Normality of dependent and independent variables.** Normality of variables can be checked by either statistical or graphical methods. It has been concluded that if the residual plots look normal, there is no reason to test the individual variables for normality (Garson, 1998; Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). If my residuals were not proven to be normal, then the standard errors of the regression coefficients are biased. Even in a
situation in which normality is not required, its existence makes for a stronger
assessment. An examination of the residual P-P plot for readiness to change (Figures 11)
was determined normal. Histograms (Figures 2–5) for our continuous variables in the
regression models are also provided and they, too, indicate the normality of variables
used in the regression. Skewness in the residuals is due to the dependent variable being
slightly skewed to the left.

Tests for homoscedasticity. Heteroscedasticity or the failure of
homoscedasticity is caused by either non-normality of one of the variables or by the fact
that one variable is related to a certain transformation of the other (Tabachnick & Fidell,
2007). For the purposes of this study, the researcher assessed a series of scatterplots
(Appendix F). The homoscedasticity assumption was checked by plotting the
standardized residual scores. A scatter plot of the standardized predicted variable by the
standardized residuals should show a random pattern across the entire range of predicted
variables (Garson, 1998) when regression errors occur in homoscedasticity. It is also
argued that in homoscedasticity violation, the scattered plot indicates a funnel shape of
data points (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). Figures 6–10 (Appendix E) indicate that the
assumption of linearity and homoscedasticity were not violated in our study. Data points
were found to cluster around a straight line that revealed the data were from normal
distribution for the dependent variable.

Multicollinearity and variance inflation factor (VIF). According to O’Sullivan
et al. (2003), multicollinearity can be detected by computing two related indices: (a)
tolerance and (b) variance inflation factor (VIF). Tolerance can be defined as $1 - R^2$,
where $R^2$ is the multiple $R$ of a given independent variable regressed on all other
independent variables. Since tolerance considers the independent variable in relation to all other independent ones and thus takes interaction into account as well as simple correlations, I used the rule of thumb of when tolerance is < .20, the dependent variable should be omitted from the analysis due to multicollinearity. These data show the variance inflation factor or the reciprocal of tolerance. When $VIF$ is high, there is multicollinearity and instability of the $b$ and beta coefficients. A common rule of thumb is that if $VIF = > 5$ then multicollinearity is high. Kutner (2010) cited a $VIF = > 10$ as a cut off value. The researcher used the $VIF = > 5$ cutoff for the purposes of this study. As shown in Table 6, a review of the tolerance and $VIF$ values revealed that there was not a problem of multicollinearity with predictors in our study.

In conclusion, all analyses of residuals were conducted through a review of histograms and scatterplots. This process is discussed further in chapter 4 and supporting figures (2—11) are presented in Appendices E—G.
CHAPTER 4

FINDINGS

This chapter presents the results of research that examined the levels of organizational commitment and job involvement as a determinant of readiness to change among community college faculty in Illinois. In addition to relationships among these primary variables, the study identified a moderate level relationship between the demographic control variable gender and readiness to change. Table 7 presents the results of the crosstabulation analysis for the demographic control variables teaching area, years of fulltime experience, gender, and tenure status. The chapter is organized into multiple sections to answer the primary research questions that guided the study.

Descriptive Statistics

This section provides cell-level n's by crosstabulation of categorical variables. Following crosstabulations of control variables, it was evident that many of the categorical cells had zeros or small cell sizes. Therefore, categories were collapsed within several variables. The resulting crosstabulations (Table 7) showed that small frequencies were still evident. This result implied that evaluation of interaction effects in our multiple regression models was not feasible.
### Table 7

**Cross Tabulation of Teaching Area, Years of Fulltime Experience, Gender, and Tenure**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching Area</th>
<th>Experience</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Tenure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 – 10</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11 – 20</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21 +</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 – 10</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11 – 20</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21 +</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 – 10</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11 – 20</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21 +</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. n = 729. Male = 284; Female = 445; Tenure = 585; Non-tenure = 144; No tenure = 1; MST = Mathematics, Science, and Technology; Other = all other teaching categories; SOC = Social Sciences.*

Table 8 below provides summary statistics for the continuous variables across each of the final categorical variables used in the regression models.
Table 8

Summary Statistics for Continuous Variables by Categorical Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Readiness</th>
<th>Affective</th>
<th>Normative</th>
<th>Continuance</th>
<th>Job Involvement</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Commitment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>442</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not tenured</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenured</td>
<td>585</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MST</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>~0</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOC</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 – 10</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 – 20</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21+</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. n = 729. MST = Mathematics, Science, and Technology; Other = all other teaching categories; SOC = Social Sciences.*
Reliability and Factor Analysis

Table 9

*Factor Loadings for Varimax Orthogonal Rotation with Four Factors Extracted*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Item</th>
<th>AC</th>
<th>JI</th>
<th>CC</th>
<th>NC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. I would be very happy to spend the rest of my career with this organization.</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I enjoy discussing my organization with people outside it.</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I really feel as if this organization’s problems are my own.</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I think that I could easily become attached to another organization as I am to this one.</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I do not feel like “part of the family” at my organization.</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I do not feel “emotionally attached”</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. This organization has a great deal of personal meaning for me.</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I do not feel a strong sense of belonging to my organization.</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. I am not afraid of what might happen if I quit my job without having another one lined up.</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. It would be very hard for me to leave my organization right now, even if I wanted to.</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Too much of my life would be disrupted if I decided I wanted to leave my organization right now.</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. It wouldn’t be too costly for me to leave my organization now.</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>-.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Right now, staying with my organization is a matter of necessity as much as desire.</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. I feel that I have too few options to consider leaving this organization</td>
<td>-.24</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>-.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. One of the few serious consequences of leaving this organization would be the security of available alternatives.</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>-.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. One of the major reasons I continue to work for this organization is that leaving would require considerable personal sacrifice – another organization may not match the overall benefits I have.</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. I think that people these days move from company to company too often.</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. I do not believe that a person must always be loyal to his or her organization.</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Jumping from organization to organization does not seem at all unethical to me.</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey Item</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>JI</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>NC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. One of the major reasons I continue to work for this organization is that I believe that loyalty is important and therefore feel a sense of moral obligation to remain.</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. If I got another offer for a better job elsewhere, I would not feel it was right to leave my organization.</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. I was taught to believe in the value of remaining loyal to one’s organization.</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Things were better in the days when people stayed with one organization for most of their careers.</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. I do not think that wanting to be a “company man” or “company woman” is sensible anymore.</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. The most important things that happen to me involve my present job.</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. To me, my job is only a small part of who I am.</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. I am very much involved personally in my job.</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. I live. Eat, and breathe my job.</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Most of my interests are centered around my job.</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. I have very strong ties with my present job that would be very difficult to break.</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Usually I feel detached from my job.</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Most of my personal life goals are job-oriented.</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. I consider my job to be very central to my existence.</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. I like to be absorbed in my job most of the time.</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Scale items are grouped by the factor on which they loaded rather than the order in which they appeared on the survey instrument. All factor loadings used to determine the factor assignment are shown in boldface. Items that were reverse coded were previously indicated. AC = Affective Commitment; JI = Job Involvement; CC = Continuous Commitment; NC = Normative Commitment.

As presented in Table 9, the results of the confirmatory factor analysis indicate the existence of four distinctive factors and most of the specific scale items loaded onto these factors are in line with the originally identified study scales. Two of the 34 items required further examination, however: Question 32 – I have very strong ties with my present job that would be very difficult to break, and Question 33 – Usually I feel detached from my job. Since the factor loading for job involvement for both items was
greater than 0.3, and since each item correlated positively with both job involvement and affective commitment factors, for the purposes of this study these items were retained in their original assignment of job involvement to preserve as much continuity with the original scale as possible.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. AC</td>
<td>.36**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. CC</td>
<td>-.24**</td>
<td>-.15**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. NC</td>
<td>.19**</td>
<td>.35**</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. JI</td>
<td>.21**</td>
<td>.37**</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.34**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. C</td>
<td>.17**</td>
<td>.67**</td>
<td>.43**</td>
<td>.71**</td>
<td>.42**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. GEN*</td>
<td>-.16**</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. AGE</td>
<td>~0</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. TENb</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. MST</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.14*</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. SOC</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.10*</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.10*</td>
<td>-.56**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. 0 – 10</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.12*</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>~0</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.43**</td>
<td>-.13**</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. 11 – 20</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.15**</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.72**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. n = 729.*Reference category for gender is male. bReference category for tenure is tenured. R = Readiness to Change, AC = Affective Commitment, CC = Continuous Commitment, NC = Normative Commitment, JI = Job Involvement, C = Commitment (Averaged), GEN = Gender, TEN = Tenure, MST = Math, Science, Technology, SOC = Social Sciences, 0–10 and 11–20 (Years of Fulltime Experience). *p < .01, **p < .001.
Results of Bivariate Correlation and Regression Analysis

Bivariate Correlations

Table 10 provides the bivariate correlation results. Coefficients between each pair of variables were computed in order to identify statistically significant relationships. As can be seen in Table 10, there were 25 statistically significant relationships indicated. Of particular interest, however, are the statistically significant relationships between the predictor variables and readiness to change. Several control variables indicated a significant relationship with the dependent variable and warrant mention.

