BRANCH CAMPUS ADMINISTRATORS: OWNERSHIP AND CONTROL

By

M. LISA VALENTINO

A DISSERTATION PRESENTED TO THE GRADUATE SCHOOL
OF THE UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT
OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF
DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA

2011

To my parents who always told me I could do anything I set my mind to….
And to my husband Bill, for loving and supporting me, no matter what I set my mind to!

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Without the support of my family, friends, and colleagues, this dissertation and my 30 year journey to earn this doctorate would not have been completed. First, I want to thank my husband, Bill, who has stood by me through these last four years of chaos. Thank you for your patience with my tunnel vision, all the dinners you brought to me in my study, all the proofreading and editing you did late at night, and most of all for all of your love … it took me 31 years to get here and I could not have done this without you.

Next, to my parents, Bob and Nancy Gangwisch, who taught me early on to love learning, and who have never stopped loving, supporting and encouraging me, thank you. To Beth Rand, my friend, shopping buddy, and "therapist", thanks for being there to listen and to help keep me semi-sane. And to my children, Erin, Justin, and Brian, I hope I have made you proud.

I also wish to acknowledge and thank my dissertation chair, Dr. Dale F. Campbell, for his advocacy, guidance, support, and encouragement along each step of the degree process. I also want to acknowledge and thank Dr. David Honeyman, a member of my committee for his research expertise, guidance, and advice throughout the learning and writing process. Thanks also to Drs. Campbell and Honeyman for their dedication to the 2007 LEAD cohort, your support for all of us throughout the program is appreciated; thank you for being our champions! I want also to acknowledge the other members of my committee Drs. Craig Wood and Lynn Leverty for their time, insight, and support.

Thank you also to the members of the 2007 LEAD cohort for their friendship and encouragement over the last four years; I cannot imagine a having a better group of people to learn and grow with. I am especially indebted to my friend, "dissertation

buddy," and fellow member of the "GIT-R-DUN" club, Dr. Toni Strollo Holbrook—thanks for listening, encouraging, critiquing, and cajoling me … it's been a much better ride because you were there.

Finally, I wish to acknowledge and thank my Seminole State College of Florida colleagues and friends. Molly, Lynn, Laura, Angela, Annye, Mike, and Bob, thank you for your patience in listening to me talk non-stop about my research and coursework during the doctoral program; and most of all thank you for your friendship and support always. To Seminole State's Institutional Research Director and statistics guru, Mark Morgan, thank you for your help with the regression and other statistical analyses. To my supervisors during these last four years, Drs. Carol Hawkins and Jim Henningsen, I appreciate your encouragement, patience, and understanding. Thank you also to Seminole State College's president, Dr. E. Ann McGee for her advice, counsel, and encouragement—it meant more than you know.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

APPENDIX

LIST OF TABLES

Abstract of Dissertation Presented to the Graduate School
of the University of Florida in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Education

BRANCH CAMPUS ADMINISTRATORS: OWNERSHIP AND CONTROL
By

M. Lisa Valentino

May 2011

Chair: Dale Campbell
Major: Higher Education Administration

This quantitative, internet-based, self-report study of 167 American community college branch campus administrators sought to examine the nature of the relationship between job-based (campus) and organization-based (institutional) psychological ownership and the administrator's perceived sense of control as measured by the level of job autonomy, level of authority, and participation in decision making. Its goal was to assess the degree to which factors, including perception of control and individual and institutional demographic characteristics, were associated with the cognitive and affective feelings of ownership with respect to their institution and campus.

Study results showed that branch campus administrators demonstrated psychological ownership for both their institutions and their campuses, with a significantly higher level of psychological ownership being expressed for the individual's campus. These observed differences suggested that the two types of psychological ownership were different constructs. The results of this study demonstrated that individual and institutional characteristics that promoted the development of an intimate knowledge of, and an investment of self into, the college, along with the perception of control, helped to facilitate the development of institutional psychological ownership.

However, it did not allow conclusions as to potential facilitating factors for job-based (campus) psychological ownership.

The results of this study provided support for application of the theory of psychological ownership in the higher education environment, confirmed the results of previous research on organizational psychological ownership, and provided support for Pierce and colleague's theory of psychological ownership. Further research is recommended into the consequences of the experience of organization- and job-based psychological ownership in non-profit and educational settings, as well as into the theory's implications for educational management practices.

CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

Community colleges have had a significant impact on the higher education landscape since their inception (Cohen and Brawer, 2003; Cohen, 1999; Vaughan, 2006). Access had been a major theme in American higher education since the end of World War II and no other segment of higher education had been more responsive to its community than community colleges (AACC, 2000, 2007; Cohen, 1999; McClenney, 2004). Most community college leaders believed that it was not accidental that the word "community" was part of the institution's name (Cohen and Brawer, 2003). These colleges were often an important part of the geographic area in which they were located and served as the cultural, social and intellectual hub of their communities (Dunderstat, 2000). As open-door institutions, community colleges offered multiple avenues for student success and placed high value on providing access to programs including transfer education, workforce education, and lifelong learning (Reitano, 1988; McClenney, 2004). Access, however, meant more than just an open admissions policy for most educators and leaders in these institutions.

Community colleges have made access to higher education geographically and financially available to millions of American citizens (Jensen, 1984), and branch campuses are a vital part of this delivery system. Accessibility remains a high priority for America's community colleges (Boone, 1997). Rucker (1979), and more recently Donhardt (1996) and Norby (2005), reported that, for many students, the proximity of a campus was the most important factor in their educational choice. Cohen (1972) reported that community colleges tended to be built such that 90–95% of the state's population resided within a reasonable commuting distance and that branch campuses

made a college education even more accessible to students. As the population of a college's service area grew and original campuses reached capacity, most colleges expanded enrollment by adding off-campus or branch campuses at convenient locations instead of opening new colleges or building new facilities on the original site. As Sasser (1978) asserted, the establishment of a branch campus was an "effective way of taking education to the people" (p. 25). Furthermore, Wygal and Owen (1975), and Holland (2001) pointed out that the establishment of a branch campus was a good strategy for many institutions; it allowed the main campus of the college to continue life as usual, while at the same time being responsive to a new local community, and more recently, Bird (in press) contended that "branch campuses are likely to play an even more critical role in the future, especially at institutions, public or private, that need increased enrollment from adult learners in order to address financial challenges" (p.10).

Branch Campuses

Branch campuses came in all sizes and organizational types at the time of this writing, and made a college education accessible to even more students, allowing them to achieve their higher educational goals at even lower costs by living at home, and maintaining jobs (Donhardt, 1996; Spencer, 1997; Dengerink, 2001). Typically, students who attended branch campuses were often place-bound commuter students who had difficulty accessing higher education offered in traditional settings (Dengerink, 2001). Huitt (1972) and Holland (2001) maintained that for many students, community college branch campuses were the only way they could attend college.

Each community college branch campus had its own unique characteristics and challenges. The community college may have had multiple sites or branches because of its geographic size, large potential student base, or diverse political districts

(Johnstone, 1999). Nevertheless, the purposes of the branch campus were to serve the needs of constituents and to advance the mission of the overall college that provided its governance. For all branch campuses effectiveness resided in the "flexibility to offer the educational services that respond[ed] directly to community needs" (Norby, 2005, p. 24); no branch campus was a carbon copy of the original campus and, to be truly responsive to its community, it had to be operated and organized differently (Holland, 2001). Critical to this success were the characteristics and leadership skills of its lead administrator.

Branch Campus Administrators

Hermanson, (1993, 1995), Baily (2002), Stahley (2002), Merzer,(2008), and Krueger, (2009) all asserted that the role of the branch campus executive officer was pivotal to the success of the branch campus since all daily administrative responsibilities of the branch were typically overseen by this individual. Stahley, (2002), Hermanson (1995), Hill (1985), Norby (2005) and Merzer (2008) all reported that branch campus administrators generally operated as part of the middle management level in community colleges. Bailey (2002) and gillie-gossom and Pelton (in press) equated the role of the branch campus administrator to that of a circus ringmaster. Like the ringmaster, the branch campus administrator was required to "juggle the demands of senior administration, faculty, career service, and community constituents and must be comfortable in each environment" (gillie-gossom and Pelton, in press, p. 4). Branch campus administrators typically had responsibility for the successful implementation of the college's mission on the branch campus and just as campuses were unique, so were the branch campus administrators that led them.

Mid-level administrators affected the tone, manner, and style of the institution, and their daily actions affected the quality of relationships with faculty, students and the community (Scott, 1978; Rosser, 2000). Hence, the success of branch campus administrators was integral to the success of the college as a whole (Bailey, 2002; Crom, 2000; Sethi, 2000). Unfortunately, unlike other administrative positions in the community college leadership hierarchy, the role of the branch campus administrator was not clearly defined (Bailey, 2002; Blocker and Campbell, 1963). Typically, the branch campus administrator was responsible for oversight of campus resources and assured that they were managed effectively and efficiently (Bailey, 2002; Honeyman, Wattenbarger and Westbrook, 1996; Moses, 2001). However, at times they were not always given the authority to make local decisions (Jensen, 1984).

Community college administration and management had been characterized as bureaucratic and hierarchical (Miller and Miles, 2008) and in most multi-campus colleges, even though the branch campuses were separated from the main campus by their geographical locations, they were typically linked organizationally to the main campus in a subordinate role. Hill (1985) referred to this as the separate-but-linked phenomenon. Stahley (2002) found that for the university branch campuses she surveyed, the majority of branch campus decisions were "made in some combination of shared decision making or decision making after consultation with the main campus" (p. 73). Yet, Hermanson (1995) reported that branch campus chief executive officers (CEOs) at two-year branches of state universities reported that "their relationship with their main campuses was the single most important issue to be addressed by their campuses" (p. 33), and Hill (1985) and Stahley (2002) both identified the occurrence of

problems in branch campus administration related to resources, decision-making, status, and prestige.

"The prime role of the administration is to coordinate and balance the diverse actions of the college" (Monroe, 1972, p. 310); and "good administration is characterized by a clear cut delegation of authority" (Kintzer, Jensen, and Hansen, 1969, p. 20). Unfortunately, Wynn (1972) argued that one important area of focus for multi-campus institutions was the definition of the authority, control, and responsibility for financial and business affairs of the college. He cited two organizational levels to which the authority, control, and responsibility for branch campus administration could be assigned: to an administrator at the individual campus in a decentralized structure, or to an administrator at a main campus level having responsibility for all units in a centralized structure. Regardless of the institutional organizational structure, the branch campus administrator still juggled the demands of various constituents and ensured that the mission and vision of the overall college were carried out.

The branch campus administrator was also responsible for creating an environment that enhanced excellence and promoted learning (Gleazer, 1998; Fryer and Lovas, 1990; and O'Banion, 1997). These administrators affected the culture and style of the campus in their daily interactions with faculty, staff, students, and the community (Scott, 1978), and as such, the success of branch campus administrators was integral to the success of the college as a whole (Bailey, 2002; Crom, 2000; Sethi, 2000; Krueger, 2009). The most effective campus leaders were passionate about the organization and their campus (Bennis, 1999), and felt as if they had a responsibility to make decisions that were in the long-term interest of the organization (O'Reilly, 2002).

Avey, Avolio, Crossley, and Luthans (2009) equated this sense of responsibility to feelings of psychological ownership, a concept first defined by Pierce, Kostova, and Dirks (2001, 2003) as a cognitive-affective state "where individuals feel as if the target of ownership (material or immaterial in nature) or a piece of it is "theirs" (i.e., It is MINE!)" (2001, p. 299).

Psychological Ownership

Pierce et al., (2001) defined psychological ownership as a state in which individuals felt as though the target of ownership (material or immaterial in nature) or a piece of it is 'theirs' (i.e., It is MINE)" (p. 229); and Van Dyne and Pierce (2004) asserted that psychological ownership was attitudinal and reflected an individual's position in the organization. According to Pierce and his colleagues, the essential aspects of psychological ownership were "the feelings of possessiveness and of being psychologically tied" to the target of ownership (Pierce, Kostova, and Dirks, 2001, p.299). Thus, psychological ownership was different from actual tangible ownership, or tax-based ownership of public institutions, and reflected a relationship between the individual and the target of ownership, where the object was experienced as having a close connection with the self or being a part of the extended self. (O'Driscoll, Pierce, and Coghlan, 2006).

Research reported that psychological ownership was related to, yet distinctly different from other organizational management constructs such as job satisfaction (Vandewalle, Van Dyne, and Kostova, 1995; Van Dyne and Pierce, 2004) and organizational commitment (Mayhew, Ashkanasy, Bramble, and Gardner, 2007; Van Dyne and Pierce, 2004). Psychological ownership has been explained in terms of a sense of responsibility evoked by the feelings of ownership; in essence, feelings of

ownership engender passion and commitment (Kenny, 2011). Given that Kouzes and Posner (1997) observed that intrinsic motivation must be present if people are to do their best, it can be argued that the establishment of psychological ownership was important to the success of higher education administrators.

Pierce Kostova and Dirks (2001, 2003) suggested three routes through which psychological ownership develops:

1. an intimate knowledge of the target (familiarity with, and greater knowledge of the object, produces feelings of ownership),
2. self investment into the target (investment of significant time and effort in the creation of the object can produce feelings of ownership), and
3. control of the target (job, organization, etc.).

Rudman and Berry (1987) asserted that the essential aspect of possession and ownership was the ability to exercise influence and control over the object, and Pratt and Dutton (2000) posited that organizational designs that permitted employee control, or informed and involved employees tended to produce more positive effects and higher psychological ownership. O'Driscoll, Pierce ,and Coghlan (2006) contended that three sources of work environment structure impacted the degree of control the individual might exercise:

- technology, or the degree of routinization, (less routine, more control),
- job autonomy (more autonomy, or freedom to choose , more perceived control), and, the
- type of decision-making structures used in the organization (more participatory led to more perceived control).

Han, Chiang, and Chang, (2010) provided empirical evidence that employee participation in organizational decision-making increased their working motivation and psychological ownership, and McIntrye, Srivastava and Fuller (2009) have provided

empirical evidence for a relationship between control over one's environment and psychological ownership. Thus, it was argued that less structured work environments that provided employees with autonomy over their work environments and allowed them to participate in decision making were more likely to produce psychological ownership. In essence, employees who had a say in the decisions of the institution, felt that they had the perceived authority to act and in turn felt as if the organization was theirs (McGregor, 1986).

Psychological ownership was defined as context-specific, temporary attitude that reflected the individual's current position in the organization and could be directed at any target including organizations, jobs, work tasks, spaces, and tools or ideas (McIntyre, Srivastava, and Fuller, 2009). More recently, O'Driscoll, Pierce, and Coghlan (2006) and Mayhew, Ashkanasy, Bramble, and Gardner (2007) had expanded the concept of psychological ownership to include job-based and organization-based psychological ownership as "two distinctly different work attitudes" (p. 493). Organization-based psychological ownership was concerned with the person's sense or feelings of "possession and psychological connection to the organization [or in this study, the institution] as a whole" (Mayhew et al., 2007, p. 478), and job-based, or in the case of this study, campus-based psychological ownership, was that which was "related to the individual's feelings of possession toward their particular jobs" (Mayhew et al., 2007, p. 478).

Ownership was associated with pride that minimized shirking and motivated organizational members to high performance levels; thus it was argued that the establishment of psychological ownership in branch campus administrators was

beneficial. The responsibilities of branch campus administrators required intimate knowledge about the institution and an investment of sufficient time and energy; this high level of familiarity and close association with the organization, coupled with the investment of time and energy should have, according to Pierce and his colleagues, facilitated strong levels of psychological ownership in branch campus administrators as long as they were provided with opportunities to exercise control and feel efficacious. Unfortunately, as mentioned earlier, one of the frustrations of higher education branch campus administrators was the remarkable lack of autonomy (Dean Dad, 2011).

Statement of the Problem

As community colleges and their branch campuses continued to evolve to meet the challenges of the higher educational landscape in the twenty-first century, the need for campus administrators committed to creative, flexible structures that allowed them to be nimble and act quickly became apparent (Alfred, 1998). Heermann (1976) claimed that effective administrative organizations in educational settings had an indirect, but important, relationship to student learning; and Stahley (2002) claimed that an effective organization provided the best opportunity for the achievement of an institution's mission.

Branch campus administrators were required to respond to this call as they were critical components of the success of the branch campus. Yet, very little was known about the branch campus administrator. This study sought to examine the nature of the relationship between job-based (campus) and organization-based (institutional) psychological ownership experienced by administrators of community college branch campuses and the branch campus administrator's perceived sense of control as

measured by the level of job autonomy, level of authority, and participation in decision making.

Purpose of the Study

The intent of this quantitative study was to examine the factors that contributed to the psychological ownership that branch campus administrator's experienced. Its goal was to assess the degree to which factors including perception of control, and individual and institutional demographic characteristics, were associated with the cognitive and affective feelings of ownership developed by branch campus administrators with respect to their institution and campus. To do so, the study examined the relationship between job- and organization-based psychological ownership and the sense of control branch campus administrators experienced in the course of carrying out everyday responsibilities. Job-based psychological ownership was defined as ownership for the administrator's campus and organization-based ownership was defined as ownership for the institution. Sense of control was defined within the context of the individual-work environment by the degree of job autonomy, the level of participation in decision making, and the amount of authority given to the branch campus administrator.

The study also examined differences in levels of both types of psychological ownership in branch campus administrators related to the branch campus administrator's gender, the length of time the administrator had served as a branch campus administrator, their longevity at the institution and their campus, to whom the branch campus administrator reported, institutional and campus size, the location of and distance between the main and branch campuses, number of branch campuses the institution had, the reporting structure of the branch campus staff, the type of

administrative role and responsibility of the branch campus administrator, and the degree of centralization of the college's organizational structure.

Research Questions

This study addressed the following specific research question: What is the nature of the relationship between the psychological ownership (campus and institutional) experienced by administrators of branch campuses in multi-campus community colleges and the branch campus administrator's perceived sense of control as measured by the level of job autonomy, level of authority, and participation in decision making? To answer this question the following twelve research questions were addressed.

1. Did branch campus administrators develop psychological ownership for their institution?

2. Did branch campus administrators develop psychological ownership for their campuses?

3. Was there a difference between the feelings of psychological ownership branch campus administrators developed for their institution and the feelings of psychological ownership they developed for their campus?

4. Was there a relationship between psychological ownership (campus and institution) and the individual respondent demographic characteristics of longevity in their current positions, tenure at their institution and branch campus, and the number of years they had been in higher education and as a branch campus administrator?

5. Was there a relationship between the institutional characteristics pertaining to institutional size (college-wide headcount), branch campus size (branch campus headcount), number of branch campuses, the distance between the branch and main campuses, and the composite score for organizational reporting structure of the branch and psychological ownership (campus and institutional)?

6. Was there a difference in the level of psychological ownership (campus and institutional) experienced by branch campus administrators based on the levels of the individual respondent demographic characteristics of gender, to whom the branch campus administrator reported (BCA Supervisor), and the branch campus administrators' administrative responsibilities and administrative role?

7. Was there a difference in the level of psychological ownership (campus and institutional) experienced by branch campus administrators based on the institutional characteristics of location of the administrative offices, degree of centralization of decisions, and branch campus staff reporting structure?

8. Were the feelings of psychological ownership (campus and institutional) experienced by branch campus administrators related to their level of perceived job autonomy?

9. Were the feelings of psychological ownership (campus and institutional) experienced by branch campus administrators related to their level of perceived participation in decision-making?

10. Were the feelings of psychological ownership (campus and institutional) experienced by branch campus administrators related to their level of perceived job authority?

11. Were the feelings of psychological ownership experienced by branch campus administrators related to their overall experiences of perceived sense of control (job autonomy, level of authority, and participation in decision making) by the branch campus administrator?

12. What was the nature of the relationship between the feelings of psychological ownership (campus and institutional) experienced by branch campus administrators and their individual demographic characteristics, the institutional characteristics, and their perception of control?

Definition of Terms

- COMMUNITY COLLEGE. A public, associate degree-granting institution that offered both vocational–technical programs for direct employment after graduation and a general education curriculum for transfer to a baccalaureate degree granting institution and whose "fundamental mission is to make higher education available to anyone who aspires it." Noted for their "local orientation and responsiveness" community colleges were established to address "ever-emerging educational, economic and social needs" (AACC, 2009, Para. 1).

- MULTI-CAMPUS INSTITUTION. According to the 1979 version of the Encyclopedia of Education, "A multi-campus college or university was an institution having more than one campus" (as cited in Bond, 1983, p. 1). For the purpose of the current study the term multi-campus institution was defined as a community college that had one or more permanent subsidiary campuses in which the subsidiary campuses are governed by the central administration of the main campus or its central office and had an on-site administrator (Stahley, 2002).

- BRANCH CAMPUS. A permanent subsidiary campus of a community college that was geographically distant from the main institution, but operated under the

direction of the central administration. The campus had a resident administrator, some resident faculty, its own budgets and a broad range of student support services and was created to serve a local community or specific educational need (Stahley, 2002; Bebko, 2009; Bird, in press).

- BRANCH CAMPUS ADMINISTRATOR. The chief administrative officer of the branch campus responsible for the daily operations of the branch campus (Bailey, 2002).

- MAIN CAMPUS. The central location of governance for the college; typically refers to the original campus site.

- ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE. Defined patterns and processes of behavior exhibited by administrators in the dominant coalition on each campus in the study (Berger, 2002, p. 42).

- PSYCHOLOGICAL OWNERSHIP. The state ascribed to such feelings of possession in the absence of any formal or legal claims of ownership. In the present context, the target of such feelings of ownership is directed towards the employing organization, or individual employee's specific job (Pierce, Kostova, and Dirks, 2001, 2003; Mayhew, Ashkanasy, Bramble, and Gardner, 2006).

- CAMPUS (JOB-BASED) PSYCHOLOGICAL OWNERSHIP. The person's sense or feelings of "possession and psychological connection" to the branch campus administrator's job, or in this study, their campus (Mayhew et al., 2007, p. 478).

- INSTITUTIONAL (ORGANIZATION-BASED) PSYCHOLOGICAL OWNERSHIP. The person's sense or feelings of "possession and psychological connection" to the organization, or in this study the branch campus administrator's institution or college (Mayhew et al., 2007, p. 478).

- AUTONOMY. A job design attribute which reflects "the degree to which the job provides substantial freedom, independence, and discretion to the employee in scheduling work and determining the procedures to be used in carrying it out" (Hackman and Oldham, 1975, p. 162).

- PARTICIPATION IN DECISION-MAKING. The degree to which an individual has the authority to, and is permitted to participate in organizational decision-making.

- AUTHORITY. The employee's ability to make decisions about and influence their job and work.

- PERCEIVED CONTROL. A composite of the worker's authority to make decisions on the job (decision authority) and the breadth of skills used by the worker (skill discretion) (Karasek, 1979; Verhoeven, 2003). In this study it is operationally defined by the combination of measures of level of job autonomy, level of authority, and participation in decision making.

Design of the Study

This study relied on the use of a quantitative, internet-based, self-report survey methodology using a survey instrument developed specifically for the purpose of this study. *Stellar Survey* was the survey tool used to obtain data. The survey was conducted on a national population of 500 onsite, American community college branch campus administrators. Questions on the survey were based on previous research in the field of business, psychology, and education on psychological ownership and its determinants. Levels of campus, or job-based, and institutional, or organization-based, psychological ownership served as the study's dependent variables. A number of independent, or explanatory variables were assessed including participant demographic characteristics (gender, the length of time the participant had worked at the institution and specific campus, their longevity in their current position, the overall length of their tenure in higher education administration and as a branch campus administrator, to whom they reported, and their perception of the scope of their administrative role and responsibilities), institutional characteristics (the size of the institution and branch campus (measured by the most recent fall term head count), the distance between the main campus and branch campus, the number of branch campuses, the administrator's belief as to the level of centralization that existed at the institution, and the reporting structure of the branch campus staff) and measures of perceived degree of job authority, perceived level of participation in decision making, and perceived level of job autonomy.

Limitations

This study examined the factors that contributed to the psychological ownership that American community college branch campus administrator's experience in the

while leading their campuses. To do so, the study examined the relationship between psychological ownership and the sense of control branch campus administrators experienced in the course of carrying out everyday responsibilities. This study is delimited by the use of only multi-campus community colleges in the United States.

The study's generalizability was limited by the number of participating institutions and respondents, and by the "self-report" nature of the data collection instrument used. Bias in responding was an issue that consistently plagued self-report research. The "social desirability bias," or the tendency to answer self-report questions in a way that heightened social approval rather than reflecting true feelings (Crowne and Marlowe, 1960), was a significant concern for this study, especially since social desirability tendencies have been shown to be strongest when the questions asked pertain to sensitive or controversial topics and the respondent is highly educated (Krysan, 1998). Finally, this research might also have been limited by researcher bias since the researcher was a branch campus administrator in a Florida community college and carried a personal bias from working in the branch campus environment.

Significance of the Study

Branch campuses played a significant role in the growth and expansion of higher education (Stahley, 2002, p.16); yet, multi-campus colleges were complex organizations that were difficult to understand and manage. College presidents, chancellors, or vice presidents who employ branch campus administrators should look for candidates with the right attitude in addition to qualifications, and according to the theory surrounding psychological ownership that "right attitude" included individuals willing to commit higher degrees of time, energy, and self to the institution. These individuals were more apt to develop psychological ownership for their campus and the institution, which translated

into stronger job performance, positive organizational citizenship behaviors and overall organizational commitment (Pierce, Kostova, and Dirks, 2001, 2003; McIntyre, Srivastava, and Fuller, 2009; Md-Sidin, Sambasivan, and Muniandy, 2010). Thus, it was important to determine the factors that promoted both campus and institutional psychological ownership in branch campus administrators.