Correlation analysis provides only partial support for my hypotheses because of the presence of moderating effects. As presented in our conceptual framework and as stated in the research hypotheses, faculty readiness to change is positively correlated to levels of organizational commitment and to levels of job involvement. Table 10 does indicate support for all but one of the hypotheses, but this support might be considered weak due to the analysis not controlling for demographic control variables. In the correlation analysis, affective commitment, normative commitment, overall commitment (averaged), and job involvement show a significant and positive correlation to readiness to change, but continuous commitment suggests a significant yet negative correlation to readiness to change. Below is the presentation of the correlation results.

Readiness to change was moderately and positively associated with overall organizational commitment, \( r = .17, p < .001 \), suggesting that an increase in overall organizational commitment was associated with an increase in readiness to change. This finding does support \( H_1 \), asserting that as levels of organizational commitment increase, faculty readiness to change increases.
Readiness to change was moderately and positively correlated with affective commitment, \( r = .36, p < .001 \). This suggests that an increase in affective commitment was associated with an increase in readiness to change. These correlational findings support \( H_{1a} \) positing that as levels of affective commitment increase, faculty readiness to change also increases.

On the other hand, readiness to change was moderately and negatively correlated to continuous commitment, \( r = -.24, p < .001 \), suggesting that an increase in continuous commitment was associated with a decrease in readiness to change. These correlational findings suggest that \( H_{1b} \) is not verified because as levels of continuous commitment increase, readiness to change decreases.

Readiness to change was moderately and positively correlated to normative commitment, \( r = .19, p < .001 \). This result says that an increase in normative commitment was associated with an increase in readiness to change. The findings support \( H_{1c} \) stating that as levels of normative commitment increase, faculty readiness to change also increases.

\( H_2 \) is supported based on strength of correlation between readiness to change and job involvement. Readiness to change was moderately and positively correlated to job involvement, \( r = .21, p < .011 \), suggesting that an increase in job involvement was associated with an increase in readiness to change.

Although the research did not aim to explore control variables or to report their implications, readiness to change also displayed significant relationships between at least one control variable. Readiness to change displayed a moderate and negative correlation to gender, \( r = -.16, p < .001 \), suggesting that female faculty have a stronger likelihood for
readiness to change than male faculty members. Overall commitment was strongly and positively correlated to job involvement, \( r = .42, p < .001 \), suggesting that an increase in overall commitment was associated with an increase in job involvement.

Overall, the correlation results conform to the study predictions of a positive relationship between levels of organizational commitment (overall, affective, normative), job involvement, and readiness to change. In contrast, the results for continuance commitment do not conform to the study predictions. In the next section, multiple regression analyses aim to identify if those relationships identified as significant or not through correlation analysis tend to shift when control variables are added into the equation.

**Multiple Regression**

The previous correlation analysis offers tentative support for the predicted direction of effects of several target independent variables on readiness to change. A stricter form of hypothesis testing is in order, however, namely an approach that looks at the effects of the target variables in the face of important control variables. The model used to provide such a test is ordinary least squares (OLS) multiple regression.

The regression model building sequence applied in this study took into account information gleaned from earlier stages of data compilation and analysis including: compiling and coding the data, factor analysis results, and treatment of outliers. Although treatment of missing data is also typically addressed before proceeding to data analysis, there was no missing data in this study because any respondent who chose *part time* was excluded from the rest of the survey. Also, all questions needed to be answered before continuing, so no data items were missing.
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Using multiple regression, the study aimed to examine how overall commitment, affective commitment, normative commitment, continuance commitment, job involvement, and control variables predict community college faculty readiness to change. Tables 11—14 present four linear regression models. Following each model, results are interpreted with special emphasis on whether they support the study’s hypotheses.

Table 11

*Model 1: Multiple Regression Model Predicting Readiness to Change from Overall Commitment and Job Involvement*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>99% CI Lower</th>
<th>99% CI Upper</th>
<th>( \hat{r}^2 )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall commitment</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job involvement</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>.020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. \( R^2 = .034 \) (Adjusted \( R^2 = .031 \)).*

**Model 1.** The first model predicted readiness to change from an averaged overall commitment factor score and job involvement. Regression results for the partial slope coefficient for overall commitment, \( b = 0.12, p = .001 \), showed that, all else held to significant reference levels, an increase in 1 SD for overall commitment caused 0.12 SD increase in readiness to change. In the population, the partial slope coefficient for overall commitment ranges between 0.03 and 0.21 with 99% confidence.

The partial slope coefficient for job involvement, \( b = 0.14, p < .001 \), showed that, all else held to significant reference levels, an increase in 1 SD for job involvement caused a 0.14 SD increase in readiness to change. In the population, the partial slope coefficient for job involvement ranges between 0.05 and 0.23 with 99% confidence.
Table 11 also reports eta-squared values for overall commitment and job involvement. The eta-squared value for overall commitment is 1.5%, indicating that 1.5% of the total variation in readiness to change is attributable directly to variation in overall commitment in this model. The eta-squared value for job involvement is 2% indicating that 2% of the variation in readiness to change is attributed to job involvement in this model.

The first regression model examined the effects of overall organizational commitment and job involvement on readiness to change. Overall commitment level results showed that faculty readiness to change increased as a result of overall increase in organizational commitment. This result confirmed the relevant conclusions of the correlation analysis that there was a positive association between these two variables. Model 2 takes includes demographic variables to understand if their inclusion has any effect on relationship between these variables.

Table 12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>99% CI</th>
<th>( R^2 )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.03 - 0.22</td>
<td>0.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job involvement</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>0.05 - 0.24</td>
<td>0.023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control effects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender(^a)</td>
<td>-0.33</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>-4.53</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>-0.48 - 0.13</td>
<td>0.028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (^b)</td>
<td>~0</td>
<td>~0</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.436</td>
<td>-0.01 - 0.01</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure (^b)</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>-2.02</td>
<td>0.043</td>
<td>-0.38 - 0.08</td>
<td>0.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MST</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>-1.50</td>
<td>0.135</td>
<td>-0.24 - 0.19</td>
<td>0.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOC</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.581</td>
<td>-0.18 - 0.26</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 – 10 years</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.754</td>
<td>-0.01 - 0.40</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 – 20 years</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.048</td>
<td>-0.07 - 0.51</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. \(^a\)Reference category for gender is male. \(^b\)Reference category for tenure is tenured. MST = Math, Science, Technology; SOC = Social Sciences. \( R^2 = .083 \) (Adjusted \( R^2 = .071 \).
**Model 2.** The second model predicted readiness to change from an averaged overall commitment factor, job involvement, and demographic controls. Regression results of the partial slope coefficient for overall commitment, $b = 0.13 \ p < .001$, showed that, all else held to significant reference levels, an increase by 1 $SD$ for overall commitment means an increase of 0.13 $SD$ in readiness to change. In the population, the partial slope coefficient for overall commitment ranges between 0.03 and 0.22 with 99% confidence.

The partial slope coefficient for job involvement, $b = 0.15, \ p < .001$, showed that, all else held to significant reference levels, an increase in 1 $SD$ for job involvement means an increase of 0.15 $SD$ in readiness to change. In the population, the partial slope coefficient for job involvement ranges between 0.05 and 0.24 with 99% confidence.

Regression results for demographic control predictors were not all significant. The only predictor identified as significant at $\alpha = .01$ in predicting readiness to change is gender. The coefficients for other controls were not evaluated due to their small coefficient values.

The partial slope coefficient for gender, $b = -0.33, \ p < .001$, indicated that, all else held to significant reference levels, being a male decreases readiness to change by 0.33 $SD$ compared to a similarly situated female. In the population, the partial slope coefficient for gender ranges between -0.48 and -0.13 with 99% confidence.

Table 12 also reports eta-squared value for overall commitment, job involvement, and all demographic control variables. The eta-squared value reported for overall commitment is 1.7%, meaning that 1.7% of the total variation in readiness to change is attributable directly to variation in overall commitment. This value is a slightly, albeit an
insignificant increase, higher than was reported in the model 1 eta-squared value. The eta-squared value for job involvement is 2.3%, meaning that 2.3% of the total variation in readiness to change is attributable directly to variation in job involvement. This value is a slightly, albeit an insignificant increase, higher than what was reported in the model 1 eta-squared value. The eta-squared value for gender is 2.8% and is therefore able to contribute 2.8% of the total understanding of readiness to change to gender.

In the second regression model, the intent was to identify if demographic control variables increased or decreased the effect of $X$ on $Y$. The demographic variables included gender, age, tenure, teaching area, and years of fulltime teaching experience. This model was used to look at overall organizational commitment and job involvement with the demographic controls.

Table 13

Model 3: Multiple Regression Model Predicting Readiness to Change from Affective, Normative, Continuance Commitment and Job Involvement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>$b$</th>
<th>$SE$</th>
<th>$t$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
<th>99% CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>9.90</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>0.25 0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normative</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.01 0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuance</td>
<td>-0.22</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-6.64</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>-0.30 -0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job involvement</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>0.05 0.23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Model 3. The third model predicted readiness to change from affective, normative, continuance commitment and job involvement. Regression results for the partial slope coefficient for affective commitment, $b = 0.33$, $p < .001$, showed that, all else held to significant reference levels, an increase in 1 SD for affective commitment caused readiness to change to increase by 0.33 SD. In the population, the partial slope coefficient for affective commitment ranges between 0.25 and 0.42 with 99% confidence.
The partial slope coefficient for normative commitment, $b = 0.10$, $p = .004$, indicated that, all else held to significant reference levels, an increase in 1 $SD$ for normative commitment caused readiness to change to increase 0.10 $SD$. In the population, the partial slope coefficient for normative commitment ranges between 0.01 and 0.18 with 99% confidence. The effect of normative commitment on readiness to change from this result is low.

The partial slope coefficient for continuance commitment, $b = -0.22$, $p < .001$, indicated that, all else held to significant reference levels, an increase in 1 $SD$ for continuance commitment caused readiness to change to decrease 0.22 $SD$. In the population, the partial slope coefficient for continuance commitment ranges between -0.30 and -0.14 with 99% confidence.

The partial slope coefficient for job involvement, $b = 0.14$, $p < .001$, showed that, all else held to significant reference levels, an increase in 1 $SD$ for job involvement means that there is an increase by 0.14 $SD$ in readiness to change. In the population, the partial slope coefficient for job involvement ranges between 0.05 and 0.23 with 99% confidence.

In the third regression model, the intent was to identify the relationship between each of the commitment contingencies of affective, normative, continuance commitment, and job involvement to readiness to change. This model did not factor in demographic variables in order to first understand the relationships between each level of commitment to readiness to change. The fourth and final model incorporated the demographic controls to test for any significant effect on the relationship between each commitment level to readiness to change.
Table 14

Model 4: Multiple Regression Model Predicting Readiness to Change from Affective, Normative, Continuance Commitment, Job Involvement and Demographic Controls

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>$b$</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>$t$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
<th>99% CI Lower</th>
<th>99% CI Upper</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affective</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normative</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>0.019</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuance</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-5.88</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>-0.29</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job involvement</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control effects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender$^a$</td>
<td>-0.31</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>-4.50</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>-0.44</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.760</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure$^b$</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>-1.74</td>
<td>0.083</td>
<td>-0.33</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MST</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>-0.28</td>
<td>0.778</td>
<td>-0.19</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOC</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.615</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 – 10 years</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.746</td>
<td>-0.18</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 – 20 years</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>0.026</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. $^a$Reference category for gender is male. $^b$Reference category for tenure is tenured.
MST = Math, Science, Technology; SOC = Social Sciences.

Model 4. The fourth model predicted readiness to change from affective, normative, continuance commitment, job involvement, and demographic controls. The partial slope coefficient for affective commitment, $b = 0.34$, $p < .001$, indicated that, all else held to significant reference levels, an increase by 1 SD in affective commitment caused an increase by 0.34 SD in readiness to change. In the population, the partial slope coefficient on affective commitment ranges between 0.25 and 0.43 with 99% confidence.

The partial slope coefficient for normative commitment, $b = 0.08$, $p = .019$, indicated that, all else held to significant reference levels, an increase by 1 SD in normative commitment caused an increase 0.08 SD in readiness to change. In the population, the partial slope coefficient for normative commitment ranges between -0.01 and 0.17 with 99% confidence. The effect of normative commitment on readiness to change from this result remained low and unchanged from model 3. This suggested that
control variables have insignificant bearing on a level of normative commitment influencing higher levels of readiness to change.

Regression results showed the partial slope coefficient for continuance commitment, \( b = -0.20, p < .001 \), indicated that, all else held to significant reference levels, an increase by \( ISD \) increase in continuance commitment caused readiness to change to decrease by 0.20 \( SD \). In the population, the partial slope coefficient on continuance commitment ranges between -0.29 and -0.11 with 99% confidence.

Regression results showed the partial slope coefficient for job involvement, \( b = -0.15, p < .001 \), indicated that, when other predictor variables are held constant, an increase by 1 \( SD \) in job involvement caused readiness to change to increase 0.15 \( SD \). In the population, the partial slope coefficient for job involvement ranges between 0.06 and 0.23 with 99% confidence. Similar to model 2, regression results for demographic control predictors were not all significant. Those predictors identified as significant in predicting readiness to change are presented. The coefficients for other controls were not evaluated due to their small coefficient values.

The partial slope coefficient for gender, \( b = -0.31, p < .001 \), indicated that, all else held to significant reference levels, being male subtracts 0.33 \( SD \) to readiness to change compared to a similarly situated female. On average, males are about a third of a point less likely to be ready for change than females. In the population, the partial slope coefficient for gender ranges between -0.44 and -0.17 with 99% confidence.

In the fourth regression model, the intent was to identify if demographic control variables increased or decreased the effect of \( X \) on \( Y \). The demographic variables included gender, age, tenure, teaching area, and years of fulltime teaching experience.
Conclusion

This chapter provided a summary of findings that show faculty readiness to change can be moderately predicted on account of their overall organizational commitment, affective commitment, normative commitment, and job involvement. Continuance commitment showed a moderate but negative relationship to readiness to change. Although I did not originally plan to discuss demographic control variables in direct relationship to readiness to change, at least one of the demographic variables, gender, did emerge as a moderate predictor of readiness to change.
CHAPTER 5
DISCUSSION

The overarching purpose of this study was to develop an understanding of the community college faculty experience. While there are many opportunities to learn about community college faculty, one way to do provide new insights to faculty was to design a study to understand if varying levels of organizational commitment and job involvement helped in any way to predict community college faculty members’ readiness to change. This chapter provides a discussion of the major findings of the research, conclusions and implications, and recommendations for future study.

Findings

The purpose of this study was to answer the overarching question, “What is the relationship between community college faculty members’ levels of organizational commitment and job involvement to their readiness to change?” Two questions guided analysis of the data, which was collected through an Internet-based survey developed by combining questions from two pre-developed and validated instruments. The research employed the 24-item Affective, Normative, and Continuance Commitment Scale developed by Meyer and Allen (1997) and an adapted 10-item scale devised by Kanungo (1982) on job involvement. To collect data on the dependent variable, this study adopted a slightly modified version of Hanpachern’s (1997) 14-item scale. A discussion of the major findings for each research question is presented in the following subsections.
Correlation analysis provided first-level analysis to address my research questions and hypotheses. The support from the bivariate correlations provided partial support for validating hypotheses. However, the bivariate correlation analysis looked at relationships without accommodating the impact of control variables. Through the subsequent multiple regression analyses, stronger support was provided in support of several hypotheses. In at least two of the regression models, I controlled for demographic control variables to understand if the relationships between predictor and outcome variables held in the face of control variables. Consequently, regression analysis provided stronger evidence in support of several study hypotheses.

**Research question 1. What is the relationship between levels of organizational commitment and readiness to change among community college faculty?** This question was developed to identify the relationship between levels of organizational commitment and readiness to change among community college faculty. This research question included $H_1$, $H_{1a}$, $H_{1b}$, and $H_{1c}$ to examine if overall organizational commitment levels, as well as the separate levels of affective, normative, and continuous organizational commitment, had any effect on readiness to change.