Organization of the Study

This research empirically explored the concept of psychological ownership and its relationship to perceived control in branch campus administrators. Its intent was to examine the factors that contributed to psychological ownership that branch campus administrators developed towards their campus (job-based) and institution (organization-based). Chapter 1 presented the background and overview of the problem, the purpose of the study, the research question, the definitions of important terms, and described the design of the study and it limitations. Chapter 2 presented a review of the literature on community colleges, their branch campuses and branch campus administrators and provided and overview of the research and theory of psychological ownership, it's definition, origin, routes, and consequences. Chapter 3 provided a detailed description of the research methodology used. The research findings were described in Chapter 4. Finally, Chapter 5 discussed conclusions drawn from the results, and made suggestions for application of the results and recommendations for future research regarding branch campus administration.

CHAPTER 2
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The purpose of this study was to examine the factors that contributed to the psychological ownership that community college branch campus administrators experienced managing their campuses. To do so, the study examined the relationship between job- and organization-based psychological ownership and the sense of control branch campus administrators experienced in everyday responsibilities. Job-based psychological ownership was defined as ownership for the administrator's campus and organization-based ownership was defined as ownership for the institution. Sense of control was defined within the context of the individual-work environment by the degree of job autonomy, the level of participation in decision making, and the amount of authority given to the branch campus administrator. Thus, the goal of this study was to assess the degree to which factors including perception of control, and individual and institutional demographic characteristics, were associated with the cognitive and affective feelings of ownership for institution and campus developed by branch campus administrators. This study was modeled after several studies on psychological ownership conducted by Jon Pierce and his colleagues at the University of Minnesota Duluth.

This chapter presents five main sections: an overview of the historical role of community colleges in increasing higher education access; branch campuses, their definition, the factors contributing to their development, their role in providing access, and their organizational characteristics; a discussion of community college management and role of the branch campus administrator; an overview of the research on

psychological ownership; and a discussion of the relevance of psychological ownership to branch campus administration.

Community Colleges and Access

Community colleges were designed as teaching institutions whose mission was to provide relevant curriculum to their local communities (Miller and Miles, 2008), and they have made access to higher education geographically and financially available to millions of American citizens (Jensen, 1984). The history of public community colleges dates back to the early 1900's, and by the 1970's these colleges had become the fastest growing segment of public education (Frye, 1992; Monroe, 1972; Medsker, 1960) with enrollments quintupling between 1960 and 1990 (Rosenbaum, 2001). Throughout the twentieth century, community colleges saw a steady increase in enrollments (Underwood and Hammons, 1999); at one point new institutions were established at the rate of approximately 55 per year, with seven states (California, Florida, Illinois, Michigan, New York, Texas, and Washington) accounting for more than two-thirds of the enrollments (Harper, 1971). During the 1990's community colleges conferred over 400,000 associates in arts degrees and close to 200,000 occupational certificates (American Association of Community Colleges, 1995).

"Community colleges are centers of educational opportunity" (AACC, 2011, para. 1). In the Fall of 2007, more than 11.8 million students were enrolled in 1,173 community colleges and their 500 branch campuses throughout 49 states (AACC, 2009) and it was estimated that they served close to half of all undergraduate students in the United States (AACC, 2011). Since their establishment, community colleges have become a major point of entry into higher education and have provided opportunities and pathways to higher education for many U.S. students; and Levinson (2005) and

Vaughan (2000) both projected that community colleges would continue to play an increasingly more important role in providing advanced educational opportunities for a growing number of students.

Community colleges have become the “people’s colleges” (Hermanson, 1995, Boone, 1997) and Vaughan (1986) asserted that community colleges were linked to their communities more than any other post-secondary institution. These institutions offered a great variety of educational programs which, according to Wattenbarger (1971), ranged “from the ridiculous to the sublime” (p. 309). Originally, junior colleges were expected to provide a substitute for the first two years of undergraduate education; then occupational and technical degree programs were added (Wattenbarger, 1971; Harper, 1971). Finally, after the culmination of World War II, junior colleges took on the added role of providing noncredit continuing or adult education courses (Wattenbarger, 1971) and the Truman Commission (1947) introduced the concept of the community college by suggesting that the name ‘community college’ be applied to the institutions who were designed to serve local community educational needs. Judith Eaton (1994) argued that in the change from the junior college to community college designation, a shift occurred away from an emphasis on the transfer function toward an open access function; preserving access still remains a critical aspect of the mission of today’s community colleges.

The traditions of universal opportunity for education for all people, local control, support of educational systems, and a relevant curriculum designed to meet the needs of the individual and the nation were critical to the mission of the first community colleges (Medsker, 1960; Gleazer, 1991, 1998; Monroe, 1972). The tenets of varied

programs, community service, innovation, open admissions, low cost, and accessibility were, and continued to be, critical to the community college doctrine into the twenty first century (Harper, 1971). Community colleges have contributed greatly to their communities by providing businesses with a better educated workforce (Conover, 2009). As a result, communities throughout the country bought into the ideals of the community college, seeing them as an instrument for meeting the needs of a changing society (Harper, 1971). William Birebaum (1969), and Robert Havighurst and Bernice Neugarten (1957) each characterized community colleges as mechanisms to provide maximum opportunity to the underserved and labeled them as "the new opportunity college." Birebaum further predicted that these colleges should be on the frontline of higher educational innovation (cited by Monroe, 1972, p.16). Thus, access was a major theme for community colleges since their inception.

Community colleges were historically the access point for the underserved and are among the most responsive of all postsecondary educational institutions to societal change (Dunderstadt, 2000). Cohen and Brawer (1994) contended that the proximity of community colleges was key to increased access and, as early as 1944 Leonard Koos demonstrated that school systems with junior colleges had a mean college entrance rate two and a half times higher than for systems without junior colleges, and that rate jumped to three and one half times in lower socioeconomic groups (Koos 1944a). In 1965, Medsker and Trent again reported that the establishment of a community college in an area significantly enhanced the chances that lower income students would attend college. In another study Koos (1944b) also showed that the proximity of a junior college was a critical aspect for college enrollment. He found that the percentage of the

population fell sharply with increasing distance from the college. Willis (1956) observed the same phenomenon in the Chicago college districts he studied. Furthermore, Cohen (1972) reported that community colleges tended to be built so that 90–95% of the state's population resided within a reasonable commuting distance, and that branch campuses made a college education even more accessible to students. Accessibility still remains one of the greatest priorities for America's community college (Boone, 1997). Rucker (1979), and more recently Donhardt (1996) and Norby (2005), reported that, for many students, the proximity of a campus was the most important factor in their educational choice.

Branch Campuses

Definition of a Branch Campus

In 1995 Hermanson lamented that "the definition of a branch campus will continue to plague researchers as long as higher education, regional accrediting agencies, and government agencies select different criteria for the definition of a branch campus" (p. 24). Throughout the literature, the term branch campus has been associated with traditional university multi-campus institutions like the University of California system (Krueger, 2009) as well as extension centers, satellite campuses, and learning centers (Krueger, 2009). Fifteen years later, Charles Bird (in press) reasserted Hermanson's concern in his forthcoming 2011 article on the future of branch campuses for the Metropolitan Universities journal.

In 1992 the American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers (AACRAO) attempted to define a branch campus as a location of an institution that was geographically apart and independent of the main campus of the institution, permanent in nature, and offered programs leading to a degree or other recognized

educational credential (AACRAO, 1992, as cited in Krueger, 2009) and Bird (in press) asserted that a branch campus was a permanent facility, that offered full degree programs, but not all of the programs delivered by the institution, a reasonably full range of services, but again, probably not all of the services available at the main campus and had some resident faculty. These definitions align with current Federal Regulation 34 CFR 600.2 which defined a branch campus as:

> A location of an institution that is geographically apart and independent of the main campus of the institution. The Secretary considers a location of an institution to be independent of the main campus if the location—
>
> (1) is permanent in nature;
>
> (2) offers courses in educational programs leading to a degree, certificate, or other recognized educational credential;
>
> (3) has its own faculty and administrative or supervisory organization; and
>
> (4) has its own budgetary and hiring authority. (Institutional Eligibility, 2011)

Factors Contributing to the Development of Branch Campuses

The reasons cited for the establishment of branch campuses were varied and included the desire of the parent institution for innovation, or to expand its services and/or prestige (Bond, 1983). "Sometimes campuses grow to a size that seems to call for more independence, and there are examples of free-standing institutions that began as branches. In other cases, an institution may morph into a 'system,' with a number of campuses pursuing independent missions, but none of them truly a branch of a single main campus" (Bird, in press, p. 3). Some of the main reasons given for the establishment of multi-campus operations were: to expand the geographic size of the college service area, to make the college more accessible to district residents, to meet the diverse educational needs of the residents of the service area, and to keep each

campus to a reasonable and functional size (Sammartino, 1964; Bond, 1983; Jensen, 1984). Sasser (1978), however, citing two surveys (Hickman, 1975; and Poole, 1975 as cited in Sasser, 1978), reported that the primary reason for establishing most branch campuses was that it was an "effective way of taking education to the people" (p. 25). According to Romesburg (1972), however, only 29% of branch campuses were established using a feasibility study that examined both the need for an institution and the type of institution needed.

Community College Branch Campuses and Access

The tremendous expansion of community colleges spawned the emergence of the multi-campus community college, and these colleges and their branches have "provided an essential base in the movement to provide an increased quality and quantity of higher education" (Jensen, 1984, p. 1). Branch campuses were not, however, a new idea. Dengerink (2001) described Thomas Jefferson's vision of multiple college campuses located such that all Virginians would have convenient access to higher education; and as early as 1824, Amos Eaton of Rensslaer Polytechnic Institute advocated the use of university extension centers. The first community (junior) college branch campuses were established in Chicago in 1934 and Los Angeles in 1945. In 1974, seventy-seven multi-campus institutions with 212 campuses existed (Rossmeier, 1976); by 2004 Katsinas and Hardy reported that one of every three community colleges were part of multi-campus or multi-college districts, and in 2005, the AACC reported 500 community college branch campuses (Katsinas and Hardy, 2004; Levinson, 2005).

The creation of branch campuses has been a typical response to the demand for community college services (Peterson an Dill, 1997). Gaither (1999) contended that the

multi-campus concept of higher education in the twenty-first century grew from the post World War II transformation of higher education, and became the dominant model for public higher education in the U.S during the last half of the twentieth century. Jensen (1984) suggested that the tremendous growth in community colleges during the 1950's and 1960's resulted from increased demand for higher education from the American population and that this resulted in an explosion of new campus locations for the colleges. Community college branch campuses provided a way to serve more students in highly populated locations (Johnstone, 1999; Conover, 2009). "At that time all that seemed necessary were a classroom, a course, and a teacher" (Parilla, 1993, p. 21). Virtually all branch campus researchers pointed out that the tremendous growth in branch campuses resulted from the combination of increased enrollment demand, increased resource support for education, and a desire for opportunity that provided fertile ground for a dramatic increase in the number of multi-campus colleges and universities (Cattell, 1971; Huitt, 1972; Gaither, 1999; Holland, 2001).

The students who attend branch campuses were often commuter students who were place-bound and had difficulty accessing higher education offered in traditional settings (Dengerink, 2001). Huitt (1972) contended that for many students, the existence of the branch campus was the only reason they were able to attend college. Holland (2001) echoed Huitt's contention when he argued that today's branch campuses are probably the

> most conspicuous example of the dilemma faced by all of higher education today, that being the public expectation that our campuses will be ready to explore and implement innovative responses to rapidly changing conditions in the economic and social environment (p. 5).

More recently, Bird (in press) contended that “branch campuses are likely to play an even more critical role in the future, especially at institutions, public or private, that need increased enrollment from adult learners in order to address financial challenges” (p.10).

Types of Branch Campuses

Jensen (1984) argued that the philosophy of the district toward its multi-campus organization was an extremely important factor governing the administration’s policies and practices and Clark (1992) asserted that the institution’s organizational structure set the parameters for the organization. However, as early as the 1970’s Block noted that “the patterns of multi-unit organization in community junior college districts are fairly varied and this made classification difficult” (1970, p. 24). This was echoed by Kerr, Millett, Clark, MacArthur, and Bowen (1978), and Clark (1983), and more recently by Bird (in press) who contended that differences in organization, mission, and history are still seen as one of the greatest challenges in research on branch campuses.

In 1963, Jensen conducted a study of ten multi-campus districts that examined the role of the central office and the individual campuses of the multi-campus district and identified three different types of multi-campus community college districts: multi-college districts that operated each campus as an individual comprehensive college, multi-branch districts operating as one legal institution with comprehensive branches, and multi-program districts operating as one legal institution (Jensen, 1984). However, 20 years later when he re-examined the structures of multi-campus institutions in California, Colorado, Florida, Oregon, and Texas, he found only two multi-campus philosophies at work. In the first philosophy, the college operated as one legal institution with multiple locations with a strong central office and single accreditation; in

the other, each campus had maximum autonomy and its own accreditation (Jensen, 1984).

Organizational Characteristics of Branch Campuses

Jones, in his 1968 study of multi-unit junior colleges identified four models of multi-unit community colleges: 1) the one college-branch center model, 2) the one college multi-campus model, 3) the multi-campus district model, and 4) the multi-college district model (Jones, 1968, as cited in Jensen, 1984). Jones argued that multi-unit colleges proceeded through these four models as they aged, maturing from a centralized one-college model to a more autonomous, decentralized, multi-college district model. Jensen also observed this relationship in his 1968 study (Jensen, 1984). However, in his 1984 follow-up work, Jensen found that a number of institutions organized as multi-college districts were actually in the process of changing back to a multi-campus district, suggesting a possible advantage to this model (Jensen, 1984).

On the other hand, Lee and Bowen (1971) and, more recently, Dengerink (2001), differentiated between two types of multi-campus structures: the multi-campus institution and the multi-institution system. According to their definition, a multi-institution system involved branches that were, for the most part, separate and unique institutions with their own individual characteristics. In this model, the individual branches had no direct relationship with each other except for the fact that they were members of the same system; whereas, in a multi-campus institution branches were dependent and connected to the main institution and "typically the administration of the originating or main campus is responsible for the coordination among the branch campuses" (Dengerink, 2001, p. 20). Fonseca and Bird (2007) distilled this notion down to three basic models for university branch campuses: the centralized model, in which a

centralized office located at the main campus made decisions for the branch campuses, the decentralized model that provided full autonomy to the branch campus sites, and the leadership model in which strategic management functions were branch campus based, but coordinated with the larger university. Levinson (2005) differentiated between two basic types of twenty-first century community colleges: single or multi-campus institutions administered and governed by a single board of trustees, and multi-campus systems of several separate and unique colleges governed by a chancellor. This study included branch campus administrators from all categories of multi-campus community college institutions.

Branch Campus Administration

Community college administration and management were characterized as bureaucratic and hierarchical (Miller and Miles, 2008), and Cohen and Brawer (2003) suggested that multi-campus institutions were more complex, structured, and formalized than single campus institutions. Wynn (1972) contended that the questions that often demanded early answers pertained to the definition of the authority, control, and decision-making responsibilities that were assigned to each level of the organizational structure, how to structure the administration of the campus, and how to organize the relationship among the multiple campuses. Ewers (2000) asserted "all institutions with multiple campuses suffer from the perception that one campus is being preferred over the others. No campus believes that it receives the attention and resources that it needs" (p.4).

Branch campuses' effectiveness was found in their "flexibility to offer the educational services that respond directly to community needs" (Norby, 2005, p 24). Each campus was unique; no branch campus was a carbon copy of the original

campus, or any other campus, and Holland (2001) asserted, that to be truly responsive to its community, each campus required differentiated operation and organization. Although every branch campus story was unique (Shaw and Bornhoft, in press), the majority of multi-campus community colleges grew from a single campus concept to multiple campuses as the population of the colleges' service areas grew and their original campuses reached capacity. The colleges expanded enrollment by adding off-campus or branch campuses at convenient locations instead of opening new colleges (Bond, 1983). This often allowed colleges to be responsive to community needs, without having to "alter the core culture and programs of the main campus" (Holland, 2001, p. 5). As the colleges grew to multiple sites, some college-wide functions were centralized with the goal of greater efficiency, while others were delegated to the branch campus. As Holland (2001) pointed out, the establishment of a branch campus appeared like a good strategy for many institutions; it allowed the main campus of the college to continue life as usual, while at the same time being responsive to a new local community.

Lee and Bowen (1971) contended that multi-campus organizational structures had strengths over single campus institutions. Among these strengths were the efficiencies brought about by the overlap of certain functions, the utilization of existing governance boards, and the promotion of specialization, diversity, and cooperation in academic planning and budget preparation. Chang (1978) described eight advantages of multi-campus structures for community colleges:

- minimized unhealthy competition among campuses;
- permitted financial flexibility;

- permitted the economy of a large scale operation while maintaining the flexibility to respond to local needs;
- increased the college's ability to attract top talent for key administrative positions;
- avoided unnecessary duplication of specialized high-cost programs;
- provided opportunity to share ideas, staff, and equipment among the campuses for program development and problem solving;
- increased effectiveness of efforts to interpret college financial and educational programs to state and federal governments; and
- permitted ease of student transfer from one campus to another within the college.

However, typically, the new campus was expected to remain subordinate to the original campus creating the multi-campus institution (Spencer, 1997; Bond, 1983), and this often created some degree of tension between the branch and the main campus (Holland, 2001; Dengerink, 2001).

Administrative Structures

Many early community colleges had their roots in the public school system: the colleges began classes in local high schools (Huitt, 1972), and some were even initially controlled by a department of public education or a superintendent (Monroe, 1972). A large part of the success experienced by community colleges and their branch campuses was attributed to the fact that local communities were willing to step in and provide temporary facilities for the campuses (Huitt, 1972). Fryer and Lovas (1990) contended that since community colleges "were created from equal parts of the university moving down and the high school moving up" (p. 26) and with their ever growing complexity, community colleges tended to be structurally and conceptually ambiguous institutions. As a result, they appeared to be caught somewhere between the secondary school model of top-down decision making and the university model of

shared governance in their governance structures (Fryer and Lovas, 1990). Additionally, as the colleges grew in size and complexity, the number of people needed to carry out the functions of the institution increased. Along with these structures came the fear that bureaucracy would increase and local autonomy would decrease (Rossmeier, 1976). Each institution dealt with this fear differently; thus there is great variance among the organizational structures in today's community colleges (Underwood and Hammons, 1999; Levinson, 2005). These differences in organization, mission, and history are seen as one of the greatest challenges in research on branch campuses (Bird, in press); "speak with [branch campus] administrators from across the United States and it becomes evident that every branch campus is unique" (Shaw and Bornhoft, in press, p. 1).

Birnbaum (1988) used the term "bureaucracy" to describe the organizational structure of community colleges. Furthermore, Lander (1977) asserted that the formal organization of a multi-campus institution tended to be even more complex than that of single campus institutions. Unfortunately, this top-down decision-making structure did not fit the community college concept of the twenty-first century and many community colleges have discovered this mismatch (Parilla, 1993). Amey, Jessup-Anger, and Jessup-Anger (2008) contended that if community colleges were to continue to meet the challenges and expectations of the new century, they would need "highly effective governance and leadership to guide them" (p. 10); and they further argued that it was because of this complexity and ambiguity that an effective organizational structure was critical to organizational functioning for the community college. Thus, the task before many community colleges was to shape institutions that were prepared to adapt to

changing environments (Parilla, 1993), and for multi-campus institutions one of the most critical problems was the need to maintain workable organizational structures (Anthony, 1976).

Fonseca and Bird (2007) asserted that one of the critical questions in the administration of branch campuses surrounded the relationship that the branch campus had with the main campus and this assertion was supported by others (Wynn, 1972; Dengerink, 2001). Wygal and Owen (1975) suggested that "a multi-campus college experiences special problems and tensions as a consequence of its size, complexity, and the distance separating its units" (p. 27). Dengerink (2001) pointed out that the relationships between the branch campus and the main campus were "complex, dynamic and labor-intensive" (p. 8); and Jensen (1984) noted that "as a community college goes multi-campus, the role of the central office becomes crucial, as does the question of how much autonomy each campus should have and/or can legally have" (p. 1).

Branch Campus Administrators

Blocker, Plummer, and Richardson, (1965) defined administration as the "direction and coordination of the elements of an organization" (p. 170). They argued that it provided both the structure and function necessary for the systematic operation of the organization. Glatter (1979; 1999) contended that educational management is concerned with the internal operation of educational institutions, their relationship with the communities in which they are set, and the governing bodies to which they are responsible. However, educational administration is not only about structure, it is also about managing people; the administrator can only accomplish things through others (Richardson, Blocker and Bender, 1972). Wilson (1980) identified a comprehensive list

of the responsibilities of academic administrators which included organizing, staffing, directing and leading, controlling, and planning. Unfortunately, in many community colleges, although senior management may delegate responsibility, it typically tends to keep a strong hold on authority (Protch, 2006).

Literature on the academic leadership of branch campuses was limited (Bird, in press, Krueger, 2009). However, Bailey (2002) asserted that the role of the branch campus administrator was pivotal to the daily operations of the branch. “Branch administrators must be willing and able to build bridges and close need gaps for all constituents at their branch, in the local community, and at the main campus. Moreover branch administrators must be aware of, and responsive to, the stated and unstated needs of students, personnel, institution, and community” (gillie-gossom and Pelton, in press, p. 7).

Hill (1985), Hermanson (1995), Stahley, (2002), Norby (2005), Merzer (2008) and most recently, Bebko and Huffman (in press), all reported that branch campus administrators were generally either the second level of administrator within the institution’s organizational structure and reported directly to the college president/chancellor, or they were a third level administrator who reported to a second level administrator. Bebko and Huffman (in press) reported that approximately half of their sample of university and community college branch campus administrators reported to either a president/chancellor or vice president on the main campus. Thus, branch campus administrators were viewed as part of the middle management of the institution.

Unfortunately, unlike other administrative positions in the community college administrative hierarchy, the role of the branch campus administrator is a hybrid position; it did not have clearly defined roles and definitions (Bebko and Huffman, in press; gillie-gossom and Pelton, in press; Bailey, 2002; Blocker and Campbell, 1963). As middle managers, branch campus administrators interacted with senior administration, faculty, career staff, and the community, and served as liaisons between each of these groups, carrying the college mission and vision to them (Johnsrud and Rosser, 1999; Bailey, 2002). Johnsrund, Heck, and Rosser, (2000) contended that midlevel administrative positions were often difficult positions to juggle, and one of them (Johnsrud, 1996) identified three sources of frustration for mid-level administrators: 1) the mid-level nature of their role, 2) the lack of recognition for their contributions, and 3) their limited opportunity for career growth or advancement. Mid-level administrative staff members often provided the necessary information for decisions, but were typically not given the authority and were rarely involved in actual decision making, yet were often held accountable for the outcomes (Johnsrund and Rosser, 1999; Johnsrund, Heck, and Rosser, 2000). Authority must be delegated right along with responsibility (Protch, 2006). Authority is the right of decision (Protch, 2006, p. 12) and a lack of authority to act was often the case for branch campus administrators (Stahley, 2002; Hill, 1985).

Job titles for branch campus administrators were as varied as their campuses (Shaw and Bornhoft, in press), but still representative of their middle management position (Conover, 2009). Previous studies have shown titles that ranged from dean, provost, director, and vice president or, in large multi-college districts, campus president

(Bond, 1983; Corbelli, 1989, Hermanson, 1995; Norby, 2005; Krueger, 2009, Bebko and Huffman, in press). Branch campus administrators typically had responsibility for the successful implementation of the college's mission on the branch campus and were "pivotal for the daily administrative responsibilities of the entire campus" (Bailey, 2002, p. 4).

The prime role of an educational administrator was to coordinate and balance the diverse needs of the various college constituents (Monroe, 1972, p. 310); and "good administration is characterized by a clear cut delegation of authority" (Kintzer et al., 1969, p. 20). Unfortunately, Wynn (1972) argued that one important area of focus for multi-campus institutions was the definition of the authority, control, and responsibility for the financial and business affairs of the college. He cited two organizational levels to which the authority, control, and responsibility for branch campus administration could be assigned: to an administrator at the individual campus in a decentralized structure, or to an administrator at a main campus level having responsibility for all units in a centralized structure.

Although each branch campus administrator's degree of centralization and autonomy varied, the branch campus administrator was still responsible for maintaining the vision and mission of the overall institution in its local community (Conover, 2009). The branch campus administrator was responsible for oversight of the campus resources and assured that they were managed effectively and efficiently (Bailey, 2002; Honeyman et al., 1996; Moses, 2001). Bailey (2002) reported that the duties of a branch campus executive officer were similar to that of the college presidents, only smaller in scope, and gillie-gossom and Pelton (in press) equated the role of the branch

campus administrator to that of a circus ringmaster; “branch administrators and staff must regularly act as masters of ceremony for academic, student, and operational issues. Like a circus ringmaster, we must be “familiar and comfortable” (Smith, 2010, para. 2, cited in gillie-gossom and Pelton, in press) in each environment” (gillie-gossom & Pelton, in press, p. 4).