$H_1$. **As levels of organizational commitment increase, faculty readiness to change also increases.** The hypothesis examined the effect of overall organizational commitment levels on readiness to change. An initial step in addressing this was correlation analysis the results of which indicated that levels of overall organizational commitment were positively correlated to readiness to change. Similar findings were discovered from the regression analyses, suggesting that there was an effect on overall organizational commitment levels and readiness to change.
**H₁a. As levels of affective commitment levels increase, faculty readiness to change also increases.** The hypothesis examined if there was an effect between affective commitment levels on readiness to change. An initial step in addressing this relationship, again, was correlation analysis. These results indicated that there was a relationship between affective commitment and readiness to change. As levels of affective commitment increased so did respondents’ readiness to change. It is also worth noting that the correlation value between affective commitment and readiness to change was the highest correlation value reported among the target commitment variables. In other research exploring affective commitment, it is suggested that another way to view high levels of affective commitment is when employees viewed their personal employment relationship as congruent to the goals and values of the organization (Beck & Wilson, 2000). Similar findings regarding the relationship between affective commitment and readiness to change were discovered from follow-up regression analyses. These regression results showed that there was a positive effect between affective commitment levels and readiness to change – even in the face of demographic controls. This meant that when faculty members’ affective commitment levels increased, an increase in readiness to change occurred.

**H₁b. As levels of continuous commitment increase, faculty readiness to change also increases.** The hypothesis examined if there was any effect of continuous commitment levels on readiness to change. In line with the effort to understand these relationships, an initial bivariate correlation analysis was undertaken. Results indicated that levels of continuous commitment were moderately and negatively correlated to readiness to change. This test suggested that when levels of continuous commitment
increase, levels of readiness to change decrease. This was the only dependent variable with a negative relationship to readiness to change. This result was contrary to the predictions of a study hypothesis. Follow-up regression analyses including controls garnered similar results.

**H1c. As levels of normative commitment increase, faculty readiness to change also increases.** This hypothesis examined if there was any effect of normative commitment levels on readiness to change. An initial step in addressing this relationship was bivariate correlation analysis, which indicated a positive correlation between normative commitment and readiness to change. Follow up regression analysis including controls offered similar results. Regression results showed that if normative commitment levels increased, then readiness to change levels also increased. These findings suggested with greater certainty that normative commitment has a positive effect on readiness to change among community college faculty.

**Research question 2. What is the relationship between job involvement and readiness to change among community college faculty?** This question was developed to identify the relationship between levels of job involvement and readiness to change among community college faculty. This research question included H2 to determine if job involvement had positive effects on readiness to change?

**H2. As job involvement increases, faculty readiness to change also increases.** The hypothesis examined if job involvement levels had an effect on increasing faculty readiness to change. As with the other predictor variables, the initial step in addressing this hypothesis involved bivariate correlation analysis. These results indicated that there was a positive relationship between job involvement and readiness to change. Similar
findings were discovered from the regression analyses performed between job involvement and readiness to change. The positive connection between job involvement and readiness to change was a strong indicator that the more involved faculty were in their work, the more likely they would be ready for change.

**Discussion**

Faculty readiness to change is an important topic for discussion. Community college faculty are considered a major labor force in the United States and constitute one-third of all post secondary education faculty (Levin, 2006), and serve more than 44% of the nation’s postsecondary students (Kirst & Venezia, 2004). It is clearly shown in the literature that community colleges will continue to face changes internally and externally both influencing how they operate. To respond to these changes, community colleges need faculty capable of teaching students how to become reasonably efficient lifelong learners (Cohen & Brawer, 2003). Understanding faculty experiences is important, and being able to gauge their readiness to change and subsequently how vested they are in these changes is even more important. It is no secret that community college faculty have high workloads, low levels of professional support, and typically are working with students who have a lot to learn just to catch up with more advantaged peers who are attending the nation’s four-year colleges and universities (Grubb, 1999; McGrath & Spear, 1991; Kozeracki, 2002). Change within any organization can be particularly challenging, and organizational readiness for change is as valuable and relevant at the individual level of the organization as it is to small groups or teams, divisions, or the organization as a whole is critical (Weiner, 2009).
This study attempted to identify if organizational commitment and job involvement were determinants to readiness to change, and based on the results, several conclusions are drawn. It is important to mention that this study is among the first that purposely modeled organizational commitment and job involvement as primary predictors of community college faculty members’ readiness to change. In line with the findings of this study, several important themes emerged. These themes are discussed below.

**Organizational commitment levels predict readiness to change.** My findings for overall organizational commitment levels and readiness to change are in line with research that also focused on organizational commitment and change. One example includes a study that focused on a large public hospital in Australia. In this early work, Iverson (1996) identified that overall organizational commitment has a significant impact on the degree of acceptance towards organizational change. Vakola and Nikolaou (2005) studied that same link between readiness to change and organizational commitment and found a similar relationship. Organizational commitment is here defined using three connected factors that included a strong acceptance of the organization’s values and goals, a willingness to exert considerable effort on behalf of the organization, and a strong desire to maintain membership in the organization. This study’s research results confirmed a positive relationship between commitment to the organization and readiness to change. In another non-academic study, Madsen, Miller, and John (2005) examined the relationship between change readiness, organizational commitment and social relationships in the workplace. In their study, organizational commitment yielded a moderately strong relationship with change readiness. Another more recent study further
confirmed our study results. In this particular study by Barber (2010), a similar result of a moderate positive correlation between change readiness and organizational commitment was reported. Barber’s work focused on change readiness of frontline workers in a nursing home.

The current research confirmed that affective commitment is regarded as the primary component of overall organizational commitment due to its strong and consistent correlations with a number of organizational and individual level outcomes (Elias, 2009). In this study, affective commitment showed the most significant and positive relationship toward readiness to change. Organizations are therefore encouraged to focus on improving, or at least maintaining, levels of affective commitment, especially when change may occur within the organization. Administrators leading faculty must identify strategies to connect faculty with the organization in a manner that fosters a deep interest in its ongoing stability and overall success. Solinger et al. (2008) further suggested that affective commitment was especially relevant when employees were expected to adjust to organizational change and to help organizations overcome difficulties.

This study’s result for affective commitment confirmed the evidence from the literature that affective organizational commitment was one of the most important determinants of successful organizational change (Darwish 2000; Iverson and Buttigieg 1998; Iverson 1996). Nordin (2012) conducted a study in a higher education setting that shows that affective commitment showed the strongest contribution to explain organizational readiness for change. Regression analysis in McKay, Kuntz, and Naswall’s (2013) study indicate that affective commitment may play an important role as antecedent to both change readiness and change resistance. In fact, affective commitment
emerged as a strong predictor of both change readiness and resistance to change. Specifically, affective commitment was significantly and positively related with perceptions of change as appropriate to the organization. The current study also confirmed that affective commitment had a slightly higher effect on readiness to change.

The most unexpected finding from my study was that continuance commitment had significant, although negative, impacts on readiness to change. Possibly this result is a consequence of the fact that continuance commitment is an extrinsic form of commitment related to economic and instrumental benefits (Johnson & Chang 2006). No other research study, however, has found a negative relationship between continuance commitment and change readiness. In the case of my study, one reason that we may see this result was due to the high representation of tenured faculty \( n = 510/729 \).

Continuance commitment, again, refers to commitment based on the costs that the employee associates with leaving the organization (due to the high cost of leaving). Potential antecedents of continuance commitment tend to include age, tenure, career satisfaction and intent to leave (Madi et al., 2012). In the past, age and tenure have been identified to function as predictors of continuance commitment, primarily because of their roles as surrogate measures of investment in the organization (Mayer & Allen, 1997). The result of holding tenure status and continuous commitment levels having significant and negative influence on readiness to change might be due to the idea that tenured faculty realize the increased recognition of the costs associated with quitting (Becker, 1960), which was later labeled as continuance commitment (Meyer & Allen, 1991, 1997). In effect, a sense of having to start over at a new institution also may contribute to this attitude. Tenured faculty represented 80% of the total responses
recorded in my study and this, too, may be a factor in continuous commitment being moderately and negatively associated with readiness to change. Continuance commitment involves a person’s bond to an organization based on what it would cost that person to leave the company. Continuance commitment echoes Becker’s (1960) side-bet theory, and employees with continuance commitment remain with an organization out of need or to avoid the perceived cost of leaving. Another way to look at this context of commitment is that employees with high levels of continuance commitment deserve special attention when an organization plans change initiatives. For example, perhaps some special training is required that targets such faculty and addresses any underlying fears of and cynicism toward change efforts. The other suggestion is that administration should work diligently to maintain engagement with faculty with tenure status.

Normative commitment levels are correlated to readiness to change and have a moderate and positive relationship to readiness to change, but this variable was associated with slightly lower levels of significance versus affective commitment and continuance commitment. This is in line with previous research indicating that correlation patterns for antecedent and outcome measures were stronger for affective than normative commitment (Meyer & Allen, 1997). Based on Herscovitch and Meyer’s (2002) conceptualization of normative commitment to change, the obligation to support a change initiative will increase as long as employees perceive it as their duty to support this initiative. Again, normative commitment involves a feeling of moral obligation to continue working for a particular organization. For any number of reasons, such as a feeling of indebtedness, need for reciprocity or organizational socialization, normatively
committed employees feel that they ought to remain with the organization (Meyer & Allen, 1991).