Gleazer (1998), Fryer and Lovas (1990), and O’Banion (1997) all asserted that effective leadership in community colleges was determined by their ability to create an environment that enhances excellence and promotes learning, and the branch campus administrator serves an important role in this leadership by creating this culture at their respective campuses (Bailey, 2002). gillie–gossom and Pelton (in press) further asserted that effective branch campus administrators “flourish in an environment where relationships are built with local business, industry, and civic leaders to identify unmet academic needs” (p. 3). Branch campus administrators affected the tone, manner, and style of the institution, and their actions on a daily basis affected the quality of relationships with faculty, students, and the community (Scott, 1978). As such, the success of branch campus administrators in their positions was integral to the success of the college as a whole (Bailey, 2002; Crom, 2000; Sethi, 2000; Krueger, 2009).

Psychological Ownership

Bennis (1999) asserted that effective leaders were passionate about their work, and certainly effective branch campus administrators are passionate about their campuses. This level of commitment is certainly evident in conversations with branch campus administrators, during which it is not uncommon to hear comments like: “MY campus grew 30% during the fall term.” “MY campus is the prettiest campus. MY campus…..and so on.” (NABCA participants, personal communication, April 14–16,

2010). Pierce and colleagues asserted that these possessive comments were indicative of a concept known as “psychological ownership” (Pierce, Rubenfeld, and Morgan, 1991; Pierce, Kostova, and Dirks, 2001; 2003; Pierce, O’Driscoll, and Coghlan, 2004; Pierce and Rodgers, 2004 and VanDyne and Pierce, 2004).

In 1991, Etzioni wrote that ownership was a “dual creation, part attitude, part object, part in the mind, part ‘real’ ” (p. 466), and during the past 20 years ownership as a psychological phenomenon has been a topic of interest in organizational and management science (Mayhew, Ashkanasy, Bramble, and Gardner, 2007; Pierce, Kostova, and Dirks, 2001, 2003; Pierce, O’Driscoll and Coghlan, 2004; Pierce and Rodgers, 2004; Van Dyne and Pierce, 2004). These researchers focused on the idea that employees who may not have had a tangible legal or financial claim of ownership still developed a psychological, or affective, feeling of ownership in the company for which they worked. In essence, the organization for which they worked became the object of ownership even though they had no tangible property interest in the company (Pierce, Kostova and Dirks, 2001, 2003; McIntyre, Srivastava and Fuller, 2009).

Pierce, Rubenfeld, and Morgan (1991) first proposed the idea that formal ownership could, and did, produce positive attitudinal and behavioral effects though a psychologically experienced form of ownership, and by 1993 Kubzansky and Druskat asserted that this psychological sense of ownership was an essential aspect of the employee-organization relationship. However, in this early model, psychological ownership was seen as an outgrowth of formal ownership and not an independent phenomenon. Although research evidence demonstrated that individuals exhibited feelings of ownership towards their organization (Dirks, Cummings, and Pierce, 1996),

the products they created (Das, 1993), and their jobs (Peters and Austin 1985), it was not until 1991 that Beggan conceptually defined psychological ownership as the state in which individuals felt as though the target of ownership or a piece of that is "theirs" (Beggan, 1991, 1992). Pierce, Kostova, and Dirks (2001, 2003) further elaborated the psychological ownership construct and began to propose a theory of psychological ownership independent of formal, legal, or financial ownership (McIntrye, Srivastava and Fuller, 2009). People, they claimed, “can come to a state where they experience a sense of ownership for objects whether or not they own them legally” (Pierce et al., 2009, p. 481).

Building on the works of Furby (1978a, 1978b), Dittmar (1992), Litwinski (1947), and Belk (1988), Pierce, Kostova, and Dirks (2001; 2003) defined psychological ownership as: a cognitive-affective state “where individuals feel as if the target of ownership (material or immaterial in nature) or a piece of it is “theirs” (i.e., It is MINE!)” (2001, p. 299). The cognitive aspects of psychological ownership included an individual’s awareness, thoughts and beliefs regarding the target of ownership. The affective aspects included the pleasurable feelings produced by the sense of ownership (Pierce, Jussila and Cummings, 2008; Pierce, Kostova and Dirks, 2001; 2003). According to these researchers the core features of psychological ownership were “the feelings of possessiveness and of being psychologically tied” to the target of ownership (Pierce, Kostova, and Dirks, 2001, p. 299). In essence, Pierce et al., (2001) argued, the target becomes part of the psychological owner’s identity. This psychological experience of ownership is not dependent on any type of equity or legal claim and exists

in its absence (McIntyre, Srivastava, and Fuller, 2009) and can be directed at any target including organizations, jobs, work tasks, space, tools, or ideas.

More recently O'Driscoll, Pierce, and Coghlan (2006) and Mayhew, Ashkanasy, Bramble, and Gardner (2007) expanded the concept of psychological ownership to include job-based and organization-based psychological ownership as "two distinctly different work attitudes" (p. 493). Organization-based psychological ownership was concerned with the person's sense or feelings of "possession and psychological connection to the organization, [or in this study institution] as a whole" (Mayhew et al., 2007, p. 478). Job-based, or in the case of this study, campus-based, psychological ownership was "related to the individual's feelings of possession toward their particular job" (Mayhew et al., 2007, p. 478). Thus, Mayhew et al., (2007) contended that, psychological ownership was a context-specific, temporary attitude that reflected the individual's current position in the organization and not an enduring personality trait.

Consequences of Psychological Ownership

Over the past decade research has established psychological ownership as distinctly different from, but related to other organizational management constructs such as job satisfaction and organizational commitment (Mayhew, Ashkanasy, Bramble, and Gardner, 2007; Van Dyne and Pierce, 2004) and different and distinct from organizational identification and internalization (Pierce, Kostova, and Dirks, 2001). It answers the question "what do I feel is mine?" not "should I maintain my membership in this organization" (commitment), "who am I?" (identification), or "what do I believe?" (internalization) (Pierce, Kosotva and Dirks, 2001, p. 305).

There are a variety of motivational, attitudinal, and behavioral consequences of psychological ownership (Pierce, Rubenfeld, and Morgan, 1991). According to Heider

(1958) feelings of ownership induce a sense of desirability and liking which leads the target of ownership to be judged more positively. Psychological ownership theory posited and empirical evidence supported, the idea that "employees who feel and act like owners of the organization will assume personal risk, responsibility, and accountability for their actions and decisions affecting their organizations" (Md-Sidin, Sambasivan, and Muniandy, 2010, p. 50). For example, Pierce, Rubenfeld, and Morgan, (1987) suggested that there was a relationship between organizational commitment, psychological ownership, and job satisfaction, and Pierce, Kostova, and Dirks (2003) maintained that psychological ownership made people feel more responsible for workplace outcomes. Han, Chiang, and Chang (2010) also asserted that "employees who perceive they have ownership of the organization regard themselves as important organizational members and then commit to the organization" (p. 2218). Research into the consequences of psychological ownership supported these claims by showing positive relationships between organizational psychological ownership and extra-role behavior (Vandewalle, Van Dyne, and Kostova, 1995), self-reported learning (Wood, 2003), job performance (Md-Sidin, Sambasivan, and Muniandy, 2010), organizational commitment (O'Driscoll, Pierce, and Coghlan, 2006; Vandewalle, Van Dyne, and Kostova, 1995; Van Dyne and Pierce, 2004; Han, Chiang, and Chang, 2010), job satisfaction (Vandewalle, Van Dyne, and Kostova, 1995; Van Dyne and Pierce, 2004), and organizational citizenship (Pierce, Van Dyne, and Cummings, 1992; Van Dyne and Pierce, 2004; Van Dye, VandeWalle, Kostova, Latham, and Cummings, 2000; O'Driscoll, Pierce, and Coghlan, 2006). Buchko (1992)

also found that ownership affected group members' attitudes, primarily through providing greater perceived influence and control.

However, O'Driscoll et al., (2006) and Mayhew et al., (2007) both found differences in the relationships between job- and organization-based psychological ownership and their consequences. Although both job-based and organization-based psychological ownership played significant roles in the development of citizenship behaviors in a study by O'Driscoll et al., (2006), they did so in different ways. Results of this study suggested that individuals with high job-based psychological ownership displayed extra role behaviors associated more specifically on job-related activities, while individuals who scored higher on organization-based psychological ownership were more likely to exhibit extra-role behaviors that benefited the whole institution. This same trend was seen in a study by Mayhew et al., (2007); while job-based psychological ownership was related to only job satisfaction, organization-based psychological ownership was related to affective organizational commitment and job satisfaction. Both of these results suggested that the consequences of job-based psychological ownership were focused at the level of the job, and only partially explained the relationship between the work environment and organizational commitment. Organization-based psychological ownership, on the other hand, promoted behaviors related to the welfare of the entire institution.

Origins of Psychological Ownership

Some behavioral researchers suggested that people have an innate need to possess (Burk, 1900; Kline and France, 1899), while others suggested that psychological sense of ownership is learned early in life as a child grasps the concept that objects that can be controlled are part of self and those that cannot are separate

from self (Furby, 1978a, 1978b; 1991; Seligman, 1975). Pierce, Kostova, and Dirks (2001) contended that both genetics and experience contributed to the development of psychological ownership. These researchers asserted that psychological ownership emerged due to the fact that it satisfies three main motives: efficacy and effectiveness, self-identity, and the need to have "a place" or a "home" (p. 300). Although these three motives were considered to be the primary motives for the development of psychological ownership, they are considered to only facilitate psychological ownership, not to be the direct cause of its occurrence (Pierce et al., 2009).

Efficacy and effectance. According to the theory of psychological ownership espoused by Pierce and colleagues (2001, 2003, 2004, 2006, 2009), an individual developed psychological ownership for organizations that provided them with opportunities to feel efficacious and in control (McIntrye, Srivastava, and Fuller, 2009); "specifically, it has been theorized that with the exercise of control over the ownership target, objects become a part of the extended self and feelings of ownership emerge" (Pierce et al., 2009, p. 482). This claim is based on Furby's work on possession during the 1970's. Furby (1987a, 1978b, 1980, 1991) posited that the motivation for possession came from an individual's need for control over the environment. Empirical support for a relationship between efficacy and psychological ownership was provided by McIntrye, Srivastava, and Fuller (2009), Pierce, O'Driscoll, and Coghlan (2004), and by O'Driscoll, Pierce, and Coghlan (2006).

Self-identity. Pierce and colleague's theory of psychological ownership also asserted that an individual developed psychological ownership for organizations that became part of the individual's self-identity, where through interaction with the

organization the employee came to use the organization to define self (Pierce, Kostova and Dirks, 2001). In essence, the theory asserted, psychological ownership evolved from the dynamics of coming to know self, expressing self to others, and maintaining self across time (Perce, Kostova, and Dirks, 2003).

Having a place. Finally, the theory of psychological ownership also asserted that the state of psychological ownership was explained in part by the individual's desire "to possess a territory or space—to have a 'home' in which to dwell" (Pierce, Kostova, and Dirks, 2001, p. 300). Van Dyne and Pierce (2004) further asserted that this was the "basic need to have a sense of belonging" (p.442).

Routes (Experiences) to Psychological Ownership

Pierce, Kostova, and Dirks (2001) posited three major routes through which psychological ownership developed: intimate knowledge of the target, the investment of self into the target, and the ability to control the target. In 2003, these authors further asserted that these routes were distinct, complementary, and additive in nature. Mayhew et al., (2007), provided empirical support for Pierce, Kostova, and Dirks' (2001, 2003) assertions and further opined that the routes to job and organization-based psychological ownership were the same.

Intimate knowledge of the target.

Pierce, Kostova, and Dirks (2001) asserted that association with the target of ownership was central to the development of feelings of psychological ownership. The more, and better, information the individual had about the organization, the deeper the relationship that existed between them and the stronger the feelings of psychological ownership were towards the organization. Thus, longer tenures with organizations were likely to be related to higher degrees of psychological ownership.

Investment of self.

Csikszentmihalyi and Rochberg-Halton (1981) asserted that the investment of individual effort into the object, or organization, caused one to become one with that object or organization. Thus, Pierce, Kostova, and Dirks' theory of psychological ownership posited that the more self-investment (in the form of time, ideas, skills, and energy) in the organization, the stronger the sense of psychological ownership was. Furthermore, Pierce, Kostova, and Dirks (2001, 2003) hypothesized that complex jobs were more malleable, thereby enabling the individual the opportunity to shape the job and work outcomes (i.e., personalize them). Thus, complex jobs required a higher degree of investment of self, such that the product of one's labor was a reflection or extension of the self, and thus complex jobs were likely to produce stronger degrees of psychological ownership.

Controlling the target.

Control of the target represented the final key characteristic in the development of feelings of psychological ownership (Pierce, O'Driscoll, and Coghlan, 2004). Dirks, Cummings, and Pierce (1997), along with Kubbzansky and Druskat (1993) and Pratt and Dutton (2000), contended that organizational structures and processes contributed to the development of psychological ownership by providing members of the organization with the opportunity to exercise control over their jobs. They posited that organizational designs that permitted employee control, informed the employee, and involved the employee tended to produce more positive effects (O'Driscoll, Pierce, and Coghlan, 2006). Jobs that were less structured and provided greater autonomy gave employees more control over their daily duties; this in turn increased the likelihood of

the employee developing feelings of ownership toward the job (Pierce, Kostova, and Dirks, 2001; Pierce, O'Driscoll, and Coghlan, 2004; Parker, Wall, and Jackson, 1997).

Pierce, O'Driscoll, and Coghlan, (2004) and O'Driscoll, Pierce, and Coghlan (2006) asserted that three important factors in the work environment influenced the amount of control the individual might exercise: 1) technology (or the processes, procedures, and systems) used by the organization, 2) degree of job autonomy (or the degree to which the job provides freedom, independence, and discretion) embedded in the design of the job, and 3) participative decision making (the design of the organization's authority and decision-making systems) (Pierce, O'Driscoll, and Coghlan, 2004). In this context, the best work environment structure was a decentralized one that provided the individual with non-routine technologies, flexible workflow patterns, and low levels of automaticity; high levels of autonomy and a high degree of sharing of authority; and employee involvement in decision making (Pierce, O'Driscoll and Coghlan, 2004). Formal, centralized organizational structures, on the other hand tended to minimize the authority delegated and the degree of autonomy and control that an individual employee had, thus lower feelings of psychological ownership would be predicted (Pierce, Kostova, and Dirks, 2001).

Autonomy. "The presence of autonomy implies that control and the a priori structuring of the job have not been imposed upon employees by other members of the social system" (Pierce, 2009, p. 486). Hackman and Oldham (1975) defined autonomy as a job design attribute that reflected "the degree to which the job provides substantial freedom, independence, and discretion to the employee in scheduling work and determining the procedures to be used in carrying it out" (p. 162), and theorized that

autonomy was positively related to intrinsic work motivation, and job satisfaction. Brass (1985) found that employees exposed to high degrees of autonomy experienced more influence than their counterparts who had low autonomy; and Yamauchi, Kumagai and Kawasaki (1999), and Tanaka and Yamauchi (2000) both found a link between autonomy and perception of control. Finally, Pierce, O'Driscoll, and Coghlan (2004) reported empirical evidence of a relationship between autonomy and control, and autonomy and psychological ownership. Thus, in this study, modeled after Pierce, O'Driscoll, and Coghlan (2004), measures of the degree of job autonomy were used as one measure of perception of control.

Participative decision-making. Also seen as influencing the degree of control an employee has over their work environment was the degree to which the employee had the authority to, and was permitted to participate in organizational decision-making. Wondolleck and Yaffee (2000) believed that "providing people with the latitude to make creative decisions is critical to fostering ownership" (p.148). Participation in organizational decisions allowed employees direct influence over organizational decisions (Chi and Han, 2008) and empirical results from Pierce, O'Driscoll, and Coghlan (2004) and O'Driscoll, Pierce, and Coghlan (2006) found positive relationships between ratings of participation in decision making, expressions of experienced control, and psychological ownership. More recently Han, Chiang, and Chang (2010) further reported positive relationships between employee participation in decision-making and psychological ownership. As employees saw themselves having increasing amounts of control over the organization, they began to experience the organization as a part of the self (Pierce, Kostova, and Dirks, 2001; Chi and Han, 2008; Han, Chiang, and Chang,

2010). Thus, when an organization allowed its employees to participate in, and have influence over, organizational decisions, the employees were more likely to perceive that 'this is MY organization;' demonstrating psychological ownership' (Pierce, Kostova and Dirks, 2003; Chi and Han, 2008).

Employees who had a say in the decisions of the institution, felt that they had the perceived authority to act and, in turn, felt as if the organization was theirs (McGregor, 1986). Han, Chiang, and Chang, (2010) demonstrated that employee participation in organizational decision-making increased their working motivation and psychological ownership. Van Dyne and Pierce (2004) demonstrated that participation in decision-making was associated with a higher altruistic spirit that contributed to psychological ownership.

Karasek (1979) further defined control as a composite of the worker's authority to make decisions on the job (decision authority) and the breadth of skills used by the worker (skill discretion) (Smith, Tisak, Hahn, and Schmieder, 1997) and Protch (2006) asserted that "authority is the right of decision" (p. 13). Karasek (1979) referred to the working individual's potential control over his/her tasks and his/her conduct during the working day as 'job decision latitude' and measurements of decision latitude were viewed as operational assessments of the concept of control, and have often been defined as the combination of job decision-making authority and the opportunity to use and develop skills on the job. In this study measures of decision latitude and job authority were used to assess perceptions of control.

Psychological Ownership and Branch Campus Administration

"Ownership engenders passion and commitment in teachers" (Kenny, 2011 , Para. 9) and was associated with pride that minimizes shirking, and motivated

organizational members to perform at high levels (Bernstein, 1979). Psychological ownership theory linked the sense of ownership with feelings of possessiveness and responsibility, which in turn led employees to invest time and energy and advocate for the organization (Pierce et al., 2001). This idea fit well with conventional wisdom that suggested that "people will take better care of, and strive to maintain and nurture the possessions they own" (Avey, Avolio, Crossley, and Luthans, 2009, p. 173).

Although most of the research on psychological ownership had been conducted in for-profit companies, a few studies examined and demonstrated the establishment of psychological ownership in employees of non-profit organizations (Vandewelle, Van Dyne, and Kostova, 1995; Belton 2008) and educational environments (teachers). Given that psychological ownership had been observed in non-profit, educational settings, it could be argued that the establishment of psychological ownership was also be important to the success of the higher education administrators. According to Pierce and his colleagues (2001, 2003, 2004, 2006, 2009), high levels of familiarity and close association with the organization, coupled with the investment of time and energy, and opportunities to exercise control, caused strong levels of psychological ownership in branch campus administrators.

Furthermore, Pierce, Jussila, and Cummings (2009) asserted that in addition to organizational structure, design of an individual employee's job was also important to the development of psychological ownership. They maintained that complex jobs with high skill variety and autonomy possessed the characteristics that aroused and satisfied the needs for the establishment of psychological ownership. These complex jobs presented greater challenges, were more open to the role incumbent's decisions and

manipulation, required more skills and abilities and higher levels of motivation, persistence, and effort. Simple jobs, on the other hand, “make it much more difficult for people to come to experience accomplishments as a function of their own skills and abilities” (Pierce, Jussila, and Cummings, 2009, p. 482). As previously illustrated, the position of a branch campus administrator could be classified as a “complex job,” since it required the individual to be highly skilled at cooperating and juggling relationships with many people and required higher levels of motivation, persistence, and effort, again suggesting the idea that branch campus administrators would develop psychological ownership for their institution and individual campus.

Hermansen, (1993, 1995), Baily (2002), Stahley (2002), Merzer,(2008), Krueger, (2009) all asserted that the role of the branch campus executive officer was pivotal to the success of the branch campus since typically all daily administrative responsibilities of the campus were overseen by this individual. The responsibilities of branch campus administrators were complex, required intimate knowledge about the institution and campus, and an investment of sufficient time and energy; which, according to the theory behind psychological ownership, facilitated the development of psychological ownership in them (Md-Sidin, Sambasivan, and Muniandy, 2010). However, the third route to facilitate the development of psychological ownership was the ability to control the target and effect change. As mid-level administrators, branch campus administrators juggled relationships between senior administration, faculty, career staff, and the community (Johnsrud and Rosser, 1999; Bailey, 2002) and shared decision-making with the main campus, limiting their autonomy and decision making authority. Lack of autonomy and authority to effect changes and participate in decisions could limit the

development of psychological ownership in branch campus administrators. Thus, this study examined the existence of psychological ownership in branch campus administrators and the factors that contributed to its expression by examining the relationship between psychological ownership and the perceived sense of control these administrators experienced in the course of carrying out their everyday responsibilities. Both job-based (campus) and organization-based (institution) psychological ownership were measured.

The next chapter presents the research methodology of the current study. It describes the research questions and hypotheses, the research sample, data collection procedures and the statistical analysis used to evaluate the data.

CHAPTER 3
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This chapter describes the research methods used in the study. It describes and explains the purpose of the study, the research questions, the overall study design, the selection of the study participants, the design and administration of the survey instrument, and the data analysis methods.

Purpose of the Study

The intent of this quantitative study was to examine the factors that contributed to the psychological ownership that community college branch campus administrators experience. To do so, the study examined the relationship between psychological ownership and the sense of control branch campus administrators experienced in the course of carrying out everyday responsibilities. Sense of control was defined within the context of the individual-work environment by the degree of job autonomy, the level of participation in decision making, and the amount of authority given to the branch campus administrator.

The study also examined differences in levels of psychological ownership in branch campus administrators related to the branch campus administrator' s gender, the length of time the administrator served as a branch campus administrator, their longevity at the institution, their longevity at the specific branch campus, institutional and campus size, the reporting structure of the branch campus administrator, the type of administrative responsibility of the branch campus administrator, and the degree of centralization of the college's organizational structure.

Research Questions

This study addressed the following specific research question: What is the nature of the relationship between the psychological ownership (campus and institutional) experienced by administrators of branch campuses in multi-campus community colleges and the branch campus administrator's perceived sense of control as measured by the level of job autonomy, level of authority, and participation in decision making? To answer this question the following twelve research questions were addressed:

1. Did branch campus administrators develop psychological ownership for their institution?

2. Did branch campus administrators develop psychological ownership for their campuses?

3. Was there a difference between the feelings of psychological ownership branch campus administrators developed for their institution and the feelings of psychological ownership they developed for their campus?

4. Was there a relationship between psychological ownership (campus and institution) and the individual respondent demographic characteristics of longevity in their current positions, tenure at their institution and branch campus, and the number of years they had been in higher education and as a branch campus administrator?

5. Was there a relationship between the institutional characteristics pertaining to institutional size (college-wide headcount), branch campus size (branch campus headcount), number of branch campuses, the distance between the branch and main campuses, and the composite score for organizational reporting structure of the branch and psychological ownership (campus and institutional)?

6. Was there a difference in the level of psychological ownership (campus and institutional) experienced by branch campus administrators based on the levels of the individual respondent demographic characteristics of gender, to whom the branch campus administrator reported (BCA Supervisor), and the branch campus administrators' administrative responsibilities and administrative role?

7. Was there a difference in the level of psychological ownership (campus and institutional) experienced by branch campus administrators based on the institutional characteristics of location of the administrative offices, degree of centralization of decisions, and branch campus staff reporting structure?

8. Were the feelings of psychological ownership (campus and institutional) experienced by branch campus administrators related to their level of perceived job autonomy?

9. Were the feelings of psychological ownership (campus and institutional) experienced by branch campus administrators related to their level of perceived participation in decision-making?

10. Were the feelings of psychological ownership (campus and institutional) experienced by branch campus administrators related to their level of perceived job authority?

11. Were the feelings of psychological ownership experienced by branch campus administrators related to their overall experiences of perceived sense of control (job autonomy, level of authority, and participation in decision making) by the branch campus administrator?

12. What was the nature of the relationship between the feelings of psychological ownership (campus and institutional) experienced by branch campus administrators and their individual demographic characteristics, the institutional characteristics, and their perception of control?

Null Hypotheses

The following null hypotheses were identified for this study:

H_{01} Branch campus administrators do not develop psychological ownership for their institutions.

H_{02} Branch campus administrators do not develop psychological ownership for their campus.

H_{03} There was no significant difference between the psychological ownership branch campus administrators develop for their campuses and those they develop for their institution.

H_{04a} There was no significant relationship between institutional psychological ownership and individual respondent demographic characteristics of longevity in their current positions, tenure at their institution and branch campus, and the

number of years they had been in higher education and as a branch campus administrator.

H_{04b} There was no significant relationship between campus psychological ownership and individual respondent demographic characteristics of longevity in their current positions, tenure at their institution and branch campus, and the number of years they had been in higher education and as a branch campus administrator.

H_{05a} There was no significant relationship between the institutional characteristics pertaining to institutional size (college-wide headcount), branch campus size (branch campus headcount), number of branch campuses, the distance between the branch and main campuses, and the composite score for organizational reporting structure of the branch and institutional psychological ownership.

H_{05b} There was no significant relationship between the institutional characteristics pertaining to institutional size (college-wide headcount), branch campus size (branch campus headcount), number of branch campuses, the distance between the branch and main campuses, and the composite score for organizational reporting structure of the branch and campus psychological ownership.

H_{06a} There was no significant difference in the level of institutional psychological ownership experienced by branch campus administrators based on the levels of the individual respondent demographic characteristics of gender, to whom the branch campus administrator reported (BCA Supervisor), and the branch campus administrators administrative responsibilities and administrative role.

H_{06b} There was no significant difference in the level of campus psychological ownership experienced by branch campus administrators based on the levels of the individual respondent demographic characteristics of gender, to whom the branch campus administrator reported (BCA Supervisor), and the branch campus administrators' administrative responsibilities and administrative role.

H_{07a} There was no significant difference in the level of institutional psychological ownership experienced by branch campus administrators based on the institutional characteristics of location of the administrative offices, degree of centralization of decisions, and branch campus staff reporting structure.

H_{07b} There was no significant difference in the level of campus psychological ownership experienced by branch campus administrators based on the institutional characteristics of location of the administrative offices, degree of centralization of decisions, and branch campus staff reporting structure.

H_{08a} There was no significant relationship between the level of job autonomy and the psychological ownership experienced by the branch campus administrator for their institution.

H_{08b} There was no significant relationship between the level of autonomy and the psychological ownership experienced by the branch campus administrator for their campus.

H_{09a} There was no significant relationship between the level of participation in decision making and the psychological ownership experienced by the branch campus administrator for their institution.

H_{09b} There was no significant relationship between the level of participation in decision making and the psychological ownership experienced by the branch campus administrator for their campus.

H_{010a} There was no significant relationship between level of authority and psychological ownership experienced by the branch campus administrator for their institution.

H_{010b} There was no significant relationship between level of authority and psychological ownership experienced by the branch campus administrator for their campus.

H_{011a} There was no significant relationship between perceived sense of control and feelings of psychological ownership experienced by the branch campus administrator for their institution.

H_{011b} There was no significant relationship between perceived sense of control and feelings of psychological ownership experienced by the branch campus administrator for their campus.

H_{012a} There was no significant overall relationship between the feelings of institutional psychological ownership experienced by branch campus administrators and their individual demographic characteristics, the institutional characteristics, and their perception of control.

H_{012b} There was no significant overall relationship between the feelings of campus psychological ownership experienced by branch campus administrators and their individual demographic characteristics, the institutional characteristics, and their perception of control.

Design of the Study

Fink (2008) asserted that surveys comprise the best data collection method available when information was needed directly from individuals regarding what they believed, knew, or thought about a given topic. Umbach (2005) added that such surveys were comparatively inexpensive, and that internet data collection was fast and efficient. Thus, this study relied on the use of a quantitative, internet-based, self-report survey methodology using a survey instrument developed specifically for the purpose of the study. To complete the study, a national internet-based survey was conducted of approximately 500 on-site branch campus administrators. Survey questions were based on previous research in the field of business on psychological ownership and its determinants (Appendix A provides a copy of the survey instrument). Although the use of online surveys for research was still a relatively new methodology, Wright (2005) contended that the development of online survey tools like *Survey Monkey®* and *Stellar Survey®* have made it faster and easier for researchers to obtain data. Creswell (2009), Sue and Ritter (2007), and Van Selm and Jankowski (2006) all asserted that online, e-mail, and web-based, survey instruments were being used as a tool and platform for survey research. Van Selm and Jankowski further added that since e-mail and internet access had reached nearly all persons engaged in higher education, it was relatively easy to survey higher education administrators by electronic means.

This study relied on the *Stellar Survey®* tool for its data collection. This tool was chosen due to its ease of use, economical cost, and the variety of available data download formats available. Advantages to the use of on-line surveys included the ability to reach people that may be difficult to contact or located in far-away locations, and that automated data collection reduced the amount of time and expense the

researcher needed to spend in data collection (Wright, 2005; Garton, Haythornthwaite, and Wellman, 2003; Yun and Trumbo, 2000). Online survey tools like *Stellar Survey®* (http://www.stellarsurvey.com/) collect and store participants' responses automatically, allowing the researcher to collect data while working on other projects (Andrews, Nonnecke, and Preece, 2003). Also, since the data was easily transferred to a statistical package, preliminary analyses were easily conducted (Llieva, Baron, and Healey, 2002). Additionally, research suggested that people may be more willing to open themselves up and express unpopular or sensitive opinions in an Internet-based survey (Muhtaseb, 2004).

Independent and Dependent Variables

Levels of psychological ownership for the participant's institution and levels of psychological ownership for the individual's campus served as the dependent variables in this study. Explanatory (independent) variables included participant demographic characteristics, institutional demographics, measures of perceived degree of job authority, perceived level of participation in decision making, and perceived level of job autonomy. Participant demographic characteristics included the administrator's gender, the length of time the participant had worked at the institution and specific campus, their longevity in their current position, the overall length of their tenure in higher education administration and as a branch campus administrator, to whom they reported, and their perception of the scope of their administrative role and responsibilities. Institutional characteristics included the size of the institution and branch campus (measured by the most recent fall term head count), the distance between the main campus and branch campus, the number of branch campuses, the administrator's belief as to the level of

centralization that existed at the institution, and the reporting structure of the branch campus staff.

Survey Instrument

Theories of psychological ownership suggested that the individual-organization relationship is most important aspect of its development; for that reason this study used the individual as the unit of analysis. The research also suggested that psychological ownership emerged as a result of the employees work environment experiences; therefore the survey used in the present study examined the branch campus administrator's perception of their work-life experiences. Following conventions used in other psychological ownership research (Pierce, O'Driscoll, and Coghlan, 2004; Pierce, Kostova, and Dirks, 2003; Pierce, Van Dyne, and Cummings, 1992), the present study defined "psychological ownership" as the "state where an individual feels as if the target of ownership or a piece of that target is theirs (i.e., "it is MINE!") (Pierce, O'Driscoll, and Coghlan, 2004, p. 509). 'Perceived control' was operationally defined as consisting of job design autonomy, participative decision making and job authority.

The survey instrument was designed to obtain information including:

- background and demographic information on the branch campus administrators and their institutions,
- branch campus administrators' perceptions as to degree in which they participated in college and campus decisions,
- branch campus administrators' perceptions as to degree of job autonomy they experienced,
- branch campus administrators' perceptions as to degree of decision making authority they experienced, and
- the level of psychological ownership branch campus administrators reported towards their institution and campus.

To this end, the survey instrument used in this study consisted of 19 questions organized in to three sections (Appendix A). Questions 1 and 2 assessed the participant's perceived degree of job authority, 3 and 4 measured the participant's perceptions as to the degree of job autonomy, question 5 assessed the administrator's perceptions as to their participation in institutional and campus decision-making, questions 6 and 7 assessed the dependent variable—the participant's sense of psychological ownership over the institution (question 6) and the campus for which they were responsible (question 7), question 8 assessed the branch campus administrator's perception as to the degree to which their institution's organization was centralized, question 9 addressed the reporting structure of the branch campus staff, questions 10–14 measured characteristics of the institution and the administrator's specific branch campus, and finally, questions 15–19 assessed the characteristics of the individual branch campus administrator.

Measurement of Psychological Ownership

Psychological ownership was measured using a modified version of an instrument initially developed by Pierce, Van Dyne, and Cummings (1992) and further validated by Van Dyne and Pierce (2004). Based on the literature concerning the psychology of possession and property, Van Dyne and Pierce (2004) approached measurement of psychological ownership by focusing on feelings of possession (Pierce, O'Driscoll & Coghlan, 2004). As a result, the questions in the assessment of psychological ownership used possessive vocabulary ("That idea was MINE," "This is MY office"). This section of the survey consisted of seven items including "This is MY institution;" and "I sense that this is MY college" that were rated according to a 7-point Likert scale ranging from 1 = strongly disagree to 7 = strongly agree.

Measurements of Perceived Control

Perceived control was operationally defined as consisting of three dimensions: perceived job autonomy, perceived authority, and perceived participation in decision-making. Each of these components was assessed using modified versions of previously developed instruments.

Perceived job autonomy. Perceived job autonomy was measured using Idazak and Drasgow's (1987) 3-item modification of Hackman and Oldham's (1975) *Job Diagnostic Survey* assessment and a three item *Decision Latitude Scale* developed by Karasek (1979). Idazak and Drasgow's assessment of perceived autonomy contained three questions; these same three items were used in this study. These items included: "The job gives me the chance to use my personal initiative and judgment in carrying out the work," "The job gives me considerable opportunity for independence," and "This job permits me to decide on my own how to go about things at work." The three items were rated on a 7-point Likert scale (1 = very inaccurate and 7 = very accurate) as to the accuracy of the statement for the participants job.

The *Decision Latitude Scale* was also used to measure perceived job autonomy on the job by assessing the authority the individual believed they had to make task relevant decisions. It consisted of five items: "In general, how much say or influence do you have in how you perform your job?" "To what extent are you able to decide how to do your job?" "In general how much say or influence do you have on what goes on in your work group (on your campus)?" "In general, how much say or influence do you have on decisions which affect your job (campus)?" and "My supervisors are receptive and listen to my ideas and suggestions." Each participant was asked to rate how much

of each item existed in their job as a branch campus administrator on a 5-point Likert scale where 1 = very little and 5 = very much.

Perceived authority. Perceived authority was assessed using Hage and Aiken's 1966 *Index of Hierarchy of Authority* and a *Decision Matrix* used by Hill (1982) and Stahley (2002) in their research on administrative issues in branch campuses. The *Index of Hierarchy of Authority* was designed to measure the extent to which "members of the organization are assigned tasks and then provided with the freedom to implement them without interruption from superiors" (Hage and Aiken 1966, p. 497). The index was a 5-item survey in which the participant rated the items on a 4-point Likert scale in which 1 = definitely false and 4 = definitely true. Items included "There can be little action taken here until a supervisor approves a decision," "A person who wants to make his own decisions would be quickly discouraged here," "Even small matters have to be referred to someone higher up for a final answer," and "I have to ask my boss before I do almost anything."

The *Decision Matrix* (Hill, 1985; Stahley, 2002) examined the degree to which the branch campus administrator had exclusive, shared, or no input in decision-making authority in matters pertaining to academic program approval, course development and scheduling, recruitment, selection, promotion and evaluation of faculty and non-faculty, professional development and training, contracts and grants, student academic support services, budget planning, development and allocation, and space, equipment and facilities. Participants were requested to rate the items on a 6-point Likert scale in which 1 = Main campus decision; branch campus is excluded and 6 = Branch campus decision exclusively, no consultation required.

Participation in decision-making. Participative decision making was assessed using a modified version of Hage and Aiken's (1967) *Index of Participation in Decision Making*. The *Index of Participation in Decision Making* examined areas of decision making that are common to most organizations and represent decisions about the allocation of people and resources, key areas of concern in the branch campus literature. The assessment was a 6-item measure in which respondents are asked to rate the level of involvement of the Branch Campus Administrator in decision-making activities such as goal setting, hiring and promotion and new program development using a 5-point Likert scale where 1 = never and 5 = always.

Reliability and Validity of the Instruments

Reliability. Since most of the scales used in this study relied on the use of summated or composite scores designed to measure the various concepts, it was important to assess the reliability of the various scales (Santos, 1999). Reliability refers to the degree to which a measure yields consistent scores when measured a number of times. Cronbach's alpha were used as the measure of reliability. This measure is a test reliability technique that requires a single administration of the scale and serves as "an index of reliability associated with the variation accounted for by the true score of the underlying construct'" (Santos, 1999, Para. 7).The coefficient typically ranges between 0 and 1, with values closer to 1 indicative of greater internal consistency of items in the scale. Nunnaly (1978) and Gliem and Gliem (2003) assert that an alpha of 0.7 or over is an acceptable reliability coefficient.

Each of the subsections of the survey used in the current study, with the exception of the *Decision Matrix*, had been used in previous psychological ownership studies and their questions were chosen because of their wide usage in the this type of

research. The *Decision Matrix* was chosen for use because of its applicability to branch campus administration and its usage in prior branch campus research.

Pierce, O'Driscoll and Coghlan (2004) reported Cronbach alpha reliability estimates of .93 for the questions used in assessing the organizational psychological ownership and estimates of .92 for the same questions when adapted to assess psychological ownership of the job, while the current study produced an alpha of .84 for institutional psychological ownership and .82 for campus psychological ownership.

Reliability estimates for use of Idazak and Drasgow's (1987) 3-item modification of Hackman and Oldham's (1975) *Job Diagnostic Survey* assessment have been estimated by Pierce, O'Driscoll and Coghlan (2004) at .84 using Cronbach coefficient alpha for measurements of job autonomy and Westman (1992) reported an alpha of .79 for the *Decision Latitude Scale* developed by Karasek (1979). The current study provided a Cronbach alpha of .88 for the *Job Diagnostic Survey* and of .81 for the *Decision Latitude Scale.*

Dewar, Whetten and Boje (1980) reported that both Hague and Aiken's *Index of Hierarchy of Authority* and their *Index of Participation in Decision Making* were reliable, reporting reliability coefficients of .79 for the *Index of Hierarchy of Authority* and .95 for the *Index of Participation in Decision Making.* In the current study an alpha of .82 was observed for the *Index of Hierarchy of Authority and .78* for the *Index of Participation in Decision Making.*

The *Decision Matrix* was adapted from a scale used in previous studies conducted by Hill (1985) and Stahley (2002) on organizational structure and authority in branch campus administrators. Although neither of the previous studies reported

reliability values for the scale, in the current study the matrix produced a Cronbach alpha of .76.

Validity. Validity refers to the extent to which an instrument measures what it purports to measure. Validation evidence for the measures of psychological ownership of the organization and job were obtained from multiple field studies and the use of two independent panels of judges (Pierce et al., 1992; Van Dyne and Pierce, 2004; Pierce, O'Driscoll and Coghlan, 2004). Pierce, O'Driscoll and Coghlan (2004) provided validation that the instrument could be used to distinguish between feelings of ownership for two related constructs: the organization and the job (or campus). The validity of the Indexes of *Hierarchy of Authority* and *Participation in Decision-making* were assessed by Dewar, Whetten and Boje (1980) who reported that both scales have "high degrees of convergent and discriminate validity; therefore they appear to validly indicate the sub-constructs for which they were intended" (p.125).

Survey Instrument Jury Process

In order to further validate the questionnaire for use with branch campus administrators, the final survey instrument was juried by the research committee of the National Branch Campus Administrators (NABCA) organization as well as the members of the researcher's dissertation committee. The NABCA research committee was made up of 10 members, all of whom were branch campus administrators. Half of the committee members were heads of community college branch campuses and the other half headed up university branch campuses. The members of the jury were sent draft copies of the survey and copies of the survey protocol, and asked to examine the survey for question clarification and appropriateness of language. Feedback from the members of the jury was used to make modifications to the survey instrument.

Population

The population for this quantitative study consisted of all public community college branch campus heads nationally. Branch campus heads were identified through the 2010 Higher Education Directory (HEP) yielding an initial population size of 534 individuals. The directory specifically codes branch campus administrators [(12) Director of Branch Campus], defining them as the official who is in charge of a branch campus (2010 Higher Education Directory). Undeliverable e-mail addresses and changes in personnel decreased the size of the population to 500 individuals. The number of possible participants was small enough to include all possible subjects in the research study and all identified individuals were invited to participate in the study. Contact information for all potential participants was purchased from HEP, Inc.

Procedure for Data Collection

The following 4-step protocol was used for administration of the survey (Creswell, 2009). Prior to beginning the study, the researcher submitted the study's protocol to the University of Florida's Institutional Review Board (IRB). Upon approval, a short advance notification (Appendix B) was sent to all community college branch campus administrators identified in the 2010 Higher Education Directory via e-mail describing the purpose of the study and inviting them to participate. This preliminary e-mail allowed the researchers to determine the viability of all e-mail addresses on the purchased list. Attempts to correct e-mails that bounced back or produced an error message were made through examination of personnel directories on college websites. A second e-mail was sent two weeks after the preliminary e-mail with a request to participate in the research study (Appendix C). This request contained a uniform

resource locator (URL) link to the web-based survey embedded in the e-mail message, as well as a description of the study background and purpose.

The recipient was requested to complete the survey within a 3-week time period. A follow-up e-mail was sent to all individuals who had not responded by the deadline reminding them of the survey and requesting that they complete it within ten days (Appendix D). A third e-mail request was sent to those who had not responded to the first two requests two weeks after the deadline of the second request and once again requested that the individual complete the survey (Appendix E). Ultimately a total of 167 surveys were returned, yielding a 33% response rate.

Data Analysis

All data collected from all participants were recorded and tabulated anonymously and the responses from the survey instrument were statistically analyzed. Data were collected from the online surveys via *Stellar Survey* and was exported into Microsoft™ Excel for tabulation. The survey information was then imported into *SPSS-PASW Statistics 19*®, a commercially-available statistical software tool, and analyzed. Descriptive statistics, Pearson correlation, Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) and Multiple Linear Regression analysis were utilized to determine the relationship between the independent and dependent variables, and to test the study's 21 null hypotheses.

Summary

This chapter has provided an overview of the research methods of this study. The purpose of the study, the research question, the overall study design, the selection of the study participants, the design and administration of the survey instrument were all explained. The methods used for data analysis were also articulated, the results of which will be presented in Chapter 4.

CHAPTER 4
RESULTS

The purpose of this study was to examine the nature of the relationship between levels of psychological ownership experienced by branch campus administrators and the individual administrator's perceived sense of control as measured by the level of job autonomy, level of authority, and participation in decision making. This chapter reports the results of the study including descriptive results, frequency and correlation data, as well as the outcomes of analysis of variance and multiple regression analyses. Discussion of the findings and conclusions based on the results of this study follow in Chapter 5.

In addition to examining the study's primary question, the research also examined differences in levels of psychological ownership in branch campus administrators related to the branch campus administrator's gender, the length of time in which the administrator served as a branch campus administrator, their longevity at the institution, their longevity at the specific branch campus, institutional and campus size, the reporting structure of the branch campus administrator, the type of administrative responsibility of the branch campus administrator, and the degree of centralization of the college's organizational structure. To answer this question the following twelve research questions were addressed:

1. Did branch campus administrators develop psychological ownership for their institution?
2. Did branch campus administrators develop psychological ownership for their campuses?
3. Was there a difference between the feelings of psychological ownership branch campus administrators developed for their institution and the feelings of psychological ownership they developed for their campus?

4. Was there a relationship between psychological ownership (campus and institution) and the individual respondent demographic characteristics of longevity in their current positions, tenure at their institution and branch campus, and the number of years they had been in higher education and as a branch campus administrator?

5. Was there a relationship between the institutional characteristics pertaining to institutional size (college-wide headcount), branch campus size (branch campus headcount), number of branch campuses, the distance between the branch and main campuses, and the composite score for organizational reporting structure of the branch and psychological ownership (campus and institutional)?

6. Was there a difference in the level of psychological ownership (campus and institutional) experienced by branch campus administrators based on the levels of the individual respondent demographic characteristics of gender, to whom the branch campus administrator reported (BCA Supervisor), and the branch campus administrators' administrative responsibilities and administrative role?

7. Was there a difference in the level of psychological ownership (campus and institutional) experienced by branch campus administrators based on the institutional characteristics of location of the administrative offices, degree of centralization of decisions, and branch campus staff reporting structure?

8. Were the feelings of psychological ownership (campus and institutional) experienced by branch campus administrators related to their level of perceived job autonomy?

9. Were the feelings of psychological ownership (campus and institutional) experienced by branch campus administrators related to their level of perceived participation in decision-making?

10. Were the feelings of psychological ownership (campus and institutional) experienced by branch campus administrators related to their level of perceived job authority?

11. Were the feelings of psychological ownership experienced by branch campus administrators related to their overall experiences of perceived sense of control (job autonomy, level of authority, and participation in decision making) by the branch campus administrator?

12. What was the nature of the relationship between the feelings of psychological ownership (campus and institutional) experienced by branch campus administrators and their individual demographic characteristics, the institutional characteristics, and their perception of control?

Respondent and Institutional Demographics

Contact information for all 2-year public college branch campus administrators was obtained through the 2010 Higher Education Directory produce a population size of 500 individuals. A total of 167 Internet–delivered surveys were returned, yielding a 33% response rate. This return rate is higher than others who have recently conducted research with branch campus administrators. For example, Krueger (2009) received 111 completed surveys in his study of both university and community college branch campus administrators, and Conover (2009), who used the same population as the current study, reported 134 responses for the demographic portion of her survey and 123 for its other portions. A small portion (10) of the surveys in the current study were returned with some items left blank, however all recorded responses were used in the analysis of the data.

Tables 4-1 and 4-2 provide demographic information for the 153 branch campus administrators that completed the demographic survey questions, and also presents information on gender and the respondent's longevity at their institutions, campuses and as branch campus administrators. Tables 4-3, 4-4, and 4-5 contain information on the institutions that employed these administrators, and presents information on institutional and branch campus size, the number of branch campuses, the location of the main campuses with respect to the branch campuses, and organizational and reporting structures.

Respondent Demographics

Table 4-1 shows that of the 153 respondents who completed the survey question on gender, 86 (56%) were male and 67 (44%) were female. The majority (83%) of the respondents were chief administrators at a single branch campus, with the remaining

participants having responsibilities for all branch campuses within their institution. Sixty-five (43%) of the respondents reported that they had administrative responsibility for branch campus matters only, while 87 (57%) indicated that they had responsibilities for both college-wide and branch campus matters. No respondents reported that they only had responsibility for college-wide matters.

Table 4-1. Branch campus administrator's demographics

Demographic Variable	Frequency	Percent (%)
Gender		
Male	84	56.2
Female	67	43.8
Administrative Role of BCA		
Chief administrator at a branch campus	127	82.5
Chief administrator of branch campuses responsible for all branch campus matters	25	16.2
College official to whom the local BCA's report	2	1.3
Scope of BCA's responsibility		
Responsible for branch campus matters only	65	42.8
Responsible for both college-wide and branch campus matters	87	57.2

As can be seen in Table 4-2, most of the branch campus administrators in the current sample had a significant degree of longevity at their institutions with a lesser number of years on their current campuses. The number of years at their current institution ranged from 1 to 45 years with a mean of 12.37 years (*SD* = 10.04). Campus tenure ranged from less than one year to 39 years with a mean of 7.45 years (*SD* = 6.97). The respondent's tenure as a branch campus administrator ranged from less than a year to 32 years with a mean of 8 years (*SD* = 6.75).

Table 4-2. Branch campus administrators demographics: Longevity

Longevity	Current Institution	At Current Campus	In Branch Campus Administration
Mean	12.37	7.45	8.08
Std Deviation	10.04	6.97	6.75
N	132	132	131

Institutional Characteristics

Demographics. The sizes of the institutions at which the respondents were employed ranged from a fall term student head count of 1,100 to 160,000, with a median of 10,000. The campuses sizes ranged in size from a fall term student headcount of 103 to 26,000, with a median of 1,700 (Table 4-3). The typical institution had three branch campuses located between 1 and 270 miles apart with the median distance being 28 miles. The majority of institutions represented housed their central administrative offices on the main campus (69.5%) (Table 4-4).

Table 4-3. Institutional demographics

Variable	N	25th Percentile	50th Percentile	75th Percentile
College-wide enrollment	151	5,500	10,000	22,324
Campus enrollment	151	900	1,700	3,600
Number of campuses	137	1.5	3.	5
Branch distance from the main campus	153	12 miles	28 miles	45 miles

Organizational structure. More than 75% of institutions housed their administrative offices on the college's main campus, however the majority (47%) of respondents indicated that they reported directly to the college President or system Chancellor, with the next highest percentage (33%) reporting to the institution's Vice President for Academic Affairs (Table 4-4). This is consistent with the reporting structure findings from previous branch campus research (Bebko and Huffman, in

press; Kreuger, 2009; Conover, 2009; Stahley, 2002). Fifty-six percent of the respondents reported that they perceived the organizational structure of their institution as moderately centralized with most decision making delegated, but some decisions still conducted only by top leaders. Another 32% reported that their institution was moderately centralized with most decision making done at the top of institution; only two of respondents saw their institution's organizational structure as decentralized. In the decision matrix, except for student life and faculty personnel issues, the majority of the respondents indicated that decisions were shared equally with the main campus. The only area in which the respondents indicated that they had limited decision authority was in the sphere of faculty personnel issues. The branches had exclusive responsibility for student life issues and planning. These findings are similar to those reported by both Hill (1985) and Stahley who reported that "branch campus exclusion from decision making process was more the exception than the rule" (Stahley, 2002, p. 115).

At most institutions, the majority of the staff (including academic and non-academic administrators, faculty, professional non-faculty, and non-professional, non-administrative staff) located on the campus either reported to the branch campus administrator or had a dual reporting structure to both the branch campus and a main campus administrator (Table 4-5). Again, this is consistent with the findings of other branch campus research (Stahley, 2002).

Table 4-4. Profile of organizational structure

Variable	Number of respondents	Percentage (%)
Location of Administrative Office		
On main campus	116	75.8
Apart from any campus	24	15.7
On a branch campus	8	5.2
On the BCA's branch campus	5	3.3
BCA's Direct Supervisor		
President	64	41.6
Chancellor	9	5.8
VP Academic Affairs	52	33.8
Provost	5	3.2
VP for Branch Campuses	2	1.3
AVP for Branch Campuses	2	1.3
Dean/Director of Branch Campuses	7	4.5
Other	13	8.4
Degree of Centralization		
Highly centralized	16	10.3
Moderately centralized-most decision making power at top	50	32.1
Moderately centralized-most decision making power a delegated	88	56.4
Highly decentralized	2	1.3

Table 4-5. Reporting structure of branch campus staff

Type of Branch Campus Staff	Number of Respondents (Percentage)		
	Reports to main campus only	Reports to both main and branch campus	Reports to branch campus only
Academic Administrators	57 (37.5%)	21 (13.8%)	74 (48.7%)
Non-academic Administrators	30 (20.1%)	42 (28.2%)	77 (51.7%)
Faculty	52 (33.8%)	34 (22.1%)	68 (44.2%)
Professional Non-faculty	25 (16.4%)	39 (25.7%)	88 (57.9%)
Non-professional Non-administrative	13 (8.4%)	36 (23.2%)	106 (68.4%)

Hypothesis Testing

The survey data were analyzed through a variety of tests to assess if they answered the study's twelve specific research questions and their corresponding null hypotheses. Descriptive statistics were calculated to summarize the composite levels of institutional and campus psychological ownership, paired t-tests were conducted to assess whether there were statistically significant differences in levels of institutional and campus psychological ownership, analyses of variance were conducted to examine relationships between the ordinal explanatory variables and the dependent measures, and Pearson-product moment correlations were used to examine the relationships between the various numerical explanatory variables and the two dependent measures of psychological ownership. Finally, a simultaneous multiple regression analysis was conducted to determine the degree of association between the explanatory variables and the two dependent variables.