One additional important observation about the discrete commitment levels is the previously identified positive relationship between affective and normative commitment. Several studies discovered stronger than expected correlations of normative to affective commitment. Hence, it has been suggested that an employee’s affective attachment to an organization was not independent of her/his sense of obligation to stay at that organization (Hackett et al., 1994). In other words, there was a natural link between affective and normative commitment. Results from my correlation analysis indicated a moderately and positive relationship between normative commitment and affective commitment, \( r = .35, p < .001 \). In research that centered on nursing faculty, the presence of affective and normative commitment enabled faculty to derive a sense of positive energy from the work environment. Findings from Gormley and Kennerly (2010) that looked at the influence of work role and perceptions of climate on faculty organizational commitment suggest that commitment and, thus, retention of faculty might be enhanced by designing a work environment consistent with enhancing the affective and normative dimensions of commitment.

**Job involvement predicts readiness to change and correlates to commitment.**

Readiness to change was moderately and positively correlated to job involvement, \( r = .21, p < .011 \) and in the regression models the effect of job involvement on readiness to change indicated a moderately positive effect, \( b = 0.15, p < .001 \). This finding indicated that within organizations with a strong job involvement culture, employees were likely to be open and ready to organizational change. These results signaled that college
administrators should encourage faculty involvement in institutional activities such as committee work or other types of engagement that extend beyond typical classroom teaching in order to influence faculty readiness to change. As demonstrated in my research results, more involved faculty has an increased likelihood for readiness to change. There were no research studies discovered that linked job involvement to readiness to change within a higher education setting.

Another interesting relationship, although not central to my research study, was the moderate and positive correlation between job involvement and both affective, \( p = .37, p < .001 \), and normative commitment, \( p = .34, p < .001 \), levels. Although this finding was not predicted, it confirmed that there was a relationship between job involvement and faculty members’ levels of affective and normative commitment. In my study, job involvement also indicated an insignificant correlation to continuous commitment.

Tansky, Gallagher and Wetzel (1997) and Cohen (1999) previously confirmed the relationship between job involvement and organizational commitment in other work environments. In research conducted by Khan, Jam, Akbar, Khan, and Hijazi (2011), results revealed that job involvement is positively related to organizational commitment, and more specifically to each level including affective commitment, continuance commitment, and normative commitment. These findings are consistent with the finding of Brown (1996) that organizational commitment is an outcome of job involvement.

Job involvement is a basic and important factor in most people's lives, since employees are emotionally affected by the extent to which they are involved in their job or tired of it (Word & Park, 2009). Employees with high levels of job involvement
tended to significantly benefit the organization (Diefendorff et al., 2002), and were likely to be satisfied with their jobs as well as highly committed to their careers and their organizations (Brown 1996; Carson et al., 1995; Cohen, 1995). The relationship between job involvement and commitment was represented in the literature (Brown, 1996; Loui, 1995). Committed employees were documented as placing extra effort to contribute towards the success of the organization, which consequently leads to higher performance (Meyer et al., 1989).

The results of a study conducted by Chughtai (2008) centered on understanding the impact of job involvement on the self-report measures of in role job performance and organizational citizenship behavior. The results indicated that commitment is significantly and positively related to both in-role and extra-role performance. It follows that interventions aimed at simultaneously increasing job involvement and organizational commitment can be a potent method to increase both types of performance. While Chughtai’s work is not directly linked to academics or the dependent variable of readiness to change, it lends worthwhile insight into the correlation between organizational commitment and job involvement. For example, these two variables are important to each other in terms of determining employee behavior or attitude toward their work. In conclusion, job involvement calculated by employee’s abrupt responses to the work and responses generated by norms, structures and policies of the organization, has also been shown to enhance the satisfaction, loyalty and motivation towards the organization (Salami, 2008).

**Gender is a good predictor to readiness to organizational change.** Although demographic variables were not part of the research questions or overarching purpose of
study, gender emerged as one significant predictor of readiness to change that is worth discussing. Female faculty displayed stronger readiness to change than male faculty, and this finding was consistent in both the correlation and regression models. This variation in readiness to change among female and male faculty could be attributed to a number of reasons. First, it is important to recognize that female responses \((n = 445)\) to the present study were higher than male faculty responses \((n = 284)\). The responses alone infer that there is a greater interest in change from female faculty. At the same time, past research has not linked gender, specifically, to readiness to change, but Stengel (1983) examined full-time community college faculty commitment to the organization’s goals and found that gender, organizational involvement, and leader behavior were positively significant factors in organizational commitment while factors of age, education, tenure status did not show significant relationships.

Results for this study indicated that differences existed in attitudes toward change between females and male faculty. Understanding why female faculty responds differently than male faculty regarding organizational change could be attributable to any number of factors. There is an evident gap in linking and further understanding gender to readiness to change, however, there are some references to the role of gender in organizational effectiveness. One study focused on non-tenured faculty as a group on college campuses who lacked power in the organizational hierarchy at most colleges and universities (Valverde, 2003). In this study, a primary finding emerged suggesting why females may have an increased propensity for readiness to change than males. This result presented an opportunity for future researchers to continue exploring the role that gender might play in determining readiness to change amongst community college faculty.
Implications, Limitations and Recommendations

Implications

The purpose of this study was to describe if community college faculty member’s organizational commitment levels and if job involvement were determinants of their readiness to change. What we know is that many faculty members at two-year institutions wholly embrace the community college mission to help students succeed (Murray, 2010). A significant part of this process was to embrace the ongoing changes that affect how community colleges function. The research offered support for $H_1$, $H_{1a}$, $H_{1c}$, and $H_2$ while $H_{1b}$ was not supported based on research results. An implication of this finding was to encourage involvement from faculty with tenure status and who may be older than the average faculty member, faculty who may feel that they would rather leave the institution but cannot do so due to the financial cost of leaving, or those who feel disconnected from institutional activities, should be considered. Although this was not a direct measure of my study it essentially was implied from the $H_{1b}$ findings that the longer a faculty member remained at an institution, the less likely they were to leave, consequently causing a potential decrease in their readiness to change.

Results also showed that faculty members’ affective commitment, normative commitment, and job involvement prove only to have moderately positive relationships to readiness to change. Administrators might seek out for opportunities to remove possible barriers that cause faculty to be only moderate relationships to their work. An implication is that seeking ways to increase faculty engagement in their work should be considered. One way to approach this opportunity is for leadership to reconsider how
they empower or encourage faculty to consider their own work experience in a context of promoting positive change within the institution.

Results also showed that female faculty have an increased readiness to change as compared to their male counterparts. While this finding was not central to the research study, the important implication is for administrators is to consider increasing female faculty involvement in change initiatives or in activities leading up to a change occurring within the institution. These may include activities such as writing the strategic plan, participating on a policy development committee, or being involved in a significant program change process that could have broad implications on the institution’s enrollments.

Limitations

Recommendations for future research address some of the limitations of this study. Several limitations require mention.

Data collection. Conducting data collection at the start of the semester was a limitation. The sample size gathered for the study could have been stronger. Data collection began at the start of the Fall 2013 semester (August). Responses may have improved if data collection was conducted mid-semester (October). A later data collection timeline may have provided faculty more time to respond because faculty would have been settled into the semester and consequently more willing to complete the survey. Another method to improve data collection could have been working more closely with institutional research departments, chief academic officers, and faculty leadership.
**Sample.** There was a high number of part-time faculty who attempted to complete the survey. The study only permitted full-time faculty participation, so part-time faculty where not permitted to participate. It was indicated in the early stages of preparing data for SPSS analysis that a high number of part-time faculty \( n = 364 \) attempted to complete the survey. If this research were replicated then improvement on distribution of surveys must be considered. Not including part-time faculty in the study is a limitation.

**Demographic controls.** A second limitation was not broadening the demographic control variables in the study and including them as part of the study’s overall design. In particular, the current study could have gathered additional information on martial status, race/ethnicity, the region or location of the college (i.e., urban, rural), the size and type of institution (single campus, district, multi-campus), the administrative structure, and the number of faculty in a division. These, among others might have provided additional opportunities to understand other important factors that may influence faculty readiness to change.