Research Questions One and Two

Did the branch campus administrators demonstrate psychological ownership for their institution? Did branch campus administrators demonstrate psychological ownership for their campuses? Composite psychological ownership scores were computed by summing the Likert scale values for each of the 7 questions pertaining to psychological ownership for both the institution and campus. Descriptive statistics were used to summarize the composite levels of institutional and campus psychological ownership expressed by the branch campus administrators.

Table 4-6 shows the mean levels of institutional and campus psychological ownership. Of the 167 respondents, only 148 answered both questions pertaining to psychological ownership. For those respondents the institutional psychological

ownership composite scores ranged from a low of 14 to a high of 46 with a mean composite score of 34.68 (*SD* = 6.21). Their composite campus psychological ownership scores ranged from a low of 11 to a high of 49 with a mean of 37.36 (*SD*=5.81). Null hypotheses H_{01} and H_{02} were rejected.

Table 4-6. Descriptive statistics for institutional and campus psychological ownership

	Mean	N	Standard Deviation	25th Percentile	50th Percentile	75th Percentile
Institutional Psychological Ownership	34.68	148	6.21	31.0	35.0	40.0
Campus Psychological Ownership	37.36	148	5.81	34.0	38.0	42.0

Research Question Three

Was there a difference between the feelings of psychological ownership branch campus administrators demonstrated for their institution and the feelings of psychological ownership they demonstrated for their campus? A paired samples t-test for related means was conducted to investigate whether there were significant differences among the two types (campus and institutional) of psychological ownership. Results indicated that the level of psychological ownership for the campus was significantly higher than the level of institutional psychological ownership (t (147) = -5.47, p=.000). Null hypothesis H_{03} was rejected.

Research Questions Four and Five

Respondent demographic variables and psychological ownership. Was there a relationship between psychological ownership (campus and institution) and the individual respondent demographic characteristics of longevity in their current positions, tenure at their institution and branch campus, and the number of years they had been in

higher education and as a branch campus administrator? Table 4-7 reports the results of the correlation conducted to analyze the relationships between each of the respondent demographic (explanatory) variables of longevity in their current positions, tenure at their institution and branch campus, and the number of years they had been in higher education and as a branch campus administrator, the institutional characteristics pertaining to institutional size (college-wide headcount), branch campus size (branch campus headcount), number of branch campuses, the distance between the branch and main campuses, and the composite score for organizational reporting structure of the branch and the two dependent measures.

Pearson product moment correlations for the respondent characteristics of longevity in their current positions, tenure at their institution and branch campus and the number of years they had been in higher education and as a branch campus administrator indicated that none of the variables were significantly correlated with psychological ownership of the campus, thus null hypothesis H_{04b} was not rejected.

Longevity at the branch campus administrator's current institution (r (151) = 0.190, p = 0.019) and number of years in higher education (r (151) = 0.185, p = 0.023) were the only two variables correlated with institutional psychological ownership, and these relationships were weak, thus H_{04a} was rejected. These results suggested that the longer and branch campus administrator served in branch campus administration, and at a specific institution, the higher their psychological ownership for their institution was likely to be; but that none of the individual branch campus administrator characteristics measured by this study were related to psychological ownership for the administrator's campus.

Table 4-7. Correlations between respondent and institutional characteristics and psychological ownership for the institution and the campus

	Institutional Psychological Ownership			Campus Psychological Ownership		
Respondent Characteristics	N	r	p	N	r	p
# Years in Current Position	153	r = .018	p = .882	136	r = .085	p = .311
# Years at Current Institution	153	r = .190*	p = .019	136	r = .109	p = .193
# Years on Current Campus	153	r =. 068	p = .402	136	r = .105	p = .207
# Years in Higher Education	152	r = .185*	p=.023	135	r = .107	p = .203
# Years as a Branch Campus Administrator	152	r = .011	p = .897	136	r = .066	p = .428
Institutional Characteristics						
# of Branch campuses	137	r = .146	p = .09	137	r = .133	p = .132
College-wide Enrollment	151	r = .133	p = .104	135	r = .104	p = .214
Branch Campus Enrollment	151	r = .160*	p = .05	135	r = .136	p = .106
Distance Between Branch and main campuses	153	r = -.048	p = .552	136	r = -.066	p = .432
Reporting Structure	145	r = .251**	p = .002	127	r = .055	p = .524

* Correlation is significant at the .05 level (2-tailed)
**Correlation is significant at the .01 level (2-tailed)

Institutional characteristics and psychological ownership. Was there a relationship between the institutional characteristics pertaining to institutional size (college-wide headcount), branch campus size (branch campus headcount), number of branch campuses, the distance between the branch and main campuses, and the composite score for organizational reporting structure of the branch and psychological ownership (campus and institutional)? Table 4-7 also reports the results of the correlational test conducted to analyze the relationships between the institutional

demographic (explanatory) variables pertaining to institutional size (college-wide headcount), branch campus size (branch campus headcount), number of branch campuses, the distance between the branch and main campuses, and the composite score for organizational reporting structure of the branch and the two dependent measures. The results of these Pearson product moment correlation analyses for the institutional characteristics showed that none of these variables were significantly correlated with psychological ownership of the campus; thus null hypothesis H_{05b} was not rejected. However, branch campus size (r (149) = 0.160, p = 0.05) and the overall branch campus reporting structure (r (143) = 0.251, p = 0.002) were significantly correlated with institutional psychological ownership; thus null hypothesis H_{05a} was rejected. These results suggested that branch campus administrators of larger branches and those branch campus administrators with higher composite branch campus reporting structure scores were more likely to demonstrate higher levels of institutional psychological ownership, but that none of the institutional characteristics measured in this study were related to the feelings of campus psychological ownership.

Research Hypotheses Six and Seven

Respondent variables and psychological ownership. Was there a difference in the level of psychological ownership (campus and institutional) experienced by branch campus administrators based on the levels of the individual respondent demographic characteristics of gender, to whom the branch campus administrator reported (BCA Supervisor), and the branch campus administrator's administrative responsibilities and administrative role? An independent t-test was conducted to compare differences in levels of psychological ownership by gender with no significant

effects observed for either institutional (t (151) = -0.174, p = 0.862) or campus (t (143) = 0.687, p = 0.493) psychological ownership.

Table 4-8 presents the results of the analysis of variance (ANOVA) tests conducted on the respondent demographic variables of to whom the branch campus administrator reported (BCA Supervisor), and the branch campus administrators' administrative responsibilities and administrative role. There was a significant effect for to whom the branch campus administrator reported for both institutional ($F_{(7, 146)} = 2.78$, $p = 0.01$) and campus ($F_{(7,138)} = 3.69$, $p = 0.001$) psychological ownership, thus null hypotheses H_{06a} and H_{06b} were both rejected. These results indicated that the higher up in the organizational chart the branch campus administrator reported, the greater their feelings of psychological ownership they demonstrated for both their institution and campus. No other significant effects were observed between respondent characteristics and psychological ownership for the campus. However, a significant effect was observed between the branch campus administrator's administrative responsibility and institutional psychological ownership ($F_{(1,150)} = 6.69$, $p = 0.011$), with branch campus administrators having both college-wide and branch campus responsibilities reporting higher levels of institutional psychological ownership than those with only branch campus responsibilities.

Institutional characteristics and psychological ownership. Was there a difference in the level of psychological ownership (campus and institutional) experienced by branch campus administrators based on the institutional characteristics of location of the administrative offices, degree of centralization of decisions and branch campus staff reporting structure? The results of the analysis of variance (ANOVA) tests

Table 4-8. Analysis of variance comparing respondent and institutional characteristics and psychological ownership for the institution and the campus

	Institutional Psychological Ownership		Campus Psychological Ownership	
Respondents Characteristics	F	*p*	F	*p*
BCA's Supervisor	$F_{(7, 146)}= 2.78^{**}$	*p*= .01	$F_{(7,138)}= 3.69^{**a}$	***p*= .001**
BCA's Administrative Responsibilities	$F_{(1,150)}= 6.69^{*}$	*p*= .011	$F_{(1,142)}= .651$	*p* = .421
BCA's Administrative Role	$F_{(2, 151)}= 1.09$	*p*= .355	$F_{(2, 143)}= .160$	*p* = .984
Institutional Characteristics				
Location of Administrative Office	$F_{(3, 149)}= 1.09$	*p*= .355	$F_{(3, 141)}= 1.17$	*p* = .323
Degree of Centralization	$F_{(3,152)}= 3.31^{*a}$	*p*= .022	$F_{(3, 144)}= 1.10$	*p* = .351
Branch Campus Staff Reporting Structure				
Academic Administrators	$F_{(2, 149)}= 3.73^{*}$	*p*= .02	$F_{(2, 141)}= 2.52$	*p* =.109
Non-academic Administrators	$F_{(2, 146)}= 5.04^{**}$	*p*= .008	$F_{(2, 139)}= 1.22$	*p* =.299
Faculty	$F_{(2, 151)}= 3.23^{*}$	*p*= .043	$F_{(2, 143)}= .013$	*p* =.987
Professional non-faculty	$F_{(2, 149)}= 4.12^{*}$	*p*= .018	$F_{(2, 142)}= .637$	*p* =.53
Non-professional, non-administrative staff	$F_{(2, 152)}= 1.11$	*p*= .334	$F_{(2, 145)}= .402$	*p*=.670

* Test is significant at the .05 level (2-tailed)

**Test is significant at the .01 level (2-tailed)

[a] Indicates violation of the Homogeneity of Variance assumption

conducted on these institutional demographic variables are presented in Table 4-8. Again, none of these variables showed a significant effect for psychological ownership of the campus, thus null hypothesis H_{07b} was not rejected. However, statistically significant effects were observed for the degree of centralization ($F_{(3,152)} = 3.31$, $p = 0.022$) and for the reporting structure of branch campus academic administrators ($F_{(2, 149)}= 3.73$, $p = 0.02$), non-academic administrators ($F_{(2, 146)}= 5.04$, $p = 0.008$), faculty ($F_{(2, 151)}= 3.23$, $p = 0.043$) and professional non-faculty ($F_{(2, 149)}= 4.12$, $p = 0.018$) and institutional psychological ownership. Thus, null hypothesis H_{07a} was rejected. These

results suggest that the more delegation of decision-making authority, or the more decentralized the institution was, the greater the branch campus administrator's feelings of psychological ownership. However, interpretation of this result could be considered questionable since Levene's test for homogeneity of variance was statistically significant, suggesting that the assumption of equal variances had been violated in this analysis. Fortunately the analysis of variance is not sensitive to violation of the equal variance assumption when sample sizes are moderate to large and the samples are approximately of equal size (Gerstman, 2006), as was the case in the current study.

Research Questions Eight, Nine, Ten, and Eleven

Perceived control was measured by assessing levels of job autonomy, levels of authority, and degree of participation in decision making by the branch campus administrator. Table 4-9 presents the results of the correlational analyses of these variables and psychological ownership (campus and institution).

Table 4-9. Relationship between job autonomy, job authority, and participation in decision-making and psychological ownership for the institution and the campus

	Institutional Psychological Ownership (N=157)	Campus Psychological Ownership (N=148)
Job Autonomy		
Decision Latitude Scale	r = .428**; p = .000	r = .112, p = .176
Job Diagnostic Survey	r = .391**; p = .000	r = .132, p = .109
Level of Participation in Decision Making	r = .430**; p = .000	r = .116, p = .162
Job Authority		
Hierarchy of Authority Scale	r = -.250**; p = .002	r = .069, p = .403
Hill's Decision Matrix	r = .344**; p = .000	r = .082; p = .320

**Correlation is significant at the .01 level (2-tailed)

Job autonomy and institutional psychological ownership. Are the feelings of institutional psychological ownership experienced by branch campus administrators related to their experienced level of perceived job autonomy? As is shown in Table 4-9, scores on the *Decision Latitude Scale* (r (155) = 0.428, p = 0.000) and the *Job Diagnostic Survey* (r (155) = 0.391, p = 0.000) were significantly correlated with institutional psychological ownership, allowing the rejection of H_{08a} and suggesting a moderately strong, positive correlation between job autonomy and institutional psychological ownership.

Participation in decision-making and institutional psychological ownership. Are the feelings of institutional psychological ownership experienced by branch campus administrators related to their experienced level of perceived participation in decision-making? Table 4-9 also showed that composite scores on the *Participation in Decision-making Scale* were also significantly correlated with institutional psychological ownership (r (155) = 0.430, p = 0.000) causing the rejection of null hypothesis H_{09a} and suggesting a moderately strong, positive relationship between the degree to which a branch campus administrator participates in decision making and feelings of institutional psychological ownership.

Job authority and institutional psychological ownership. Are the feelings of institutional psychological ownership experienced by branch campus administrators related to their experienced level of perceived job authority? Table 4-9 also showed that composite scores on *Hill's Decision Matrix* (r (155) = 0.344, p = 0.000) and the *Hierarchy of Authority Scale* (r (155) = -0.250, p = 0.002) were both statistically significantly correlated with institutional psychological ownership. Therefore, null

hypothesis H_{010a} was rejected. The moderately strong positive correlation observed on *Hill's Decision Matrix* suggests that the more authority assigned to the branch campus administrator, the more ownership the administrator will feel toward their institution. Since the *Hierarchy of Authority Scale* was a reverse scale in which lower composite scores are indicative of higher authority, the negative correlation between this measure and the measure of institutional psychological ownership was also indicative of a positive relationship between the degree of job authority experienced by the branch campus administrator and the degree of psychological ownership they felt for their institution.

Perceived control and institutional psychological ownership. Are the feelings of institutional psychological ownership experienced by branch campus administrators related to their overall experiences of perceived sense of control (job autonomy, level of authority, and participation in decision making) by the branch campus administrator? A composite score for overall perception of control was computed by summing the scores on the *Job Diagnostic Survey*, the *Decision Latitude Scale*, the *Index of Participation in Decision-making*, the *Hierarchy of Authority Scale* and *Hill's Decision Matrix*. The Pearson product moment correlation conducted between the perceived control composite score and institutional psychological ownership was statistically significant ($r(157) = .479$, $p = .000$). This was not surprising, since all measures of perception of control were significantly related to institutional psychological ownership. Null hypothesis H_{011a} was rejected and it was concluded that there was a significant moderately strong relationship between perceived sense of control and feelings of institutional psychological ownership experienced by the branch

campus administrators, with institutional psychological ownership being highest when the branch campus administrator had the greatest perceived sense of control.

Job autonomy and campus psychological ownership. Are the feelings of campus psychological ownership experienced by branch campus administrators related to their experienced level of perceived job autonomy? As shown in Table 4-9, scores on the *Decision Latitude Scale* (r (146) = 0.112, p = 0.176) and the *Job Diagnostic Survey* [r (146) = 0.132, p = 0.109]) were not significantly correlated with psychological ownership for the campus. Thus, null hypothesis H_{08b} was not rejected.

Participation in decision-making and campus psychological ownership. Are the feelings of campus psychological ownership experienced by branch campus administrators related to their experienced level of perceived participation in decision-making? Table 4-9 shows that composite scores on the *Participation in Decision-making Scale* (r (146) = 0.082; p = 0.320) were not statistically significant. Consequently, null hypothesis H_{09b} was not rejected.

Job authority and campus psychological ownership. Are the feelings of campus psychological ownership experienced by branch campus administrators related to their experienced level of perceived job authority? Table 4-9 also shows that composite scores on both measures of job authority [*Hierarchy of Authority Scale* (r (146) = 0.069, p = 0.403) and *Hill's Decision Matrix* (r (146) = 0.082; p = 0.320)] were not statistically significant. Accordingly, null hypothesis H_{010b} was not rejected.

Perceived control and psychological ownership for the campus. The Pearson product moment correlation conducted between the perceived control composite score and campus psychological ownership was not statistically significant (r

(148) = 0.158, p = 0.054). This is not surprising since all measures of perception of control were also not significantly related to campus psychological ownership independently. Null hypothesis H_{011b} was not rejected.

Research Question Twelve

What is the nature of the relationship between the feelings of psychological ownership (campus and institutional) experienced by branch campus administrators and their individual demographic characteristics, the institutional characteristics, and their perception of control? A simultaneous multiple regression analysis was conducted using *SPSS-PASW Statistics 19*® to learn more about the relationship between the specific explanatory variables and the outcome variables of campus and institutional psychological ownership experienced by branch campus administrators. The explanatory variables used in this analysis were respondent demographic variables including gender, tenure at current institution and campus, longevity in higher education administration and as a branch campus administrator, to whom the branch campus administrator reports and the type of administrative role and responsibilities they held. Institutional demographic variables included institutional size, branch campus size, location of main campus, number of branch campuses, degree of institutional centralization and branch campus staff reporting structure and measures of perceived control including degree of job authority, job autonomy, and participation in decision making. Campus psychological ownership was also included as an explanatory variable in the regression analysis for institutional psychological ownership. The significance level was again set at α=.05 and the “missing listwise” option was selected for treating records with missing data.

Regression model for institutional psychological ownership. The proposed regression model was as follows: Institutional Psychological ownership = a constant + b (gender) + b(tenure at current institution) + b(tenure at current campus) + b(longevity in higher education administration) + b(tenure as a branch campus administrator) + b(who the branch campus administrator reports to) + b(the type of administrative role the branch campus administrator has) + b(the type of administrative responsibilities the branch campus administrator has) +b(institutional size) + b(branch campus size) + b(location of main campus) + b(number of branch campuses) + b(distance between branch and main campuses) + b(the degree of institutional centralization) + b(the branch campus staff reporting structure) + b(the degree of job authority) + b(the degree of job autonomy) + b(the degree of participation in decision making) + b(campus psychological ownership).

The R^2 of 0.546 for the model for institutional psychological ownership was statistically significant ($F_{(24, 96)} = 4.231$, $p = 0.000$) suggesting that the explanatory variables were jointly associated with approximately 55% of the variance seen in the measures of institutional psychological ownership. The adjusted R^2 was 0.417. This value for the R^2 indicated a moderately strong association. Table 4-10 reports the unstandardized regression coefficients (b), the standard regression coefficients (β), the observed t-test values and their significance levels. Two of the explanatory variables were statistically significant: respondent characteristic tenure in higher education (b =0.128, t (88) = 2.090, p = 0.039 and the campus psychological ownership score, (b =0.381, t (88) = 4.412, p = 0.000).

The regression equation for the model for institutional psychological ownership was as follows: institutional psychological ownership = 1.145 + -0.453 (gender) + 0.095 (tenure at current institution) + -0.013 (tenure at current campus) + 0.128 (longevity in higher education administration) + -0.184 (tenure as a branch campus administrator) + -0.377 (who the branch campus administrator reports to) + -0.227 (the type of administrative role the branch campus administrator has) + 0.459 (the type of administrative responsibilities the branch campus administrator has) + 0.000031 (institutional size) + 0.000048 (branch campus size) + -0.468 (location of main campus) + 0.038 (number of branch campuses) + -0.006 (distance between branch and main campuses) + 0.162 (the degree of institutional centralization) + -.970 (whom the branch campus academic administrators report to) + 0.087 (whom the branch campus non-academic administrators report to) + 1.078 (whom the branch campus faculty report to) + 0.363 (whom the branch campus professional non faculty report to)+ -0.578 (whom the branch campus non-professional, non-administrative staff report to) + 0.031 (Index of job authority score) + 0.480 (decision latitude scale score) + 0.059 (job diagnostic survey score) + 0.062 (score on the decision matrix) + 0.137 (the degree of participation in decision making) + 0.381 (campus psychological ownership).

Interpretation of the unstandardized regression coefficient for any explanatory variable is dependent on the scale used to measure the variable. For the statistically significant explanatory variable tenure in higher education, the regression coefficient (b) value of 0.128 suggested that for each one year increase in tenure in higher education there is a 0.128 point increase in institutional psychological ownership, and for the other statistically significant variable, the regression coefficient (b) value of 0.381 suggested

that for each 1-point increase in the campus psychological ownership score, there is a 0.381 point increase in institutional psychological ownership.

Table 4-10. Regression table for institutional psychological ownership

Variables	b	Std error	*β*	*t*	*p*
Constant	1.145	7.090		.161	.872
Campus psychological ownership	.381	.086	.352	4.412	.000
Respondent Characteristics					
Gender	.453	1.01	.037	.452	.653
Tenure at institution	.095	.067	.146	1.416	.160
Tenure at campus	-.013	.109	-.014	-.118	.907
Tenure in higher ed	.128	.061	.202	2.090*	.039
Tenure as a BCA	-.184	.098	-.216	-1.879	.064
To whom BCA reports	-.377	.228	-.139	-1.652	.102
Administrative role	-.227	1.344	-.014	-.169	.866
Administrative responsibility	.459	.531	.074	.863	.390
Institutional Characteristics					
Institution size	.000031	.000	.111	.746	.458
Campus size	.000049	.000	.033	297	.767
Location of administrative offices	-.468	.588	-.084	-.796	.428
Number of branch campuses	.038	.220	.022	..174	.863
Distance between branch and main campuses	-.006	.015	-.037	-.438	.662
Degree of centralization	.162	.858	.018	-.189	.851
Branch staff reporting structure					
Academic administrators	-.970	.776	-.148	-1.251	.214
Non-academic administrators	.087	.874	.011	.100	.921
Faculty	1.078	.846	.151	1.274	.206
Professional non-faculty	.363	.952	.046	.381	.704
Non-professional, non-administrative staff	-.578	.960	-.058	-.602	.549
Job Authority					
Index of job authority	.031	.229	.016	.136	.892
Decision latitude scale	.480	.268	.261	1.790	.077
Job Autonomy					
Job diagnostic survey	.059	.221	.031	.281	.779
Decision matrix	.062	.084	.088	.735	.464
Index of participation in decision making	.137	.181	.094	.755	.452

Regression model for campus psychological ownership. The proposed regression model was as follows: campus psychological ownership = a constant + b(gender) + b(tenure at current institution) + b(tenure at current campus) + b(longevity in higher education administration) + b(tenure as a branch campus administrator) + b(who the branch campus administrator reports to) + b(the type of administrative role the branch campus administrator has) + b(the type of administrative responsibilities the branch campus administrator has) +b(institutional size) + b(branch campus size) + b(location of main campus) + b(number of branch campuses) + b(distance between branch and main campuses) + b(the degree of institutional centralization) + b(the branch campus staff reporting structure) + b(the degree of job authority) + b(the degree of job autonomy) + b(the degree of participation in decision making).

The R^2 of 0.191 for the model for campus psychological ownership was not statistically significant ($F_{(23, 91)} = 0.874$, $p = 0.635$) and none of the explanatory variables except for the constant (b = 18.403, SD = 8.478, $t\ (113) = 2.171$, $p = .033$) were significant (Table 4-11). This result suggests that although the proposed model for campus psychological ownership might account for approximately 19% of the variance in the campus psychological ownership score, the variables measured by this study did not significantly explain the variation in the campus psychological ownership measure.

Summary

E-mail requests to participate in an on-line survey were sent to 500 community college branch campus administrators throughout the United States. A total of 167 respondents completed the informed consent and participated in the survey, a 33% response rate. However, 10 of those surveys were left completely blank, thus there were 157 useable responses, or a 31% response rate.

Table 4-11. Regression table for campus psychological ownership

Variables	b	Std error	*β*	*t*	*p*
Constant	8.403	8.478		2.171	.033
Respondent Characteristics					
Gender	-.692	1.230	-.060	-.562	.575
Tenure at institution	.015	.082	.026	.187	.852
Tenure at campus	-.086	.134	-.101	-.643	.522
Tenure in higher ed	.089	.074	.152	1.198	.234
Tenure as a BCA	-.004	.120	-.005	-.035	.972
To whom BCA reports	-.146	.280	-.058	-.522	.603
Administrative role	-.847	1.647	-.056	-.515	.608
Administrative responsibility	-.298	.651	-052	-.458	.648
Institutional Characteristics					
Institution size	.0000308	.000	.121	.616	.540
Campus size	.0000210	.000	-.016	-.104	.917
Location of administrative offices	-1.065	.712	-.207	-1.495	.138
Number of branch campuses	.204	.270	.127	.758	.451
Distance between branch and main campuses	-.008	.018	-.053	-.477	.635
Degree of centralization	-1.677	1.037	-.205	-1.616	.110
Branch staff reporting structure					
Academic administrators	-.716	.949	-.118	-.754	.453
Non-academic administrators	1.567	1.059	.221	1.479	.143
Faculty	.501	1.036	.076	.484	.630
Professional non faculty	.665	1.166	-.091	-.571	.570
Non-professional, non-administrative staff	.789	1.175	.086	.672	.504
Job Authority					
Index of job authority	.503	.276	.273	1.823	.072
Decision latitude scale	.314	.327	.85	.959	.340
Job Autonomy					
Job diagnostic survey	.117	.258	.066	.452	.653
Decision matrix	.050	.103	.077	.482	.631
Index of participation in decision making	.298	.220	.222	1.354	.179

Survey data provided a profile of community college branch campus administrators and their institutions as well as composite scores on Idazak and Drasgow's (1987) modification of Hackman and Oldham's (1975) *Job Diagnostic Survey* assessment, Karasek's (1979) *Decision Latitude Scale*, Hage and Aiken's (1966) *Index*

of Hierarchy of Authority, Hill's (1985) *Decision Matrix,* and Hage and Aiken's (1967) *Index of Participation in Decision Making* and institutional and campus psychological ownership.

Bivariate analyses were conducted between the two dependent variables, and between the independent (explanatory) and both dependent variables via t-tests, analysis of variance, and Pearson-product moment correlation tests. Evaluation of research hypothesis one and two found that branch campus administrators did demonstrate psychological ownership for both their institutions and their campuses (mean psychological ownership (institution) = 34.6 ; SD = 6.206; mean psychological ownership (campus) = 37.36; SD = 5.814). In the test of research hypothesis three, a paired–test showed significant differences between the two measures of psychological ownership with the psychological ownership for the campus significantly higher than institutional psychological ownership (t (147) = -5.47, p =0.000).

Investigation of research hypotheses four and five found that Pearson-product moment correlation analyses showed weak, but significant relationships between institutional psychological ownership and the respondent demographic characteristics of longevity at the branch campus administrator's current institution (r (151)=0.190, p = 0.019) and number of years in higher education (r (151)= 0.185, p = 0.023). Significant weak correlations were also observed between institutional psychological ownership and the institutional demographics characteristics of branch campus size (r (149) = 0.160, p = 0.05) and the overall branch campus reporting structure (r (143) = 0.251, p = 0.002). No significant correlations were observed for any of the respondent or institutional demographic characteristics and psychological ownership for the campus.

Examination of research hypotheses six and seven using analysis of variance (ANOVA) tests showed significant effects between institutional psychological ownership and the respondent demographic variables of whom the branch campus administrator reported to (BCA Supervisor) ($F_{(7, 146)}$= 2.78, p =0.01), and the branch campus administrators' administrative responsibilities ($F_{(1,150)}$= 6.69, p = 0.011) and between the institutional characteristics of degree of centralization ($F_{(3,152)}$= 3.31, p = 0.022), and the reporting structure of branch campus academic administrators ($F_{(2, 149)}$= 3.73,p = 0.02), non-academic administrators ($F_{(2, 146)}$= 5.04, p = 0.008), faculty ($F_{(2, 151)}$= 3.23, p = 0.043), and professional non-faculty ($F_{(2, 149)}$= 4.12, p = 0.018). For the dependent variable of campus psychological ownership, only the respondent demographic characteristic of to whom the branch campus administrator reported was statistically significant ($F_{(7,138)}$= 3.69, p = 0.001).

Exploration of research hypotheses eight, nine, ten, and eleven found significant moderate correlations between institutional psychological ownership and both measures of job autonomy [*Decision Latitude Scale* (r (155) = 0.428, p = 0.000), and *Job Diagnostic Survey* (r (155) = 0.391, p = 0.000)], and composite scores on the *Participation in Decision-making Scale* (r (155) = 0.430, p = 0.000). Both measures of job authority [*Hill's Decision Matrix* (r (155) = 0.344, p = 0.000) and the *Hierarchy of Authority Scale* (r (155) = -0.250, p = 0.002)] showed weaker, but still significant relationships. These correlations all supported the conclusion that the more autonomy, authority, and participation in decision making a branch campus administrator had, the higher the level of institutional psychological ownership. On the other hand, there were no significant relationships observed for any of these variables and psychological

ownership for the campus; suggesting that sense of control may not be related to job-based psychological ownership.

Finally, to examine research hypothesis twelve, a simultaneous multiple regression analysis was conducted to learn more about the relationship between the various explanatory variables and both outcome variables. The R^2 of 0.546 for the model for institutional psychological ownership was statistically significant ($F_{(24, 88)}$ = 4231, p =0.000) suggesting that the explanatory variables were jointly associated with approximately 55% of the variance seen in the measures of institutional psychological ownership. Two of the explanatory variables were also statistically significant: respondent characteristic tenure in higher education (b= 0.128, *t* (88) = 2.090, *p* = 0.039 and the campus psychological ownership score (b= 0.564, *t* (88) = 4.412, *p* = 0.000). The R^2 of 0.191 for the model for campus psychological ownership was not statistically significant ($F_{(24, 89)}$ = 0.874, p = 0.635) and none of the explanatory variables, with the exception of the constant (b = 18.403, SD = 8.478, *t (113)* = 2.171, *p* =.033), were significant; again suggesting that the variables measured in this study were significantly related to the experience of institutional psychological ownership, but not to psychological ownership for the campus in branch campus administrators.

The implications of these results will be discussed further in Chapter 5.

CHAPTER 5
CONCLUSIONS

This research empirically explored the concept of psychological ownership and its relationship to perceived control in branch campus administrators. It examined the factors that contributed to psychological ownership that branch campus administrators develop towards their campus (job-based) and institution (organization-based). This chapter concludes the study with a discussion of the results, suggestions for future research, and the implications for practice in branch campus settings.

Discussion of Finding

The intent of this quantitative study was to examine the factors that contributed to the psychological ownership that branch campus administrator's experience. The goal of the study was to assess the degree to which factors including perception of control, and individual and institutional demographic characteristics, were associated with the cognitive and affective feelings of ownership developed by branch campus administrators with respect to their institution and campus using the theory of psychological ownership espoused by Pierce, and colleagues (2001, 2003, 2004, 2006, 2008).

Branch Campus Administrators and Psychological Ownership

Did branch campus administrators develop psychological ownership for their institution and their campuses? As expected, the results of the present study found that that branch campus administrators demonstrated psychological ownership for both their institutions and their campuses. These results paralleled outcomes of studies by Vandewalle, Van Dyne, and Kostova (1995) and Van Dyne and Pierce (2004) who reported moderate levels of organization-based psychological ownership in various

types of U.S. employees and by O'Driscoll, Pierce, and Coghlan (2006), Mayhew, Ashjanasy, Bramble, and Gardner (2007), and McIntyre, Srivastava, and Fuller (2009), who found moderate levels of both job- and organization-based psychological ownership reported by employees at for-profit companies in New Zealand and the United States. Furthermore, the results of this study also correspond with the outcomes of two additional studies conducted in educational settings. Wood (2003) found that job-based psychological ownership increased self-directed learning in college-level marketing students, and a more recent study by Md-Sidin et al., (2010) demonstrated the presence and impact of feelings of organization-based psychological ownership in business school lecturers. Md-Sidin et al., (2010) found "reasonable levels of psychological ownership" (p. 54) for the institution at which the lecturers were employed, and suggested that this was not surprising since academicians tend to have more control over their work. Thus, psychological ownership was established as an important construct in for-profit, non-profit, and educational settings.

Was there a difference between the feelings of psychological ownership branch campus administrators developed for their institution and the feelings of psychological ownership they developed for their campus? Significant differences were observed between the two measures of psychological ownership. Campus (job-based) psychological ownership was significantly higher than institutional (organization-based) psychological ownership. These findings are comparable to the findings of all studies that have measured job- and organization-based psychological ownership (Pierce, O'Driscoll, and Coghlan, 2004; Mayhew, Ashjanasy, Bramble, and Gardner, 2007; McIntyre, Srivastava, and Fuller, 2009) which also found that job-based psychological

ownership levels were higher than organization-based psychological ownership. Mayhew, Ashjanasy, Bramble, and Gardner (2007) asserted that the differences in observed values of job- and organization-based psychological ownership indicated that the two constructs were distinctly different, yet related. Pierce, O'Driscoll, and Coghlan (2004) further contended that since employees experience the organization through their job experiences, which are closer to self and more intimate, job-based psychological ownership would be expected to be higher, and was an important component of organization-based psychological ownership.

Respondent and Institutional Characteristics and Psychological Ownership

Was there a relationship between psychological ownership (campus and institution) and the individual respondent demographic characteristics (longevity in their current positions, tenure at their institution and branch campus and the number of years they had been in higher education and as a branch campus administrator) or institutional characteristics (institutional size, branch campus size, number of branch campuses, the distance between the branch and main campuses, and the composite score for organizational reporting structure of the branch)? Weak, but significant relationships were observed between institutional psychological ownership and the respondent demographic characteristics of longevity at the institution, number of years in higher education, institutional demographic characteristics of branch campus size, and the overall branch campus reporting structure. The positive correlations between each of these variables and organizational psychological ownership indicated that as each variable increased, so did organizational psychological ownership. These results correspond with those that would be expected by the theory of organizational psychological ownership espoused by Pierce et al., (2003). According to Pierce et al.,

(2003) people find themselves psychologically tied to things as a result of their active participation or intimate association with them. Thus, it was not surprising that longer tenures at the institution, especially as a higher education administrator, were associated with higher levels of organizational psychological ownership. Furthermore, the positive correlation between branch campus reporting structure and psychological ownership also supported the theoretical assertion made by Pierce et al., (2003) that individuals who are given more opportunities to "create, shape, or produce" (p. 93) are more invested in the target and more likely to experience ownership.

Was there a difference in the level of psychological ownership (campus and institutional) experienced by branch campus administrators based on the levels of the individual respondent demographic characteristics (gender, to whom the branch campus administrator reported, and the branch campus administrators' administrative responsibilities and administrative role) or institutional characteristics (location of the administrative offices, degree of centralization of decisions, and branch campus staff reporting structure)? Significant differences were observed in levels of institutional psychological ownership on the respondent demographic variables of to whom the branch campus administrator reported and the branch campus administrator's administrative responsibilities. Again, these findings provide support for the theory of psychological ownership espoused by Pierce et al., (2003). Pierce and his colleagues asserted that individuals who are provided the opportunity to become invested in a target are more likely to develop higher levels of psychological ownership. The results of this study showed that branch campus administrators who have both institutional and branch campus responsibilities and who report to senior level institutional management

tend to develop higher levels of organizational psychological ownership. As expected, those employees who had invested more time and mental energy into the organization, and had more influence in how the institution was run, were more likely to develop strong feeling of ownership for the institution.

Significant differences were also observed in levels of institutional psychological ownership for the institutional characteristics of degree of centralization and the reporting structures of branch campus staff. These findings were also anticipated based on assertions made by Pierce and his colleagues (2001, 2003, 2004, 2006, 2009). Branch campus administrators who were employed at institutions where there was more delegation of decision-making authority experienced greater feelings of psychological ownership. Pierce et al., (2001, 2003) asserted that this is due to the fact that the individuals are provided more of an opportunity to invest themselves in the institution, fulfilling their motive to intimately know the target, invest self in, and control it. These three motives, according to Pierce and his colleagues were the key routes that facilitated expression of psychological ownership.

Perception of Control and Psychological Ownership

Were the feelings of psychological ownership (campus and institutional) experienced by branch campus administrators related to their experienced level of perceived job autonomy, participation in decision making and level of perceived job authority, and overall degree of perceived control? Moderate relationships were observed for job autonomy, and participation in decision-making and institutional psychological ownership. Weaker, but still significant, relationships were also found between degree of job authority and institutional psychological ownership. These results correspond to those found by previous researchers (Parker et al., 1997: Pierce,

O'Driscoll, and Coghlan, 2004; O'Driscoll, Pierce, and Coghlan, 2006; Mayhew, Ashjanasy, Bramble, and Gardner, 2007; Han, Chiang, and Chang, 2010) who explored the relationship between autonomy, participation in decision-making, and perceived control in the expression of organization-based psychological ownership. Furthermore, these results conform to those predicted by the theory of psychological ownership espoused by Pierce et al., (2001, 2003). Branch campus administrators who are given the freedom and latitude to decide where and how they do their jobs, and are permitted to take an active part in organizational decision-making, are more likely to express high levels of psychological ownership for their institution.

Institutional and Campus Psychological Ownership

Institutional psychological ownership. What was the nature of the relationship between the feelings of psychological ownership (institutional) experienced by branch campus administrators and individual demographic characteristics, institutional characteristics, and perception of control? The linear regression model for organization-based psychological ownership was statistically significant, with the proposed model accounting for approximately 55% of the variance observed in organization-based psychological ownership. This suggests that individual, institutional, and control factors are all important in facilitating the expression of psychological ownership in branch campus administrators. Furthermore, the overall significance of the job-based psychological ownership factor in the regression model provides support for the contention made by Pierce, O'Driscoll and Coghlan (2004) that, since employees experience the organization through their job, job-based psychological ownership was an important component of organization-based psychological ownership.

Campus psychological ownership. What was the nature of the relationship between the feelings of psychological ownership (campus) experienced by branch campus administrators and individual demographic characteristics, institutional characteristics, and perception of control? The failure to observe any significant relationship between any of the variables measured in this study and campus (job-based) psychological ownership, as well as the non-significance of the overall regression model for campus (job-based) psychological ownership was surprising and inconsistent with earlier results from Pierce, O'Driscoll, and Coghlan (2004), who demonstrated that perception of control was a direct and positive mediating variable in the experience of both job-based and organization-based psychological ownership in employees of a New Zealand for-profit company, and from O'Driscoll, Pierce, and Coghlan (2006), who found that the degree of autonomy and degree of participation in decision-making of New Zealand workers were related to both job-and organization-based psychological ownership.

However, Asatryn (2006) also found no relationship between the perception of control and degree of psychological ownership that customers developed for a particular restaurant brand. Asatryn (2006) suggested a possible reason for the failure of the regression model may be that the model was missing a key variable, or variables. This was highly probable due to the relative newness of psychological ownership as construct and the limited research that has been conducted. It was possible, and highly probable, that important relevant variables may have not yet been identified. This contention was supported by Pierce, Kostova, and Dirks (2003) in their theoretical proposal where they included a discussion of the possibility that factors other than those

they had presented could be related to psychological ownership, including individual characteristics, personality traits, and culture. Recently McIntyre, Srivastava, and Fuller (2009) provided empirical support for this assertion when they demonstrated a relationship between the personality traits locus of control and individualism, and organization-based psychological ownership. More research into the differences between job-based and organization-based psychological ownership was needed to test these assertions.

Another possible explanation for the differing results in this study as compared to other studies examining job-based psychological ownership and its antecedents (O'Driscoll et al., 2006; Pierce et al., 2004) was related to the different organizational contexts (for-profit versus government) in which the employees worked. Pierce, Kostova, and Dirks (2003) also posited that, in addition to possible individual characteristics and traits, it was possible that organizational characteristics could also influence the expression of psychological ownership. The majority of research on psychological ownership cited in this study has been conducted in for-profit industries, not non-profit or government settings. All of the respondents in this study were employed in public, government-supported community colleges, a very different environment from the for-profit, corporate world.

Recently, Md-Sidin et al., (2010) studied the link between psychological ownership and job performance, satisfaction, and commitment in a public academic setting, and although these authors established the existence of psychological ownership in the business school lecturers studied, the study measured only organization-based psychological ownership, not job-based, and was conducted in

Malaysia, a collectivist society very different from the individualistic society in which the subjects of the current study lived and worked. More exploration of the differences between job-based and organization-based psychological ownership needs to be conducted in government/non-profit organizations.

Implications for Higher Education Administration

The results of this study demonstrated that mid-level educational administrators, like employees in for-profit companies, develop a sense of psychological ownership for their jobs and their colleges. Previous research conducted in for-profit environments suggested that "creating an organizational culture that encourages psychological ownership is valuable for both the organization and the employees" (McIntyre et al., 2009, p. 398). It could be argued that creating the same type of ownership-facilitating environment would also be valuable in educational settings. Pierce et al., (2003), in their initial consideration of the theory of psychological ownership, contended that the development of psychological ownership was good for the organization because it "leads to felt responsibility towards the target and to protective, stewardship and other altruistic behaviors toward it" (p. 307); and Aryee, Sun, and Zhou (2009) further asserted that organizations that prompted ownership beliefs, or psychological ownership, in their employees would benefit from positive organizational citizenship behaviors. Freiberg (2001) contended that employees that feel like owners cater to the purpose of the organization by actively supporting its mission, vision, values, and strategy, and Sharp (2005) stated that ownership provides the transition from "It's just a job" to "It's who I am and what I do" (p.12). All of these consequences are likely to be just as desirable in government-supported educational environments as they are in for-profit companies and further exploration of these contexts is encouraged.

If organizational psychological ownership produces these same consequences in educational settings as it does in for-profit companies, then educational leaders who desired to facilitate the development of psychological ownership in their employees would want to use a flexible, adaptive, leadership style characterized by participation and delegation (Wood, 2003). Higher education managers could promote the same routes for facilitation of psychological ownership with their employees as do for-profit managers. For example, they could organize work such that there were increased opportunities for employee control, increased intimate knowledge, and provide occasions for the employees to make significant investments of self into the institution (Pierce et al., 2001). Furthermore, educational managers would want to rely on practices that will develop organizational understanding and provide opportunities for influence. A participatory climate of employee influence, control, and self-determination facilitates the development of organizational psychological ownership in for-profit industries by promoting employee sharing of organizational goals and the belief that they are trusted to act in the best interest of the institution (Wagner, Parker, and Christiansen, 2003); such a climate is likely to promote the same in educational settings.

In addition to creating a participatory culture, Pierce, Jussila, and Cummings (2009) further asserted that managers could accomplish the facilitation of psychological ownership in employees by focusing on designing jobs that were complex, non-routine, and required high skill, variety, and autonomy. Complex, non-routine jobs provide employees the opportunity to personalize and invest themselves in their work, thus providing them intimate knowledge, a sense of control, and a feeling of belongingness;

meeting all three of the routes that facilitate the development of organizational psychological ownership. Thus, if future research continues to suggest that the psychological ownership theory applies to higher educational institutions; educational managers would want to create organizational structures such that their administrators were provided with a maximum degree of flexibility, participation in decision-making, and local control over their work.

Implications for Branch Campus Administration

Branch campus administrators have been shown to demonstrate psychological ownership for both their campuses (job-based) and institution (organization-based), indicating that the theory of psychological ownership can be applied specifically to branch campus administration. Previous research conducted in for–profit industries links psychological ownership to positive organizational citizenship behaviors such as stronger job performance and increased organizational commitment (Pierce et al., 2001, 2003; McIntyre et al., 2009) and Md-Sidin et al., (2010) found similar outcomes in Malaysian business school lecturers; therefore it is likely that this would also be true for branch campus administrators. Unfortunately, this study examined only those factors that facilitated the development of psychological ownership, and not its consequences, so it is recommended that future research examine both the antecedents and consequences of psychological ownership in branch campus administrators.

Hermanson (1995) asserted that supportive supervisors were important to the success of a branch campus administrator. Therefore, if psychological ownership was found to be related to positive organizational citizenship behaviors in branch campus administrators, then senior leaders of multi-campus institutions would want to strive to provide an empowering environment to their branch campus administrators. Pierce et

al., (2001, 2003), McIntyre et al., (2009) and Md-Sidin et al., (2010), all argued that by providing administrators with the authority, autonomy, and opportunity to participate in decision-making, the college would create a campus culture that empowered individuals and enhanced their sense of psychological ownership.

On the other hand, however, both McIntyre et al., (2009) and Pierce et al., (2009) caution that the picture may not be all positive when it comes to the potential consequences of psychological ownership. Dirks et al., (1996) found that organization-based psychological ownership was also associated with the negative organizational citizenship behaviors of resistance to organizational change and a reluctance to share work (or workspace) with co-workers. Brown, Lawrence, and Robinson (2005) further contended that territorial and defensive behaviors were potential outcomes of psychological ownership, and that jealousy might arise when others begin to develop intimate knowledge of the target of ownership, or in the case of branch campus administrators, the branch campus. These potential negative consequences are particularly significant for branch campus administration since a territorial and "stay out of my sandbox" type of attitude could lead to a failure by the branch campus administrator to share information about their campus with the rest of the college, thus affecting the critically important branch/main campus relationship. Given Stahley's (2002) contention that the majority of branch campus decisions were "made in some combination of shared decision making or decision making after consultation with the main campus" (p. 73), further research is needed into both negative and positive consequences of psychological ownership in branch campus administrators.

Directions for Future Research

There is a very limited body of research in the literature concerning branch campus administrators and "the research on psychological ownership is still at an amorphous stage" (Md-Sidin et al., 2010, p. 55). Thus, it is not surprising that several questions remain yet to be answered.

1. The role of the branch campus administrator as a campus and institutional leader in the multi-campus organization should be examined further.

2. Research should be conducted to validate the existence of psychological ownership in other higher education administrators.

3. Research should be conducted to examine the influence of psychological ownership on positive organizational citizenship behaviors, i.e., job satisfaction, or organizational commitment, in branch campus administrators.

4. Research should be conducted to examine the influence of psychological ownership on negative organizational citizenship behaviors like territoriality and resistance to organizational change in branch campus administrators.

5. Differences between job-based and organization-based psychological ownership should be examined in both for-profit and government/non-profit organizations.

6. The impact of individual differences such as personality traits and characteristics on the expression of psychological ownership should be examined in for-profit, non-profit, and educational environments.

7. The impact of cultural differences characteristics on the expression of psychological ownership should be examined in for-profit, non-profit, and educational environments.

8. The role of organizational characteristics on the expression of psychological ownership should be examined in for-profit, non-profit, and educational environments.

9. The role that the leadership style of senior level management plays in the development of psychological ownership in their direct reports should be examined.

10. The relationship between organizational and campus psychological ownership and educational management practices should be further examined.

11. The relationship between organizational and campus psychological ownership and institutional size should be further examined.

12. The relationship between organizational and campus psychological ownership and institutional governance patterns should be further examined.

Final Conclusions

The results of this study provide evidence that branch campus administrators, like employees in for-profit organizations, develop a cognitive affective sense of possession (psychological ownership) for both their campuses and their colleges. This finding provided support for application of the theory of psychological ownership in higher education settings.

Differences were observed in the levels of campus (job-based) and institutional (organization-based) psychological ownership, which suggested that these two types of psychological ownership were different constructs with potentially differing facilitation routes. Unlike previous research conducted in the for-profit realm, the results of this study did not allow conclusions as to potential facilitating factors for job-based (campus) psychological ownership. Further research into the factors influencing the development of job-based (campus) psychological ownership is needed in branch campus administrators as well as in other educational and non-profit environments.

On the other hand, the results of this study did demonstrate that individual and institutional characteristics that promoted the development of an intimate knowledge and an investment of self into the college, as well as the perception of autonomy and control, helped to facilitate the development of institutional psychological ownership in educational settings. This indicated that the theory of organizational psychological ownership could be applied to community college administrators. However, further research is needed into the consequences of the experience of organizational

psychological ownership in non-profit and educational settings, as well as into the implications this would have on educational management practices.

APPENDIX A
SURVEY

Branch Campus Administrators: Ownership and Control

Informed Consent

Protocol Title: Psychological Ownership in Branch Campus Administrators: Influence of Perceived Control

Please read this consent document carefully before you decide to participate in this study.

Purpose of the research study:
The purpose of this study is to examine relationship between the psychological ownership experienced by branch campus administrators in
multi-campus community colleges and the branch campus administrator's perceived sense of control as measured by the administrator's
perceptions as to the level of job autonomy, level of authority, and degree of participation in decision making they experience.

What you will be asked to do in the study:

Complete a 21 question web-based survey.

Time required:
20-30 minutes

Risks and Benefits:
None are identified at this time.

Compensation:
None.

Confidentiality:
Your identity will be kept confidential to the extent provided by law. Your name will not be used in any report.

Voluntary participation:
Your participation in this study is completely voluntary. There is no penalty for not participating.

Right to withdraw from the study:
You have the right to withdraw from the study at anytime without consequence.

Whom to contact if you have questions about the study:
Dr. Dale Campbell, Professor and Director of the Community College Leadership Consortium
University of Florida College of Education, 229A Norman Hall, Gainesville, FL 32611-2250
Phone: 352-273-4300
dfc@coe.ufl.edu

M. Lisa Valentino, Graduate Student, University of Florida College of Education, 229A Norman Hall, Gainesville, FL 32611-2250
Phone: 407-446-5089
valentil@ufl.edu

This study has been approved for use though 7-12-2011 by the University of Florida Institutional Review Board 02.
Protocol # 2010-U-0641
Whom to contact about your rights as a research participant in the study:
IRB02 Office, Box 112250, University of Florida, Gainesville, FL 32611-2250; phone 392-0433.

Agreement: I have read the procedure described above. I voluntarily agree to participate in the procedure and I have received a copy of this description. *

- I agree
- I do not agree

8%

Next >>

Please contact Lisa Valentino (valentil@ufl.edu) if you have any questions regarding this survey.

Branch Campus Administrators: Ownership and Control

When the following decisions are made, what level of involvement does the Branch Campus Administrator have? How often (frequently) do Branch Campus administrators usually participate in the decision making process for the following?

	Never	Seldom	Sometimes	Often	Always
College wide goal setting and planning	○	○	○	○	○
Campus goal setting and planning	○	○	○	○	○
Hiring new staff for your campus	○	○	○	○	○
Promoting any of the professional staff located on the campus you administer	○	○	○	○	○
Adoption of new policies related to the campus you administer	○	○	○	○	○
Adoption of new programs	○	○	○	○	○

25%

<< Prev Next >>

Please contact Lisa Valentino (valentil@ufl.edu) if you have any questions regarding this survey.

Branch Campus Administrators: Ownership and Control

Think about your job as a branch campus administrator. Using the scale below please choose the column that corresponds with how much of that entity there is in your job.