**Survey design.** The development and presentation of the survey should be improved. Both the questions and the length may have proven to be barriers to faculty completing the survey. There are a couple of opportunities for simplification. First, reducing the number of survey questions and providing an open-ended change scenario for participants may have been more conducive to prompting a stronger faculty response. In other words, it might have been helpful to avoid indicating a predetermined change scenario for participants because many participants may not have identified to the change that was presented.
Recommendations for Practice

The results of this study support recommendations for practice and suggest opportunities community college professionals should consider as they attempt to enhance the participation by faculty in their institutional change process. These recommendations are framed around those broader factors that may influence a faculty member’s participation in the change process, let alone their readiness for change. From a review of the study findings and conclusions, recommendations for practice include the following:

**Compare full- and part-time faculty experiences.** Comparing the full- and part-time faculty experience with change could be useful especially knowing that nearly 60% of community college classes are instructed by part-time (adjunct) faculty. It is reported that part-time faculty teach approximately 58% of U.S. community college classes and thus manage learning experiences for more than half (53%) of students enrolled in community colleges (JBL Associates, 2008). In Fall 2010 in Illinois, that number was 59% (ICCB, 2011). Because part-time faculty members constitute such a large percentage of the teaching faculty at community colleges, they have a significant impact on institutional success. Future research is warranted that focuses on part-time faculty related to organizational commitment, job involvement and readiness to change.

**Involve faculty early in organizational change initiatives.** It is no longer acceptable for faculty to not be part of institutional change. Providing faculty with opportunities be involved in organizational change is important for administrators to consider. It is observed from this study that there are implications between organizational commitment and job involvement on faculty members’ readiness to
change. Recognizing that faculty levels of organizational commitment and job involvement can help to determine their attitude about change is important for administrators to consider. While each institution is unique in addressing change, knowing more about how their faculty feel and approach change can be useful in better facilitating the overall process.

Involving faculty in work beyond the classroom. At another level, administration should consider how faculty are involved in work beyond routine teaching duties. Professional expectations for full-time community college faculty usually often include additional duties, yet these duties should be considered opportunities to engage faculty at deeper levels in institutional operations and not simply as other duties only necessary or required to meet contractual or promotional expectations. Administrators must understand that in including all faculty voices in the process of change that only then can they truly create an institutional culture of productive, effective, and inclusive change.

Consider Progressive Hiring Policies and Procedures. One consideration for colleges is to evaluate the multi-year faculty contracts in lieu of a tenure process. One finding of my research pointed to tenure faculty being less engaged or interested in change. Administration should consider multi-year faculty contracts. This could provide more incentive to remain engaged and committed to participating in and adding to their intuition’s success.

Encourage Faculty Leadership and Institutional Administration Collaboration. Administration should increase their reach in to increasing the diversity of faculty leadership on campus. It is often the case that faculty leadership occurs in silos and that there is not always alignment between faculty and administration when it comes
to institutional decisions or changes. Encouraging faculty leadership and institutional leadership to communicate opening, even adopting a shared governance model of change where all parties are accountable.

**Recommendation for Future Research**

**Research design.** While the design of my current study was effective, consideration of a stronger method that would allow for deeper understanding of faculty attitudes about organizational change is a future recommendation. One option is to design an ethnographic study of full-time faculty experiences with change and about those conditions within their unique cultures that, in part, factor in to defining their overall organizational commitment, job involvement and their readiness to change. Readiness to change is a useful dependent variable, but gaining more insight into the true nature of how faculty respond to change may be better understood through ethnography.

**Compare Administrative and Faculty Attitudes toward Change.** A comparative research study about administrative and faculty attitudes toward change would be useful in gaining even deeper understating about what gaps in the perception and ability to facilitate successful change exists between these two employee groups. Another outcome of such a study can be to gain clarification on the varying expectations that each group have of each other when in comes to participating and supporting organizational change.

**Faculty work conditions and change.** To gain more understanding of the factors that influence faculty experience with change, a research study aimed at gaining a comprehensive synthesis of what is known about community college faculty and how their work conditions affect their readiness to change and engagement in organizational
change can provide additional insights into the change process.

**Female faculty work experience.** In this research study, gender emerged as an interesting predictor of readiness to change. A research study is needed that aims to gain a more comprehensive understanding of how the role of gender can influence change. Of particular use to understanding gender’s role in change may be a study on female faculty work experience. A subsequent study asking why females are more open to change in further understanding the dynamics of change.

**Study Alternate Factors of Organizational Change.** Several other antecedents of change were discussed in Chapter 2, including organizational identification, mutual respect and trust, and leadership behaviors. Each of these factors is relatively unexplored within the literature on readiness to change and change management, especially within a context of higher education. Developing a study in a higher education setting could be helpful in better understanding how, for example, organizational identification, trust, and leadership behavior in the workplace correspond to higher levels of organizational performance and competitiveness. In addition, a study that examines union status as a moderator of levels of organizational identification, mutual respect and trust, and leadership behaviors is in order.

**Conclusion**

Community college faculty are not an easy population to study, and they are difficult to define as a professional class because they are neither high school teachers nor university professors (Grubb, 1999; Levin, Kater, & Wagoner, 2006; McGrath & Spear,
An attempt to provide a better understanding of community college faculty, the current research study set out to understand faculty’s readiness to change within their colleges.

Providing a better understanding of what may contribute to defining the community college faculty experience is an ongoing endeavor, and it is one that hopefully researchers continue to bring focus to. The current study provided a preliminary examination of one aspect of the community college experience, namely what factors contribute to their engagement in the change process within their institutions. Of course, this research only scratches the surface of this topic. This research is among the first to focus specifically on how full-time community college faculty members’ levels of organizational commitment and job involvement factor into their readiness to change.

We learned that organizational commitment levels and job involvement indeed contribute to faculty members having particular levels of readiness to change. We also learned that the longer a faculty member remains at an institution, while their continuous commitment levels may increase, their readiness to change decreases. We also know that females are more open to change than males. While these are important findings, they contribute a small piece to a much larger picture of the community college faculty experience. As mentioned earlier, perhaps exploring other institutional characteristics (i.e., administration, regional location, student population, union or nonunion, or financial status) could contribute additional levels of understanding about community college faculty members’ readiness to change. These variables might also lend even more insight into the particular nuances that truly shape faculty opinion and attitude about change.
Nevertheless, utilizing faculty levels of commitment and job involvement as predictors of the degree of change can provide useful insight to scholars, college administrators, and peers who are facing change within their community colleges. Outcalt (2002) points out that few national studies have attempted a broad analysis of contemporary community college faculty so that much of our understanding about faculty today is anecdotal. What has been gleaned from the current research study can help contribute to better understanding how community college faculty identify with and contribute to change, the role that administrators might play in influencing faculty engagement with institutional change, and how faculty can better align their own expectations with those that exist within the institution.
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APPENDIX A

COMMUNITY COLLEGE FACULTY CHANGE SURVEY

Informed Consent

1. Dear Participant:

My name is Kenneth Trzaska and I am a Doctoral student in the Department of Education Policy, Organization, and Leadership at the University of Illinois. I am conducting a study of community college faculty, focusing on their attitudes towards their work and work environment. The study is done under the direction of Dr. Russell Korte, Assistant Professor Education Policy, Organization and Leadership at the University of Illinois. Your responses will be extremely valuable in better understanding faculty members and the important roles they play in community colleges. If you decide to take part in this project, I ask that you complete the following questionnaires, electronically. I anticipate that it will take approximately 20 minutes of your time to complete the questionnaire.

Your participation in this project is completely voluntary. Your participation will be confidential since your responses will collect no personal identifying information and are accessed only by the researchers. All information that is obtained during this research project will be kept secure and will be accessible only to project personnel. Participation in the research is anonymous.

As a participant, you will be eligible for one of six (6) $50 Best Buy Gift Cards as an incentive for your participation. Your identifying information will go into a separate file and can’t be linked to your survey responses.

We anticipate no risk to participating in this research other than what might be experienced in normal life and the research may be helpful in improving our understanding of community college faculty. The results of this study will be published in my dissertation, a journal article and a conference presentation. Be assured that in any publication or public presentation, all information will be aggregated and there will be no information whatsoever that could identify you.

If you DO want to participate, please just print a copy of this letter for your records and proceed to respond to the questionnaire.

If you do NOT want to participate in the project, please just choose ‘no thank you’ below.

If you have any questions about this research project, please feel free to contact us either by mail, e-mail, or telephone.
Sincerely,

Kenneth Trzaska, Doctoral Candidate  
906-285-1989 (direct)  
trzaska@illinois.edu

If you have any questions about your rights as a participant in this study or any concerns or complaints, please contact the University of Illinois Institutional Review Board at 217-333-2670 (collect calls will be accepted if you identify yourself as a research participant) or via email at irb@illinois.edu

Dr. Russell Korte can be reached at 217-333-0807, korte@illinois.edu, or at the Education, Policy and Organization Leadership Department, 346 Education Building, 1310 S. 6th St. Champaign, IL 61820. Mr. Ken Trzaska can be reached at 906-285-1989 or trzaska@illinois.edu

I understand that my consent to participate in this project does not constitute a waiver of any legal rights or redress I might have due to my participation, and I acknowledge that I have received a copy of this consent form.

☐ I consent  ☐ No thank you
2. Are you a fulltime faculty member?

☐ Yes
☐ No
The statements listed below represent feelings individuals might have about the community college in which they are employed. With respect to your own feelings about your particular community college, please indicate the degree of your agreement or disagreement with each statement by choosing the appropriate choice.

**3. I would be very happy to spend the rest of my career with this organization.**
- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Slightly disagree
- Undecided
- Slightly agree
- Agree
- Strongly Agree

**4. I enjoy discussing my organization with people outside it.**
- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Slightly disagree
- Undecided
- Slightly agree
- Agree
- Strongly Agree

**5. I really feel as if this organization’s problems are my own.**
- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Slightly disagree
- Undecided
- Slightly agree
- Agree
- Strongly Agree
6. I think that I could easily become as attached to another organization as I am to this one.

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Slightly disagree
- Undecided
- Slightly agree
- Agree
- Strongly Agree

7. I do not feel like 'part of the family' at my organization.

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Slightly disagree
- Undecided
- Slightly agree
- Agree
- Strongly Agree

8. I do not feel 'emotionally attached' to this organization.

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Slightly disagree
- Undecided
- Slightly agree
- Agree
- Strongly Agree
9. This organization has a great deal of personal meaning for me.

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Slightly disagree
- Undecided
- Slightly agree
- Agree
- Strongly agree

10. I do not feel a strong sense of belonging to my organization.

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Slightly disagree
- Undecided
- Slightly agree
- Agree
- Strongly agree

11. I am not afraid of what might happen if I quit my job without having another one lined up.

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Slightly disagree
- Undecided
- Slightly agree
- Agree
- Strongly agree
12. It would be very hard for me to leave my organization right now, even if I wanted to.
- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Slightly disagree
- Undecided
- Slightly agree
- Agree
- Strongly Agree

13. Too much in my life would be disrupted if I decided I wanted to leave my organization now.
- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Slightly disagree
- Undecided
- Slightly agree
- Agree
- Strongly Agree

14. It wouldn't be too costly for me to leave my organization now.
- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Slightly disagree
- Undecided
- Slightly agree
- Agree
- Strongly Agree
**15.** Right now, staying with my organization is a matter of necessity as much as desire.

- [ ] Strongly disagree
- [ ] Disagree
- [ ] Slightly disagree
- [ ] Undecided
- [ ] Slightly agree
- [ ] Agree
- [ ] Strongly Agree

**16.** I feel that I have too few options to consider leaving this organization.

- [ ] Strongly disagree
- [ ] Disagree
- [ ] Slightly disagree
- [ ] Undecided
- [ ] Slightly agree
- [ ] Agree
- [ ] Strongly Agree

**17.** One of the few serious consequences of leaving this organization would be the scarcity of available alternatives.

- [ ] Strongly disagree
- [ ] Disagree
- [ ] Slightly disagree
- [ ] Undecided
- [ ] Slightly agree
- [ ] Agree
- [ ] Strongly Agree
18. One of the major reasons I continue to work for this organization is that leaving would require considerable personal sacrifice - another organization may not match the overall benefits I have here.

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Slightly disagree
- Undecided
- Slightly agree
- Agree
- Strongly Agree

19. I think that people these days move from company to company too often.

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Slightly disagree
- Undecided
- Slightly agree
- Agree
- Strongly Agree

20. I do not believe that a person must always be loyal to his or her organization.

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Slightly disagree
- Undecided
- Slightly agree
- Agree
- Strongly Agree
21. Jumping from organization to organization does not seem at all unethical to me.

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Slightly disagree
- Undecided
- Slightly agree
- Agree
- Strongly Agree

22. One of the major reasons I continue to work for this organization is that I believe that loyalty is important and therefore feel a sense of moral obligation to remain.

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Slightly disagree
- Undecided
- Slightly agree
- Agree
- Strongly Agree

23. If I get another offer for a better job elsewhere, I would not feel it was right to leave my organization.

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Slightly disagree
- Undecided
- Slightly agree
- Agree
- Strongly Agree
24. I was taught to believe in the value of remaining loyal to one's organization.

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Slightly disagree
- Undecided
- Slightly agree
- Agree
- Strongly agree

25. Things were better in the days when people stayed with one organization for most of their careers.

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Slightly disagree
- Undecided
- Slightly agree
- Agree
- Strongly agree

26. I do not think that wanting to be a 'company man' or 'company woman' is sensible anymore.

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Slightly disagree
- Undecided
- Slightly agree
- Agree
- Strongly agree
Using a 5-point Likert scale with responses ranging from 1—strongly disagree to 5—strongly agree, please complete the following section.

**27. The most important things that happen to me involve my present job.**
- [ ] Strongly disagree
- [ ] Disagree
- [ ] Neither agree or disagree
- [ ] Agree
- [ ] Strongly agree

**28. To me, my job is only a small part of who I am.**
- [ ] Strongly disagree
- [ ] Disagree
- [ ] Neither agree or disagree
- [ ] Agree
- [ ] Strongly agree

**29. I am very much involved personally in my job.**
- [ ] Strongly disagree
- [ ] Disagree
- [ ] Neither agree or disagree
- [ ] Agree
- [ ] Strongly agree

**30. I live, eat, and breathe my job.**
- [ ] Strongly disagree
- [ ] Disagree
- [ ] Neither agree or disagree
- [ ] Agree
- [ ] Strongly agree
*31. Most of my interests are centered around my job.
   - Strongly disagree
   - Disagree
   - Neither agree or disagree
   - Agree
   - Strongly agree

*32. I have very strong ties with my present job that would be very difficult to break.
   - Strongly disagree
   - Disagree
   - Neither agree or disagree
   - Agree
   - Strongly agree

*33. Usually I feel detached from my job.
   - Strongly disagree
   - Disagree
   - Neither agree or disagree
   - Agree
   - Strongly agree

*34. Most of my personal life goals are job-oriented.
   - Strongly disagree
   - Disagree
   - Neither agree or disagree
   - Agree
   - Strongly agree

*35. I consider my job to be very central to my existence.
   - Strongly disagree
   - Disagree
   - Neither agree or disagree
   - Agree
   - Strongly agree
35. I like to be absorbed in my job most of the time.

- [ ] Strongly disagree
- [ ] Disagree
- [ ] Neither agree or disagree
- [ ] Agree
- [ ] Strongly agree
Please answer the following questions assuming that within your community college the administration is preparing for a massive change, considered either transformation or transactional, within your institution. Examples of such changes include implementing new technologies such as massive open online courses throughout the institution, merging academic departments/divisions, providing additional reports on student learning outcomes due to accreditation requirements, evaluating your productivity in order to meet enrollment targets and fiscal conditions and parameters, or increasing your workload demands.

Please determine how likely you are to feel or react to the proposed changes in the ways described below. Please answer for yourself. There is no right or wrong answer.

**37. My willingness or openness to work more because of the change is:**
- Very unlikely
- Unlikely
- Slightly unlikely
- Undecided
- Slightly likely
- Likely
- Very likely

**38. My willingness or openness to solve organization problems associated with the change is:**
- Very unlikely
- Unlikely
- Slightly unlikely
- Undecided
- Slightly likely
- Likely
- Very likely

**39. My willingness or openness to create new ideas in response to the change is:**
- Very unlikely
- Unlikely
- Slightly unlikely
- Undecided
- Slightly likely
- Likely
- Very likely
*40. My willingness or openness to do things in a new or create way is:

- Very unlikely
- Unlikely
- Slightly unlikely
- Undecided
- Slightly likely
- Likely
- Very likely

*41. My willingness or openness to take responsibility for the change if it fails in my area.

- Very unlikely
- Unlikely
- Slightly unlikely
- Undecided
- Slightly likely
- Likely
- Very likely

*42. My willingness or openness to learn new things.

- Very unlikely
- Unlikely
- Slightly unlikely
- Undecided
- Slightly likely
- Likely
- Very likely

*43. My willingness or openness to support change.