	Very little	Little	A moderate amount	Much	Very much
In general, how much say or influence do you have in how you perform your job?	○	○	○	○	○
To what extent are you able to decide how to do your job?	○	○	○	○	○
In general how much say or influence do you have on what goes on on your campus?	○	○	○	○	○
In general, how much say or influence do you have on decisions which affect your campus?	○	○	○	○	○
My supervisors are receptive and listen to my ideas and suggestions.	○	○	○	○	○

33%

<< Prev Next >>

Please contact Lisa Valentino (valentil@ufl.edu) if you have any questions regarding this survey.

Branch Campus Administrators: Ownership and Control

How accurate are the following statements in describing your role as a Branch Campus Administrator?

	Very innaccurate	Inaccurate	Slightly inaccurate	Neither accurate nor inaccurate	Slightly accurate	Accurate	Very Accurate
The job gives me the chance to use my personal initiative and judgment in carrying out the work.	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
The job gives me considerable opportunity for independence.	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
This job permits me to decide on my own how to go about things at work.	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

42%

<< Prev Next >>

Please contact Lisa Valentino (valentil@ufl.edu) if you have any questions regarding this survey.

Branch Campus Administrators: Ownership and Control

For each of the following functions, please place a check under the descriptive heading that most adequately describes the type of involvement the branch campus has in decisions made regarding the stated function.

	Main campus decision; branch campus is excluded	Branch campus can recommend action; main campus makes decision	Decision shared equally with main campus	Branch campus decision after consultation with main campus	Branch campus decision exclusively; no consultation required
Faculty Personal Issues (Recruitment, Selection, Evaluation & Promotion/Tenure)	○	○	○	○	○
Non Faculty Personnel Issues (Recruitment, Selection, Evaluation & Promotion)	○	○	○	○	○
Faculty & Staff Training and Professional Development	○	○	○	○	○
Academic Program Approval	○	○	○	○	○
Course Development & Scheduling	○	○	○	○	○
Student Life and Activities	○	○	○	○	○
Library and Media Services	○	○	○	○	○
Budget Planning and Development	○	○	○	○	○
Budget Administration (Purchasing/expenditures), Allocation & Distribution	○	○	○	○	○
Campus Publicity	○	○	○	○	○
Space, Equipment and Facilities Maintenance	○	○	○	○	○

50%

<< Prev Next >>

Please contact Lisa Valentino (valentil@ufl.edu) if you have any questions regarding this survey.

Branch Campus Administrators: Ownership and Control

Think about the home, boat, or cabin that you own or co-own with someone, and the experiences and feelings associated with the statement: "THIS IS MY (OUR) HOUSE!" The following questions deal with the "sense of ownership" that you feel for the INSTITUTION (college) you work for. Indicate the degree to which you personally agree or disagree with the following statements.

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Slightly disagree	Niether agree nor disagree	Slightly agree	Agree	Strongly agree
This is MY institution.	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
I sense that this institution is OUR college.	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
I feel a high degree of personal ownership for the college.	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
I sense that this is MY college.	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
This is OUR college.	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Most of the people that work for this institution feel as though they own the college.	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
It is hard for me to think of this college as MINE.	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

58%

<< Prev Next >>

Please contact Lisa Valentino (valentil@ufl.edu) if you have any questions regarding this survey.

Branch Campus Administrators: Ownership and Control

Think about the home, boat, or cabin that you own or co-own with someone, and the experiences and feelings associated with the statement "THIS IS MY (OUR) HOUSE!" The following questions deal with the "sense of ownership" that you feel for the CAMPUS that you administer. Indicate the degree to which you personally agree or disagree with the following statements.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Neither agree or disagree	Slightly Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
This is MY campus.	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
I sense that this branch site is OUR campus.	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
I feel a high degree of personal ownership for this campus.	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
I sense that this is MY campus.	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
This is OUR campus.	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Most of the people that work for this branch site feel as though they own the campus.	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
It is hard for me to think of this campus as MINE.	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

67%

<< Prev Next >>

Please contact Lisa Valentino (valentil@ufl.edu) if you have any questions regarding this survey.

Branch Campus Administrators: Ownership and Control

How would you characterize the organizational structure of your institution?

- ○ Highly centralized structure in which decision-making power is located at the top of the organization and there is little delegation of authority.
- ○ Moderately centralized structure in which most decision-making power done at the top of the organization, however there is some, but limited delegation of authority.
- ○ Moderately decentralized structure in which most decision-making is delegated to the subunits of an organization, but some decisions are still conducted only by top leaders.
- ○ Highly decentralized structure in which all decision-making is delegated to the subunits of an organization.

75%

<< Prev Next >>

Please contact Lisa Valentino (valentil@ufl.edu) if you have any questions regarding this survey.

Branch Campus Administrators: Ownership and Control

At your branch campus, the following personnel, excluding the chief administrator, report to:

	Reports to Branch Campus Administrator	Reports to Main Campus Administrator	Reports to Both—Main/Branch Branch Campus Administrator
Academic Administrators	○	○	○
Non-Academic Administrators	○	○	○
Faculty	○	○	○
Professional Non-Faculty	○	○	○
Non-Professional/Non-Administrative Staff	○	○	○

83%

<< Prev Next >>

Please contact Lisa Valentino (valentil@ufl.edu) if you have any questions regarding this survey.

Branch Campus Administrators: Ownership and Control

How many branch campus locations does your institution have?

The college's central administrative offices are located:

- At the main campus.
- On a branch campus.
- On the branch campus at which you are the administrator.
- Apart from any campus.

Total college-wide enrollment (headcount) during the most recent Fall term:

Your branch campus' enrollment (headcount) during the most recent Fall term was:

Distance (miles) between your campus and the main campus:

92%

<< Prev Next >>

Please contact Lisa Valentino (valentil@ufl.edu) if you have any questions regarding this survey.

Branch Campus Administrators: Ownership and Control

Your gender is:

☐ Male

☐ Female

Which of the following statements best describes your Branch Campus Administrative role?

○ The chief administrator at a branch campus.

○ The chief administrator of branch campuses responsible for all branch campus operations in the organization.

○ The college official in the central administration of the organization to whom the local Branch Campus Administrator reports.

Which of the following best describes the scope of your administrative responsibility?

○ I have responsibilities for branch campus matters only.

○ I have responsibilities for college-wide matters only.

○ I have responsibilities both college-wide and branch campus matters.

Number years of experience:

In your current position. [ ]

At your current institution [ ]

On your current campus. [ ]

In Higher education administration. [ ]

In Branch campus administration. [ ]

To whom do you report?

○ President

○ Chancellor

○ Vice President of Academic Affairs

○ Provost

○ Vice President for Branch Campuses

○ Associate Vice President for Branch Campuses

○ Dean or Director of Branch Campuses

○ Other (please specify)

[ ]

Thank you very much for your cooperation and responses. If you would like to have a copy of the results of the survey, please provide your name and mailing address below:

Name: [ ]

Mailing address: [ ]

E-mail address: [ ]

100%

APPENDIX B
PRE-NOTICE E-MAIL

Hello!

You are receiving this e-mail because you have been identified as an educational leader who has responsibility for branch or regional campus matters at your institution. In a few days you will receive an e-mail request to fill out a survey for an important project being conducted by the Community College Leadership Consortium at the University of Florida.

The survey is entitled *Branch Campus Administrators: Ownership and Control* and its purpose is to collect information to examine the factors that contribute to the psychological ownership that branch campus administrators experience in the course of leading their campuses. The perceptions of branch campus administrators are the important aspects of this study.

Thank you very much for your time and consideration. I hope you will take the time to complete the survey; the information provided by campus leaders like you is essential to furthering research in branch campus administration.

Lisa Valentino

Doctoral Student, College of Education, University of Florida

Campus Provost, Seminole State College of Florida

Dr. Dale Campbell

Director of the Community College Leadership Consortium

Interim Director of School of Human Development and Organizational Studies in

Education, College of Education University of Florida

APPENDIX C
EMAIL LETTER REQUESTING PARTICIPATION

Dear Branch Campus colleagues,

You have been identified as an educational leader who has responsibility for branch or regional campus matters at your institution. Your views about these matters are highly valued, so we invite you to participate in a research study entitled *Psychological Ownership in Branch Campus Administrators: Influence of Perceived Control.* The intent of the study is to examine the factors that contribute to the psychological ownership that branch campus administrators experience in the course of leading their campuses. The perceptions of branch campus administrators are the important aspects of this study. Therefore, you are asked to please (a) complete the web survey located at http://www.stellarsurvey.com/s.aspx?u=7FB9304E-B9AC-4372-93F2-2371F98AA93D& by **December 1, 2010**.

The study is being conducted under the guidance of Professor Dale Campbell at the University of Florida. It has been designed to:

1. Assess the levels of psychological ownership Branch Campus administrators experience for their institutions and campuses.
2. Examine the factors that contribute to the psychological ownership that branch campus administrators experience in the course of leading their campuses.

The survey instrument should take no longer than 20 to 30 minutes for you to complete.

Your participation in this survey is completely voluntary and your decision to participate or not will in no way impact your relationship with the College of Education or University of Florida. To encourage full participation however, a reminder notice will be sent to anyone who has not completed the survey by December 1, 2010.

The results of the data gathered will be aggregated. Therefore, individual responses will not be identified.

If, for any reason you are unable to complete the web-based survey, a pencil and paper version can be sent to you. Also, if you would like to have a copy of the results of this study, please check the box at the end of the questionnaire and insert your e-mail address in the space provided.

Thank you very much for your time and cooperation!

Sincerely,

Lisa Valentino
Doctoral Student, College of Education, University of Florida
Campus Provost, Seminole State College of Florida

Dr. Dale Campbell

Director of the Community College Leadership Consortium
Interim Director of School of Human Development and Organizational Studies in Education
College of Education, University of Florida

APPENDIX D
SECOND REQUEST FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION

Dear branch campus colleague.

Recently I sent you a request for your participation in a survey about your experiences as a branch campus administrator entitled *Psychological Ownership in Branch Campus Administrators: Influence of Perceived Control.* You were chosen to participate in this study due to that fact that you are recognized as an educational leader who has responsibility for branch or regional campus matters at your institution. Your views about these matters are highly valued.

If you have already completed and returned the questionnaire to us, please accept our sincere thanks. If not, we urge you to please consider doing so today. Your opinions are very important in helping us further research in branch campus administration. We are very grateful for your help.

The intent of the study is to examine the factors that contribute to the psychological ownership that branch campus administrators experience in the course of leading their campuses. It is hoped that the results of this study will aid in a better understanding of branch campus administration. Therefore, you are asked to please (a) complete the web survey located at http://stellarsurvey.com/s.aspx?u=7FB9304E-B9AC-4372-93F2-2371F98AA93D& before Monday December 13, 2010.

The study is being conducted under the guidance of Professor Dale Campbell at the University of Florida. It has been designed to:

1. Assess the levels of psychological ownership Branch Campus administrators experience for their institutions and campuses.
2. Examine the factors that contribute to the psychological ownership that branch campus administrators experience in the course of leading their campuses.

The survey instrument should take no longer than 20 to 30 minutes for you to complete.

Your participation in this survey is completely voluntary and your decision to participate or not will in no way impact your relationship with the College of Education or the University of Florida

The results of the data gathered will be aggregated. Therefore, individual responses will not be identified. No individual responses will be included in the report, so please take a few minutes to log in and complete the twenty item survey.

If, for any reason you are unable to complete the web-based survey pencil and paper version can be sent to you. Also, if you would like to have a copy of the results of this study, please check the box at the end of the questionnaire and insert your e-mail address in the space provided.

Thank you very much for your time and cooperation!

Sincerely,

Lisa Valentino
Doctoral Student, College of Education, University of Florida
Campus Provost, Seminole State College of Florida

Dr. Dale Campbell
Director of the Community College Leadership Consortium
Interim Director of School of Human Development and Organizational Studies in Education
College of Education, University of Florida

APPENDIX E
FINAL FOLLOW-UP EMAIL REQUESTING PARTICIPATION

Dear Branch campus colleague,

At the end of last year we sent you a survey about your experiences as a branch campus administrator entitled Psychological Ownership in Branch Campus Administrators: Influence of Perceived Control. If you have already completed and returned the questionnaire, please accept our sincere thanks. If not, we urge you to please consider doing so today. Your opinions are very important in helping us further research in branch campus administration. We are very grateful for your help.

You were chosen to participate in this study due to that fact that you are recognized as an educational leader who has responsibility for branch or regional campus matters at your institution. Your views about these matters are highly valued. You are one of only 500 branch campus administrators to receive this survey and your input is extremely important to the outcome of the study. The intent of the study is to examine the factors that contribute to the psychological ownership that branch campus administrators experience in the course of leading their campuses. It is hoped that the results of this study will aid in a better understanding of branch campus administration. Therefore, you are asked to please (a) complete the web survey located at http://stellarsurvey.com/s.aspx?u=7FB9304E-B9AC-4372-93F2-2371F98AA93D& before January 12, 2011.

The study is being conducted under the guidance of Professor Dale Campbell at the University of Florida. It has been designed to:
1. Assess the levels of psychological ownership Branch Campus administrators experience for their institutions and campuses.
2. Examine the factors that contribute to the psychological ownership that branch campus administrators experience in the course of leading their campuses.

The survey instrument should take approximately 20 to 30 minutes for you to complete.

Your participation in this survey is completely voluntary and your decision to participate or not will in no way impact your relationship with the College of Education or University of Florida.

The results of the data gathered will be aggregated. Therefore, individual responses will not be identified. No individual responses will be included in the report, so please take a few minutes to log in and complete the twenty item survey.

If, for any reason you are unable to complete the web-based survey pencil and paper version can be sent to you. Also, if you would like to have a copy of the results of this study, please check the box at the end of the questionnaire and insert your e-mail address in the space provided.

Thank you very much for your time and cooperation!

Sincerely,

Lisa Valentino
Doctoral Student, College of Education, University of Florida
Campus Provost, Seminole State College of Florida

Dr. Dale Campbell
Director of the Community College Leadership Consortium
Interim Director of School of Human Development and Organizational Studies in Education College of Education, University of Florida

LIST OF REFERENCES

American Association of Community Colleges (AACC). (1995). *AACC facts 1995*. Washington D.C.: AACC.

AACC. (2000). *Community colleges past to present*. Retrieved from http://www.aacc.nche.edu/AboutCC/history/Pages/pasttopresent.aspx

AACC. (2007). *Serving communities, strengthening the nation*. Retrieved from http://www.aacc.nche.edu/AboutCC/Pages/serving.aspx

AACC. (2009). *About community college: Fast facts*. Retrieved from http://www.aacc.nche.edu/AboutCC/Pages/fastfacts.aspx

AACC. (2011). *About community colleges*. Retrieved from http://www.aacc.nche.edu/AboutCC/Pages/default.aspx

Alfred, R. (1998). Redesigning community colleges to compete for the future. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 22*, 315–333.

Amey, M., Jessup-Anger, E., & Jessup-Anger, J. (2008). Community college governance: What matters and why? *New Directions for Community Colleges, 141*, 5–14.

Andrews, D., Nonnecke, B., & Preece, J. (2003). Electronic survey methodology: A case study in reaching hard-to-involve Internet users. *International Journal of Human-Computer Interaction, 16*(2), 185–210.

Anthony, J. (1976). Reflections on the cluster college. *New Directions for Community Colleges*, 13, 11–24.

Asatryn, V. (2006). *Psychological ownership theory: An application for the restaurant industry*. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from http://proquest.umi.com.lp.hscl.ufl.edu/pqdweb?index=4&did=1158516971&SrchMode=2&sid=2&Fmt=6&VInst=PROD&VType=PQD&RQT=309&VName=PQD&TS=1296878131&clientId=20179

Aryee, S., Sun, L., & Zhou, Q. (2009). Employee-organization relationship, psychological ownership and contextual performance: A social exchange perspective. *Academy of Management Proceedings*, *2009*, 1–6.

Avey, J., Avolio, B., Crossley, C., & Luthan, F. (2009). Psychological ownership: Theoretical extensions, measurement and relation to work outcomes. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 30*(2), 173–191.

Bailey, N. (2002). *The relationship between organizational climate and job satisfaction as reported by branch campus executive officers in multi-campus community college systems*. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from http://proquest.umi.com.lp.hscl.ufl.edu/pqdweb?index=0&did=727400581&SrchMode=2&sid=2&Fmt=6&VInst=PROD&VType=PQD&RQT=309&VName=PQD&TS=1239486057&clientId=20179

Bebko, P.. (2009). *Definition profiles: An update on the work of the NABCA research committee*. Presentation at the 12th annual conference of the National Branch Campus Administrators (NABCA). Panama City Beach, FL. April 16, 2009.

Bebko, P., & Huffman, D. (in press). Developing a typology of branch campuses: findings from the NABCA campus and center administrator survey. *Metropolitan Universities***.**

Becker, I. (1964). The case for community/junior colleges. *Junior College Journal, 34*, 26–30.

Beggan, J. (1991). Using what you own to get what you need: The role of possessions in satisfying control motivation. In Rudmin, F.W. (Ed.). To have possessions: A handbook on ownership and property. (Special issue). *Journal of Social Behavior and Personality 6*(6), 129–146.

Beggan, J. (1992). On the social nature of nonsocial perception: The mere ownership effect. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology 62*(2)**,** 229–237.

Belk, R. W. (1988). Possessions and the extended self. *Journal of Consumer Research, 15*, 139–168.

Belton, L. (2008). *Factors related to success and participants' psychological ownership in collaborative wildlife management: A survey of sage-grouse local working groups*. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from http://proquest.umi.com.lp.hscl.ufl.edu/pqdweb?did=1568967671&sid=2&Fmt=6&clientId=20179&RQT=309&VName=PQD

Bennis, W.G. (1999). The leadership advantage. *Leader to Leader 12*, 18–23.

Berger, J. (2002). The influence of the organizational structures of colleges and universities on college student learning. *Peabody Journal of Education 77*(3), 10–59.

Bernstein, P. (1979). *Workplace democratization: Its internal dynamics*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction.

Bird, C. (in press). A perspective on the future of branch campuses. *Metropolitan Universities*.

Birnbaum, R. (1991). *How colleges work: The cybernetics of academic organization and leadership*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Birnbaum, R. (1988). *How colleges work*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.

Blevins, R. (2001). A study of the association between organizational trust and decision-making, communications and collaborations incomprehensive, regional institutions of higher education. (Doctoral dissertation). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 61*, 4236.

Block, M. (1970). M.U.D—An increasing dilemma for community junior college. *Community and Junior College Journal, 40,* 23–25.

Blocker, C., & Campbell, H. (1963). *Administrative practices in university extension centers and branch campuses*. Austin, TX: University of Texas.

Blocker, C., Plummer, R., & Richardson, Jr., R. (1965). *The two-year college: A social synthesis.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Boldman, L. & Deal, T. (2003). *Reframing organizations: Artistry, choice and leadership*, 3rd edition. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, Inc.

Bond, J. (1983). *Perceptions of selected community college parent campus administrators, accountable for branch campuses, concerning the desirable functions and responsibilities of community college branch campuses*. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from http://proquest.umi.com.lp.hscl.ufl.edu/pqdweb?did=753574711&sid=1&Fmt=6&clientId=20179&RQT=309&VName=PQD

Boone, E. J. (1997). National perspective of community colleges. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 21*, 1–12.

Brass, D. (1985). Technology and the structuring of jobs: Employee satisfaction, performance and influence. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 35*(2), 216–240.

Buchko, A. (1992). Effects of employee ownership on employee attitudes: Three theoretical perspectives. *Work and Occupations, 19*, 59–78.

Burk, C. (1900). The collecting instinct. *Pedagogical Seminary, 7,* 179–207.

Cattell, N. (1971). The branch campus role in community-based education. *The Educational Record, Fall,* 368–370.

Chang, N. (1978). *Organizational structure in the multi-campus community junior colleges/districts*. Community College of Denver. (Eric Document Reproduction Service No. ED 158 795).

Chieffo, A. (1991). Factors contributing to job satisfaction and organizational commitment of community college leadership teams. *Community College Review, 19*(2), 15–25.

Chi, N., & Han, T. (2008). Exploring the linkages between formal ownership and psychological ownership for the organization: The mediating role of organizational justice. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 81,* 691–711.

Clark, B. (1983). *The higher education system: Academic organization in cross-national perspective.* Berkley, CA: University of California Press.

Clark, G. (1992). Culture, leadership and organizational systems. In G. Baker III and Associates (Ed). *Cultural leadership in America's community colleges*. Washington, DC: American Association of Community Colleges.

Cohen, A. (2001). *Are all community colleges alike?* Los Angeles, CA: Eric Clearinghouse for Community Colleges. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service Document No. ED 452 313).

Cohen A. (1999). Governmental policies affecting community colleges. Draft of a chapter from B. Townsend (Ed). *Community colleges: Policy in the future context*. (ERIC Reproduction Service Document No. ED 429 623).

Cohen, A. (1995). *Projecting the future of community colleges.* Los Angeles, CA: Eric Clearinghouse for Community Colleges. (ERIC Digest Document No. ED 388 351).

Cohen, A., & Brawer, F. (2003). *The American community college* (4th Ed). San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.

Cohen A., & Brawer, F. (1994). The challenging environment: Context, concepts and crisis. In A. M. Cohen, and F. B. Brawer, (Eds.) (1994). *Managing community colleges* (p. 5-21). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Cohen, M. (1972). Junior college growth. *Change, 4*(9), 32a–32d.

Conover, K. (2009). *Leadership competencies of branch campus administrators in multi-campus community college systems*. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from http://proquest.umi.com.lp.hscl.ufl.edu/pqdweb?did=1820123691&sid=3&Fmt=6&clientId=20179&RQT=309&VName=PQD

Corbelli, J. (1989). *Administrative decision-making styles in higher education*. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from http://proquest.umi.com.lp.hscl.ufl.edu/pqdweb?index=24&did=746870051&SrchMode=1&sid=2&Fmt=2&VInst=PROD&VType=PQD&RQT=309&VName=PQD&TS=1239486713&clientId=20179

Creswell, J. W. (2009). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (3rd ed.). Los Angeles, CA: Sage.

Crom, M. (2000). The new key to employee retention. *Leader to Leader, 18*, 12–14.

Crowne, D., & Marlowe, D. (1960). A new scale of social desirability independent of psychopathology, *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 24*, 349–354.

Csikszentmihalyi, M., & Rochberg-Halton, E. (1981). *The meaning of things: Domestic symbols and the self.* Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.

Das, G. (1993). Local memoirs of a global manager. *Harvard Business Review, 71*(2): 38–47.

Davis, G. (2001). *Issues in community college governa*nce. Retrieved from http://www.aacc.nche.edu/Resources/aaccprograms/pastprojects/Pages/issuesccgovernance.aspx

Dean Dad. (2011, January 9). Blog: Confession of a community college dean. *Inside Higher Ed (Online)*. Retrieved from http://www.insidehighered.com/blogs/confessions_of_a_community_college_dean/an_open_letter_to_ed_d_candidates

Dengerink, H. (2001). Branch campuses as the new metropolitan universities. *Metropolitan Universities, 12*(2), 7–9.

Dewar, R., Whetten, D., and Boje, D. (1980). An examination of the reliability and validity of the Aiken and Hage scales of centralization, formalization, and task routineness. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 25*(1), 120–128.

Dittmar, H. (1992). *The social psychology of material possessions: To have is to be.* New York, NY: St. Martin's Press.

Dirks, K. T., Cummings, L. L., & Pierce, J. L. (1996). Psychological ownership in organizations: Conditions under which individuals promote and resist change. In R. W. Woodman & W. A. Pasmore (Eds.), *Research in Organizational Change and Development, 9*, 1-23. Greenwich, CT: IAI Press.

Donhardt, G. (1996). How far will commuters travel? *Planning For Higher Education, 25*(1), 34–43.

Dunderstadt, J. (2000). *A university for the 21st century*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.

Eaton, J. (1994). *Strengthening collegiate education in community colleges*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Etzioni, A. (1991). The socio-economics of property. *Journal of Social Behavior and Personality, 6,* 465–468.

Evans, J. P. (1999). Benefits and barriers to shared authority. In M. Miller (ed.), (1999). *Responsive academic decision making involving faculty in higher education governance.* Stillwater, OK: New Forums.

Ewers, P. (2000). *Report to Roosevelt University: On governance for a multi-campus university.* Chicago, IL: Roosevelt University.

Fink, A. (2008). *How to conduct surveys: A step-by-step guide.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Fonseca, J. & Bird, C. (2007, October). Under the radar: Branch campuses take off. *University Business (Online)*. Retrieved from. http://www.universitybusiness.com/viewarticle.aspx?articleid=924

Freiberg, K. (2001, July). Owner mentality. *Executive Excellence*, 7–8.

Frye, J. (1992). *The vision of the public junior college 1900-1940*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Fryer, T., Jr., & Lovas, J. (1990). *Leadership in governance: Creating conditions for successful decision making in the community college*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.

Furby, L. (1978a). Possessions: Toward a theory of their meaning and function throughout the life cycle. In P. B. Baltes (Ed.), *Life Span Development and Behavior, 1*, 297-336. New York: Academic Press.

Furby, L. (1978b). Possession in humans: An exploratory study of its meaning and motivation. *Social Behavior and Personality, 6*(1), 49–65.

Furby, L. (1980). The origins and early development of possessive behavior. *Political Psychology, 2*(1), 30–42.

Furby, L. (1991). Understanding the psychology of possession and ownership: A personal memoir and an appraisal of our progress. *Journal of Social Behavior and Personality, 6,* 457–463.

Gade, M. (1993). *Four multi-campus systems: Some policies and practices that work*. Washington, DC: Association of Governing Boards of Colleges and Universities.

Gaither, G. (Ed). (1999). *The multi-campus system*. Sterling, VA: Stylus.

Garton, L., Haythornthwaite, C., & Wellman, B. (1999). Studying on-line social networks. In S. Jones (Ed.), *Doing internet research: Critical issues and methods for examining the net* (pp. 75-105). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Gerstman, B. (2006). *StatPrimer (Version 6.4). (13) ANOVA topics (post hoc comparisons, Levene's test, non-parametric tests).* Retrieved from http://www.sjsu.edu/faculty/gerstman/StatPrimer/anova-b.pdf

gillie-gossom, j & Pelton, M. (in press). Branch campus leadership: Like running a three-ring circus? *Metropolitan Universities*.

Glatter, R. (1999). From struggling to juggling: Towards a redefinition of the field of educational leadership and management. *Educational Management and Administration*, *25*(2), 181–192.

Glatter, R. (1979). Educational policy and management: One field or two? *Educational Analysis, 1*(2), 15–24.

Gleazer, E. (1998). *Values, vision and vitality*. Washington, DC: Community College Press.

Gleazer, E. (1991). Evolution of junior colleges into community colleges. In: G. Baker, III and associates. (1991). *A handbook on the community college in America: Its history, mission and management*. Westport, CT: Greenwood press.

Gleazer, E. (1971). The emerging role of the community junior college. *Peabody Journal of Education, 48*(4), 255–256.

Gliem, J. & Gliem, R. (2003). Calculating, interpreting, and reporting Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficient for Likert-type scales. *Midwest research-to-practice conference in adult, continuing, and community education, 2003 conference proceedings*, 82-88. Retrieved from https://scholarworks.iupui.edu/bitstream/handle/1805/344/Gliem+&+Gliem.pdf?sequence=1

Hackman, J. R., & Oldham, G. R. (1980). *Work redesign.* Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Hackman, J. R., & Oldham, G. R. (1975). Development of the job diagnostic survey. *Journal Applied Psychology, 60*, 159–170.

Hage, J., & Aiken, M. (1967). Relationship of centralization to other structural properties. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 12*, 72–92.

Han, T., Chiang, H., & Chang, A. (2010). Employee participation in decision making, psychological ownership and knowledge sharing: Mediating role of organizational commitment in Taiwanese high-tech organizations. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management, 21*(12), 2218–2233.

Havighurst, R., & Neurfarten, B. (1957). *Society and education*. Englewood Cliff, NJ: Allyn & Bacon.

Harper, W. (1971). The community and junior college: An overview. *Peabody Journal of Education 48*(4), 257–261.

Heermann, B. (Ed). (1976). Changing managerial perspectives. *New Directions for Community Colleges, 13*, 4.

Heider, F. (1958). *The psychology of interpersonal relations*. New York, NY: Wiley.

Hermanson, D. (1993). *A revalidation of Dunlap's survey to determine the profile and critical issues of lower division branch campuses of four year institutions*. Grand Forks: University of North Dakota. (Eric Document Reproduction Service No. ED 358 897).

Hermanson, D. (1995). *Inter-campus relations as perceived by branch campus and main campus administrators*. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from http://proquest.umi.com.lp.hscl.ufl.edu/pqdweb?did=742872231&sid=2&Fmt=6&clientId=20179&RQT=309&VName=PQD

Hill, R. (1985). *Multi-campus university organizational structure and branch campus administrative problems*. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from http://proquest.umi.com.lp.hscl.ufl.edu/pqdweb?index=1&did=752951321&SrchMode=1&sid=3&Fmt=6&VInst=PROD&VType=PQD&RQT=309&VName=PQD&TS=1239486950&clientId=20179

Holland, B. (2001). From the Editor. *Metropolitan Universities, 12*(2), 4–6.

Honeyman, D., Wattenbarger, J., & Westbrook, K. (Eds.) 1996). *A struggle to survive: Funding higher education in the next century*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press, Inc.

Huitt, R. (1972). The 10,000 mile campus: University branches put education where students are. *College and University Business, 53*, 41–43, 45.

Idaszak, J., & Drasgow, F. (1987). A revision of the job diagnostic survey: Elimination of a measurement artifact. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 72,* 69–74.

Institutional Eligibility. 34 C.F.R. pt. 600.2. (2011). Retrieved from http://ecfr.gpoaccess.gov/cgi/t/text/text-idx?c=ecfr&sid=702c7e87ace35f7eefc7466b2beb3c3f&rgn=div8&view=text&node=34:3.1.3.1.1.1.23.2&idno=34

Jenkins, J. (1974*). An exploratory study of relationships between control and authority patterns and organizational efficiency in urban multi-unit community college systems* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from http://proquest.umi.com.lp.hscl.ufl.edu/pqdweb?index=0&did=761309781&SrchMode=1&sid=4&Fmt=1&VInst=PROD&VType=PQD&RQT=309&VName=PQD&TS=1239487056&clientId=20179

Jenkins, J., & Rossmeier, J. (1974). *Relationships between centralization/decentralization and organizational effectiveness in urban multiunit community college systems*. *A summary report.* Ann Arbor, MI: Center for the Study of Higher Education. (Eric Document Reproduction Service No. ED 110 103).

Jensen, A. (1965). *An investigation of the administration of junior college districts with multi-campuses*. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from http://proquest.umi.com.lp.hscl.ufl.edu/pqdweb?index=0&did=754571331&SrchMode=1&sid=6&Fmt=1&VInst=PROD&VType=PQD&RQT=309&VName=PQD&TS=1239487155&clientId=20179

Jensen, A. (1984). *Multi-campus community colleges: Twenty years later*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education National Institute of Education (p. 5-23). (ERIC Reproduction Service Document No. ED256413).

Johnsrud, L. K. (1996). *Maintaining morale: A guide to assessing the morale of midlevel administrators and faculty*. Washington, DC: College and University Personnel Association.

Johnsrund, L., Heck, R., & Rosser, V. (2000). Morale matters: Midlevel administrators and their intent to leave. *The Journal of Higher Education*, *71*(1), 34–59.

Johnsrud, L., & Rosser, V. (1999). College and university midlevel administrators: Explaining and improving their morale. *The Review for Higher Education, 22*(2), 121–141.

Johnstone, D. B. (1992). *Central administration of public multi-campus college and university systems*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Jones, M. (1968). *The development of multiunit junior colleges.* Washington, DC: ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior College Information.

Karasek, R. (1979). Job demands, job decision latitude, and mental strain: Implications for job redesign. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 24*, 285–306.

Katsinas, S., & Hardy, D. E. (2004). Publicly controlled two-year institutions in the United States. (Unpublished draft report). Denton, TX: University of North Texas.

Kenny, D. (2011, September 22). A teacher quality manifesto. *The Wall Street Journal* (Online). Retrieved from http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052748703440604575496281030445268.html

Kerr, C., Millett, J. D., Clark, B. R., MacArthur, B., & Bowen, H. R. (1978). *12 Systems of Higher Education: 6 Decisive Issues.* New York, NY: International Council for Educational Development. (Eric Document Reproduction Service Document No.ED 177 952).

Kezar, A. (2004). What is more effective governance: Relationships, trust and leadership or structures and formal processes? *New Directions for Higher Education, 127*, San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.

Kintzer, F. (1969). *The multi-institution junior college district*. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Community Colleges. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service Document No. ED 030 415).

Kintzer, F., Jensen A., & Hansen, J. (1969). *The multi-institution junior college district*. Washington, DC: American Association of Junior Colleges. (Eric Reproduction Services Document No. ED 030 415).

Kline, L., & France, C. J. (1899). The psychology of mine. *Pedagogical Seminary & Genetic Psychology, 6*(4), 421–470.

Koos, L. (1944a). How to democratize the junior college. *School Review, 52,* 271–284.

Koos, L. (1944b). Local versus regional junior colleges. *School Review, 52,* 525–531.

Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B.Z. (1997). *Leadership Challenge*. (5th Edition). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Krueger, J. (2009). Branch campus leaders descriptions of the main campus administrative, departmental and faculty attitudes toward the branch organization, and their level of job satisfaction and organizational commitment. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from http://proquest.umi.com.lp.hscl.ufl.edu/pqdweb?did=1878782491&sid=3&Fmt=6&clientId=20179&RQT=309&VName=PQD

Krysan, M. (1998). Privacy and the expression of white racial attitudes. *Public Opinion Quarterly, 62*, 506–544.

Kubzansky, P. E., & Druskat, V. U. (1993). *Psychological* sense of ownership in the *workplace: Conceptualization and measurement***.** Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Psychological Association, Toronto, Ontario.

Ladner, M. D., Wingenbach, G., & Raven, M. (2002). *Internet and paper based data collection methods in agricultural education research***.** Proceedings of the Southern Agricultural Education Research Conference, Orlando, FL. Retrieved from http://pubs.aged.tamu.edu.lp.hscl.ufl.edu/jsaer/pdf/Vol52/52-02-040.pdf.

Lander, V. (1977). *The significance of structure in Arizona community college districts: A limited study.* Graduate seminar Paper: University of Arizona. (Eric Document Reproduction Services Document No. ED 139 481).

Lee, E., & Bowen, F. (1971). *The multi campus university: A study of academic governance*. New York, NY: McGraw Hill Co.

Lee, E., & Bowen, F. (1975). *Managing multi-campus systems: Effective administration in and unsteady state*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.

Levinson, D. (2005). *Community colleges: A reference handbook*. Santa Barbara, CA: ABC-CLIO. Retrieved from http://books.google.com/books?id=xrnPJcb7c54C&printsec=copyright&dq=%22Levinson%22+%22Community+colleges:+A+reference+handbook%22+&lr=#PPR4,M1

Litwinski, L. (1947). The psychology of ''mine''. *Philosophy, 22,* 240–251.

Llieva, J., Baron, S., & Healey, N. M. (2002). Online surveys in marketing research: Pros and cons. *International Journal of Market Research, 44*(3), 361–367.

Mayhew, M., Ashkansy, N., Bramble, T, & Gardner, J. (2007). A study of the antecedents and consequences of psychological ownership in organizational settings. *Journal of Social Psychology, 147*, 177–500.

McCabe, R. (1977). Planning for a community college system. *Planning For Higher Education, 6,* 41–43.

McClenney, K. (2004). The promise of community colleges. *Community College Journal, 75*(3) 12–15.

McGregor, D. (1986). *The human side of enterprise*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

McIntrye, N., Srivastava, A., & Fuller, J. (2009). The relationship of locus of control and motives with psychological ownership in organizations. *Journal of Managerial Issues 21*(3), 383–401.

Md-Sidin, S., Sambasivan, M., & Muniandt, N. (2010). Impact of psychological ownership on the performance of business school lecturers. *Journal of Education for Business, 85*(1) 50–56.

Medsker, L. (1960). *The junior college: Progress and prospect*. New York, NY: McGraw Hill.

Medsker, L. & Trent, J. (1965). *The influence of different types of public higher institutions on college attendance from varying socioeconomic and ability levels.* U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare Cooperative Research Project No. 438. Berkeley, CA.: Center for the Study of Higher Education, University of California, Berkeley. (ERIC Reproduction Service Document No. ED 002 875).

Mehta, R., & Sivadas, E. (1995). Comparing responses rates and response content in mail versus electronic mail surveys. *Journal of the Market Research Society, 37*(4), 429–440.

Mertzer, M. (2008). *Perceptions of inter-campus relations by branch campus and main campus student affairs administrators in multi-campus public universities in Florida*. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from http://proquest.umi.com.lp.hscl.ufl.edu/pqdweb?index=0&did=1481676501&SrchMode=1&sid=7&Fmt=6&VInst=PROD&VType=PQD&RQT=309&VName=PQD&TS=1239487535&clientId=20179

Miller, M., & Miles, J. (2008). Internal governance in the community college: Models and quilts. *New Directions for Community Colleges, 141*, 35–44.

Moltz, D. (2011, January 13). To library, or not to library. *Inside Higher Ed* (on-line). Retrieved from http://www.insidehighered.com/news/2011/01/13/community_colleges_debate_when_branch_campuses_need_libraries

Monroe, C. (1972). *Profile of the community college*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Moses, Y. (2001). Scanning the environment: AAHE's president reports on trends in higher education. *AAHE bulletin, 53(*10), 7–9.

Mutahseb, A. (2004). *The Internet as an alternative source of information and alternative forum of expression for Arab Americans.* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from http://proquest.umi.com.lp.hscl.ufl.edu/pqdweb?index=0&did=766261911&SrchMode=2&sid=1&Fmt=6&VInst=PROD&VType=PQD&RQT=309&VName=PQD&TS=1240281681&clientId=20179.

Norby, P. (2005). *Out on a limb: serving students at one community college branch campus.* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from http://proquest.umi.com.lp.hscl.ufl.edu/pqdweb?index=0&did=1020076871&SrchMode=1&sid=8&Fmt=6&VInst=PROD&VType=PQD&RQT=309&VName=PQD&TS=1239487641&clientId=20179

Nunnaly, J. (1978). *Psychometric theory*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

O'Banion, T. (1997). *A learning college for the 21st century*. Phoenix, AZ: Oryx Press.

O'Discoll, M., Pierce, J., & Coghlan, A. (2006). The psychology of ownership: Work environment structure, organizational commitment and citizenship behaviors. *Group and Organizational Management, 31*(3), 388–416.

O'Reilly, C. (2002). The wrong kind of ownership. *Across the Board*, September, 19–20.

Parker, S., Wall, T., & Jackson, P. (1997). That's not my job: Developing flexible employee work orientations. *Academy of Management Journal, 40*(4), 899–929.

Parilla, R. (1993). Adapting institutional structure and culture to change. *New Directions for Community Colleges, 84*, 21–33.

Peterson, M. W., & Dill, D. D. (1997). Understanding the competitive environment of the postsecondary knowledge industry. In Marvin W. Peterson, David D. Dill, Lisa A. Mets and Associates, *Planning and Management for a Changing Environment: A Handbook on Redesigning Postsecondary Institutions* (pp. 3–29). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Peters, T., & Austin, N. (1985). *A passion for excellence*. New York, NY: Random House.

Pierce, J, Jussilia, I., & Cummings, A. (2009). Psychological ownership within the job design context: Revision of the job characteristics model. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 30*, 477–496.

Pierce, J. Kostova, T., & Dirks, K. (2001). Toward a theory of psychological ownership in organizations. *Academy of Management Review, 26*, 298–310.

Pierce, J., Kostova, T., & Dirks, K. (2003). The state of psychological ownership: Integrating and expending a century of research. *Review of General Psychology, 7,* 84–107.

Pierce, J., O'Driscoll, M., & Coghlan, A. (2004). Work environment structure and psychological ownership: The mediating effects of control. *Journal of Social Psychology, 144*, 507–534.

Pierce, J., & Rodgers, L. (2004). The psychology of ownership and worker-owner productivity. *Group and Organization Management, 29*, 599–613.

Pierce, J. L., Rubenfeld, S. A., & Morgan, S. (1991). Employee ownership: A conceptual model of process and effects. *Academy of Management Review, 16*, 121–144.

Pierce, J., Van Dyne, L., & Cummings, L. (1992). *Psychological ownership: A conceptual and operational exploration*. New Orleans, LA: Southern Management Association Proceedings (pp. 203–211).

Pratt, M., & Dutton, J. (2000). Owning up or opting out: The role of identities and emotions in issue ownership. In N. Ashkanasy, C. Hartel, & W. Zerbe (Eds.), *Emotions in the workplace: Research, theory, and practice. (pp.*103–129). New York, NY: Quorum.

Protch, O. (2006). Delegation of authority. *Supervision, 67* (4), 12–14.

Reitano, J. (1988). *The community college mission: Access or anarchy?* Paper presented at the Conference on General Education and The Two Year College, Buffalo, NY April 22–23, 1988. (Eric Document Reproduction Services Document No ED 295 698). Retrieved from http://www.eric.ed.gov/PDFS/ED295698.pdf

Richardson, R. (1973). Governing the multi-unit community college system. *Educational Record, 54,* 141–146.

Richardson, R., Blocker, C., & Bender, L. (1972). *Governance for the two year college.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Romesburg, K. (1972). *Characteristics of branch colleges in the United States*. Ann Arbor, MI: University press.

Rosenbaum, J. (2001). *Beyond college for all: Career paths for the forgotten half*. New York, NY: Russell Sage Foundation.

Rossmeier, J. (1973). *An exploratory study of the relationship between control and authority patterns and organizational responsiveness in urban multiunit community college systems.* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from http://proquest.umi.com.lp.hscl.ufl.edu/pqdweb?index=0&did=759169611&SrchMode=1&sid=9&Fmt=1&VInst=PROD&VType=PQD&RQT=309&VName=PQD&TS=1239487741&clientId=20179

Rossmeier, J. (1976). Perspectives on multiunit colleges. *New Directions for Community Colleges, 13*, 77–88.

Rosser, V. (2000). Midlevel Administrators: What we know. *New Directions for Higher Education*, *111*, 5–13.

Rushing, J. (1970). Managing the multi-campus. *College Management, 5*, 14–16.

Rucker, R. (1979). *Student's perceptions of the extension centers of San Jacinto College.* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from http://proquest.umi.com.lp.hscl.ufl.edu/pqdweb?index=0&did=749235081&SrchMode=1&sid=11&Fmt=1&VInst=PROD&VType=PQD&RQT=309&VName=PQD&TS=1239487956&clientId=20179

Rudmin, F. W., & Berry, J. W. (1987). Semantics of ownership: A free-recall study of property. *The Psychological Record, 37*, 257–268.

Sammartino, P. (1964). *Multiple campuses*. Rutherford, NJ: Fairleigh Dickenson University Press.

Santos, J.R. (1999). Cronbach's alpha: a tool for assessing the reliability of scales. *Journal of Extension, 37*(2). Retrieved from http://www.joe.org/joe/1999april/tt3.php

Sasser, J. (1978). Satellite centers: An educational medium of the future. *Community College Frontiers, 6,* 25–27.

Scott, R. (1978). Lords, squires and yeoman: Collegiate middle managers and their organizations. *ASHE-ERIC/Higher Education Research Report No 7*. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.

Schindler, C. (1952). Stepchild of the college campus. *The Journal of Higher Education, 23*(4), 191–197+227–228.

Seligman, M. E. P. (1975). *Helplessness.* San Francisco, CA: Freeman.

Sethi, D. (2000). Leading from the middle. *Leader to Leader, 7*, 6–9.

Shaw, K., & Bornhoft, S. (In press). Community support and relevance to community: Indispensable underpinnings for branch campuses. *Metropolitan Universities.*

Sharp, D. (2005, March 12). Developing managers. *New Straits Times*, 12.

Smith, C., Tisak, J., Hahn, S., & Schmieder, R. (1997). The measurement of job control. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 18*(3), 225–237.

Smith, S. (2010). How do I become a ringmaster? Retrieved from http://www.wisegeek.com/how-do-i-become-a-ringmaster.htm

Spencer, P. (1997). *Breaking free: Forces that affect a center becoming a college*. San Jacinto, CA: Mt San Jacinto College. (Eric Document Reproduction Services Document No ED 409 964). Retrieved from http://eric.ed.gov/PDFS/ED409964.pdf

Stahley, M. (2002). *Multi-campus university organizational structure and branch campus administrative problems: An iteration and expansion of Hill*. (Doctoral Dissertation). Retrieved from http://proquest.umi.com.lp.hscl.ufl.edu/pqdweb?index=0&did=726486681&SrchMode=1&sid=12&Fmt=6&VInst=PROD&VType=PQD&RQT=309&VName=PQD&TS=1239488037&clientId=20179

Sue, V., & Ritter, L. (2007). *Conducting Online Surveys*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Tanaka, K., & Yamauchi, H. (2000). Influence of autonomy on perceived control beliefs and self-regulated learning in Japanese undergraduate students. *North American Journal of Psychology, 2*(2), 255–273.

Tollefson, T., Garrett, R., & Ingram, W. (Eds.) (1999). *Fifty state systems of community colleges: Mission, governance, funding and accountability*. Johnson City, TN: Overmountain Press.

Umbach, P. (2005). Getting back to the basics of survey research. *New Directions for Institutional Research, 127*, 91–100.

Underwood, J., & Hammons, J. (1999). Past present and future variations in community college organization structure. *Community College Review, 26*(4), 39–60.

Upton, J. (1973). The small multi-campus college. *Community and Junior College Journal, 43*, 28–29.

Van Dyne, L., & Pierce, J. (2004). Psychological ownership and feelings of possession: Three field studies predicting employee attitudes and organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 25*, 439–459.

Van Dyne, L., VandeWalle, D., Kostova, L., Latham, M., & Cummings, L. (2000). Collectivism, propensity to trust and self-esteem as predictors of organizational citizenship in a non-work setting. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 21*, 3–23.

VandeWalle, D., Van Dyne, L., & Kostova, T. (1995). Psychological ownership: An empirical examination of its consequences. *Group and Organization Management, 20*, 210–226.

VanSelm, M., & Jankowski, N (2006). Conducting online surveys. *Quality and Quantity, 40*(3), 435–456.

Vaughan, G. B. (1986). *The community college presidency*. New York, NY: American Council on Education/Macmillan Publishing Company.

Vaughan, G. (2000). *The community college story* (2nd ed). Washington, DC: American Association of Community Colleges, Community College Press.

Vaughan, G. (2006). *The community college story*, (3rd ed). Washington, DC: Community College Press.

Verhoeven, C. (2003). Job conditions and wellness/health outcomes in Dutch secondary school teachers. *Psychology and Health*, *18*, 473–487.

Wagner, S., Parker, C., & Christansen, N. (2003). Effects of ownership beliefs and behaviors on organizational effectiveness. *Personnel Psychology, 56,* 817–871.

Wattenbarger, J. (1971). The future of the community junior college. *Peabody Journal of Education*, *48*(4), 307–313.

Wattenbarger, J., Cage, B., & Arney, L. (1970). *The community junior college: Target population, program costs and cost differentials.* (National Educational Finance Project, Special Study GO.6). Gainesville, FL: University of Florida,.

Wattenbarger, J., & Holcombe, W. (1975). Central administration in multi-unit community colleges. Gainesville, FL: Institute of Higher Education. (ERIC Reproduction Service Document No. ED 107 328). Retrieved from http://www.eric.ed.gov/PDFS/ED107328.pdf

Wells, E. (1985). Branches for opportunity. *American Education, 2*(4), 5–8.

Westman, N. (1992). Moderating effect of decision latitude on stress-strain relationship: Does organizational level matter? *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 13*, 713–722.

Willis, B. (1956). *Report on Chicago city junior college to the Chicago board of education*. Chicago, IL: Chicago Board of Education.

Wilson, J. (1980). *Administrative functions and tasks common to the positions of president, vice president of academic affairs, academic deans, and department chairpersons in public institutions of higher education*. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from http://proquest.umi.com.lp.hscl.ufl.edu/pqdweb?index=0&did=748832891&SrchMode=1&sid=14&Fmt=6&VInst=PROD&VType=PQD&RQT=309&VName=PQD&TS=1239488207&clientId=20179

Wondolleck, J. M., & Yaffee, S. L. (2000). *Making collaboration work: Lessons from innovation in natural resource management*. Washington, DC.: Island Press.

Wood, C. (2003). The effects of creating psychological ownership among students in group projects. *Journal of Marketing Education, 25*, 241–249.

Wright, K. (2005). Researching Internet-based populations: Advantages and disadvantages of online survey research, online questionnaire authoring software packages, and web survey services. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication, 10*(3), article 11. Retrieved from http://jcmc.indiana.edu/vol10/issue3/wright.html

Wygal, A., & Owen, D. (1975). Community college needs: A model for assessing educational needs of metro communities to be fulfilled by multi-campus public community colleges. *College and University Business, 55,* 24–31.

Wynn, J. (1969). *Study of selected aspects of centralization versus autonomy in the administration of multi-campus two year colleges.* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from http://proquest.umi.com.lp.hscl.ufl.edu/pqdweb?did=754907711&sid=3&Fmt=1&clientId=20179&RQT=309&VName=PQD

Wynn, J. (1972). Administering multi-campus junior colleges. *College and University Business, 53*, 44.

Yamauchi, H., Kumagai, Y., & Kawasaki, Y. (1999). Perceived control, autonomy and self-regulated learning strategies among Japanese high school students. *Psychological Reports, 85*, 779–798.

Yun, G. W., & Trumbo, C. W. (2000). Comparative response to a survey executed by post, email, and web form. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication, 6*(1). Retrieved from http://jcmc.indiana.edu/vol6/issue1/yun.html.

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

M. Lisa Valentino received her bachelor of science in psychology from the University of Kentucky in 1980 and her master of arts, also in psychology, from Clark University in 1984. She began her professional career as an adjunct faculty member at Seminole Community College (now Seminole State College of Florida), where she found her passion for helping community college students. She earned her tenure as a full-time professor of psychology at Seminole in 1993, and in 2005 she was promoted to the position of Campus Dean at Seminole's Oviedo Campus, the college's first full service branch campus. In 2010 she became the Oviedo Campus' Provost.

Valentino was a member of the 2007 LEAD cohort at the University of Florida and completed her doctorate in higher education administration in May of 2011. She serves on the research committee of the National Association of Branch Campus Administrators (NABCA) and is a founding member of the Florida Branch Campus Administrator (FABCA) organization. She continues to serve as the FABCA treasurer.