- Very unlikely
- Unlikely
- Slightly unlikely
- Undecided
- Slightly likely
- Likely
- Very likely
*44. My willingness or openness to sell ideas about the change.
- Very unlikely
- Unlikely
- Slightly unlikely
- Undecided
- Slightly likely
- Likely
- Very likely

*45. My willingness or openness to be a part of the new project.
- Very unlikely
- Unlikely
- Slightly unlikely
- Undecided
- Slightly likely
- Likely
- Very likely

*46. My willingness or openness to find ways to make the change fail.
- Very unlikely
- Unlikely
- Slightly unlikely
- Undecided
- Slightly likely
- Likely
- Very likely

*47. My willingness or openness to change the way I work because of the change.
- Very unlikely
- Unlikely
- Slightly unlikely
- Undecided
- Slightly likely
- Likely
- Very likely
48. My willingness or openness to be a part of the change program.
- Very unlikely
- Unlikely
- Slightly unlikely
- Undecided
- Slightly likely
- Likely
- Very likely

49. My willingness or openness to change something even if it appears to be working.
- Very unlikely
- Unlikely
- Slightly unlikely
- Undecided
- Slightly likely
- Likely
- Very likely

50. My willingness or openness to improve what we’re currently doing rather than implement a major change.
- Very unlikely
- Unlikely
- Slightly unlikely
- Undecided
- Slightly likely
- Likely
- Very likely
51. What is your gender?

52. What is your current age?

53. Choose your teaching area:

- Humanities
- Social Sciences
- Science/Math/Business/Computing/IT
- Nursing
- Industrial Arts
- Drafting
- Childcare Specialties/Vocational/Occupational
- Other
- Developmental Remedial education

Choose all that apply.

Other (please specify)

54. What is your tenure status?

- Tenured
- Non-tenured
- My institution does not offer a tenure status

55. Years of full-time service:

- 5 or less
- 6-10
- 11-15
- 16-20
- 21-25
- 26-30
- 31 or more
APPENDIX B

INVITATION TO PARTICIPATE

DATE

Dear Community College Colleague,

I am pleased to share information with you about an exciting opportunity with Ken Trzaska, a doctoral candidate at the University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign. Ken is a College Administrator, faculty member and community college advocate, and he is now conducting his dissertation research on faculty experiences with change initiatives in their institutions.

You have also received this invitation electronically to your e-mail. Please read his letter below inviting you to participate in this study.

Sincerely,

Ken Trzaska
Doctoral Candidate

THIS SURVEY WILL ONLY TAKE 10-15 MINUTES OF YOUR TIME

https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/facultyreadinessdoctoralresearch
Dear Community College Colleague,

This is your second notice to participate in an important research study. The dissertation research is on faculty experiences with change initiatives in their institutions. Your contributions to the study could help provide useful insights and understanding to full-time community college faculty experience with change.

The findings could lend support and insight to community college leadership and faculty on faculty member’s experience with organizational change. Please consider taking the time right now to fill out his brief online survey. By participating you will have an option to enter a lottery drawing for one of six $50 gift cards. This is my way of thanking you for taking the survey right now.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Ken Trzaska
Doctoral Candidate

THIS SURVEY WILL ONLY TAKE 10-15 MINUTES OF YOUR TIME

https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/facultyreadinessdoctoralresearch
Dear Participant:

My name is Kenneth Trzaska and I am a Doctoral student in the Department of Education Policy, Organization, and Leadership at the University of Illinois. I am conducting a study of community college faculty, focusing on their attitudes towards their work and work environment. The study is done under the direction of Assistant Professor Dr. Jessica Li and Associate Professor & Associate Dean Dr. Christopher Span in the department of Education Policy, Organization and Leadership at the University of Illinois Champaign-Urbana. Your responses will be extremely valuable in better understanding faculty members and the important roles they play in community colleges. If you decide to take part in this project, I ask that you complete the following questionnaires, electronically, and return it to the address indicated below and at the end of the questionnaire. I anticipate that it will take approximately 20 minutes of your time to complete the questionnaire.

Your participation in this project is completely voluntary. Your participation will be confidential since your responses will collect no personal identifying information and accessed only by the researchers. All information that is obtained during this research project will be kept secure and will be accessible only to project personnel. Participation in the research is anonymous.

As a participant, you will be eligible for one of six (6) $50 Best Buy Gift Cards as an incentive for your participation. Your identifying information will go in to a separate file and can’t be linked to your survey responses.

We anticipate no risk to participating in this research other than what might be experienced in normal life and the research may be helpful for improving our understanding of community college faculty. The results of this study will be published in my dissertation, a journal article and a conference presentation. Be assured that in any publication or public presentation, all information will be aggregated and there will be no information whatsoever that could identify you.

If you DO want to participate, please just print a copy of this letter for your records and proceed to respond to the attached questionnaire.

If you do NOT want to participate in the project, please just delete this e-mail and do not proceed to the questionnaire.

If you have any questions about this research project, please feel free to contact us either by mail, e-mail, or telephone.

Sincerely,

Kenneth Trzaska
If you have any questions about your rights as a participant in this study or any concerns or complaints, please contact the University of Illinois Institutional Review Board at 217-333-2670 (collect calls will be accepted if you identify yourself as a research participant) or via email at irb@illinois.edu

Dr. Jessica Li can be reached at 217-333-0960 or jli2011@illinois.edu, Dr. Christopher Span can be reached at 217-333-2800 or cspan@illinois.edu; both can also be reached at the Education, Policy and Organization Leadership Department, 346 Education Building, 1310 S. 6th St. Champaign, IL 61820. Mr. Ken Trzaska can be reached at 906-285-1989 or trzaska@illinois.edu

I understand that my consent to participate in this project does not constitute a waiver of any legal rights or redress I might have due to my participation, and I acknowledge that I have received a copy of this consent form.

Consent Statement (will be part of formal Survey Monkey questionnaire)

1. By clicking “yes” below, you acknowledge that you have read and understand the above information (informed adult consent letter). You agree that 1) your participation is voluntary, 2) you can enter in to a drawing for one of six (6) $50 gift cards for taking this survey and that identifying information will go to a separate file and can’t be linked to your survey responses, 3) you are aware and encouraged to print or contact the researcher for a copy of this informed consent waiver.

(_) Yes, I acknowledge that I have read, understand, and agree to the terms stated in this informed consent page.
APPENDIX E

HISTOGRAMS OF STANDARDIZED RESIDUALS FROM MULTIPLE REGRESSION MODELS

Figure 2. Model 1 Histogram of standardized residuals.
Figure 3. Model 2 Histogram of standardized residuals.
Figure 4. Model 3 Histogram of standardized residuals.
Figure 5. Model 4 Histogram of standardized residuals.
APPENDIX F

SCATTERPLOTS DESCRIBING RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN READINESS AND ITS PRIMARY PREDICTORS

Figure 6. Scatter plot of affective commitment and readiness.
Figure 7. Scatter plot of normative commitment and readiness.
Figure 8. Scatter plot of continuance commitment and readiness.
Figure 9. Scatter plot of overall commitment and readiness.
Figure 10. Scatter plot of job involvement and readiness.
APPENDIX G

P-P PLOT OF REGRESSION STANDARDIZED RESIDUAL FOR Y

*Figure 11.* P-P Plot of regression standardized residual for readiness to change.
### APPENDIX H

Distribution Frequency for Survey Question Categories (Adjusted for Reversed Questions) Total Category Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question Category</th>
<th>Slightly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Disagree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Slightly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affective Commitment</td>
<td>343 (5.9%)</td>
<td>683 (11.7%)</td>
<td>562 (9.6%)</td>
<td>373 (6.4%)</td>
<td>866 (14.8%)</td>
<td>1872 (32.1%)</td>
<td>1133 (19.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuance Commitment</td>
<td>459 (7.9%)</td>
<td>988 (16.9%)</td>
<td>588 (10.1%)</td>
<td>322 (5.5%)</td>
<td>834 (14.3%)</td>
<td>1443 (24.7%)</td>
<td>1198 (20.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normative Commitment</td>
<td>509 (8.7%)</td>
<td>1405 (24.1%)</td>
<td>863 (14.8%)</td>
<td>860 (14.7%)</td>
<td>1061 (18.2%)</td>
<td>890 (15.3%)</td>
<td>244 (4.2%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question Category</th>
<th>Slightly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Disagree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Slightly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job Involvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Unlikely</td>
<td>282 (2.8%)</td>
<td>828 (8.1%)</td>
<td>613 (6.0%)</td>
<td>1368 (13.4%)</td>
<td>1368 (13.4%)</td>
<td>3571 (35.0%)</td>
<td>1905 (18.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unlikely</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly Unlikely</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly Likely</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likely</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Unlikely</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. $n$ for commitment category = 5,832, $n$ for job involvement category = 7,290, and $n$ for readiness to change category = 10,206.
APPENDIX I

Means, Standard Deviations, Age and Gender Descriptives for Research Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affective Commitment</td>
<td>4.87</td>
<td>1.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuance Commitment</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normative Commitment</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Commitment</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Involvement*</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Readiness to Change</td>
<td>5.12</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>48.6</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender*</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*On a 5-point ordinal scale. Other variables are on a 7-point ordinal scale.

Note. n = 729. *Reference category for gender is male.