SELF-EFFICACY AMONG COMMUNITY COLLEGE FACULTY TEACHING IN CTE DUAL-ENROLLMENT PROGRAMS

A Dissertation by

Sherry D. Farrell

Master of Business Administration, University of Phoenix, 2009

Bachelor of Science, Weber State University, 2004

Submitted to the Department of Counseling, Educational Leadership,
Educational and School Psychology
and the faculty of the Graduate School of
Wichita State University
in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Education

May 2017

SELF-EFFICACY AMONG COMMUNITY COLLEGE FACULTY TEACHING IN CTE DUAL-ENROLLMENT PROGRAMS

The following faculty members have examined the final copy of this dissertation for form and content, and recommend that it be accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirement for the degree of Doctor of Education with a major in Educational Leadership.

_____
Eric Freeman, Committee Chair

_____
John Perry, Committee Member

_____
Marlene Schommer-Aikins, Committee Member

_____
Kristin Sherwood, Committee Member

_____
Susan Bray, Committee Member

Accepted for the College of Education

_____
Shirley Lefever, Dean

Accepted for the Graduate School

_____
Dennis Livesay, Dean

DEDICATION

To my beloved husband and best friend, Gary

Technology is just a tool in terms of getting the kids working together and motivating them.

The teacher is the most important- Bill Gates

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to acknowledge the WSU faculty for the wisdom and guidance they provided me during this educational journey. I appreciate the hard work they perform in the field studies each year to provide students an opportunity to learn the dissertation process. The knowledge I gained through the field studies was invaluable as I began to do my own study. The WSU Educational Leadership Program is a special program.

I would also like to thank Dr. Freeman for serving as my dissertation advisor and guiding me through this process. I appreciate all of the insights he provided me during the entire journey. I thank all of my dissertation committee members- Dr. Perry, Dr. Schommer-Aikins, Dr. Sherwood, and Dr. Bray for taking time out of their busy schedules to contribute to my proposal and to my defense. I also provide a sincere word of appreciation for the community colleges' presidents and staff members who welcomed me into their institutions and participated in my study. Without their cooperation, this study would not have been possible.

Finally, I would like to provide a special word of gratitude to Dr. Sherwood whose mentoring, support, and encouragement helped me believe in myself. I can honestly say it is Dr. Sherwood who helped understand the importance of a theoretical framework in a qualitative study. I will be forever grateful for the patience she has shown me. She truly has a heart for teaching.

ABSTRACT

In 2012, the Kansas Legislature passed Senate Bill 155 that allowed all high school juniors and seniors to enroll in tuition-free postsecondary career and technical education courses (CTE) courses. Community colleges provided many of these courses. As a result, high school students and college students were integrated in the classroom and instructed by college faculty. This qualitative study explored faculty perceptions of self-efficacy as it related to teaching dual-enrollment CTE courses to high school students in rural Kansas community colleges. Data was collected through faculty focus groups consisting of faculty who taught CTE dual-enrollment programs, interviews of administrators who supervised dual-enrollment programs, and document analysis at three community colleges. The data was analyzed through the theoretical framework of Bandura's Self-Efficacy Theory and common themes were identified that affected the self-efficacy of these instructors in both negative and positive ways.

Administrators and instructors reported high levels of satisfaction helping students obtain an education. Both groups acknowledged challenges associated with differences between the high school and community college environments. The two groups differed on their perceptions of the amount of time required to teach dual-enrollment courses. Instructors viewed dual-enrollment courses as more time-intensive than regular college courses while administrators did not view them any differently. Faculty experienced high self-efficacy with teaching content but low-self-efficacy maneuvering within the high school environment. Administrators were not aware of faculty's level of self-efficacy and did not address it. Implications include aligning the high school and community college class schedules, addressing the need for funding for course supplies, creating a student admissions process, and improving communication between the high school staff and community college faculty.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter Page

CHAPTER 1 1

Career and Technical Education Initiatives in Kansas 2
Problem Statement 4
Theoretical Framework 6
Cognitive Processes 7
Affective and Selection Processes 8
Contextual Factors of Self-Efficacy 9
Community College Context 9
Institutional Implications of Self-Efficacy 11
Purpose and Significance of the Study 12

CHAPTER 2 14

LITERATURE REVIEW 14
Kansas Board of Regents 15
Technical Education 15
Kansas Community Colleges 16
Secondary and Postsecondary Integration Programs 17
Advanced Placement Programs 17
Course-Based College Credit 17
Middle Colleges 18
Competency-Based Programs 18
CTE and Dual-Enrollment Courses 19
Advantages and Disadvantages of Dual Enrollment Programs for Students 20
Advantages and Disadvantages of Dual-Enrollment Programs for Institutions 22
Self-Efficacy Theory 23
Qualitative Self-Efficacy Studies 24

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

Chapter Page

CHAPTER 3 25

METHODOLOGY 25
Rural Community Colleges as Research Site 25
Description of Flowerville Community College 28
Description of Riverview Community College 28
Description of Brooke Land Community College 29
Research Participants 29
Data Collection 30
Review of Documents and Artifacts 30
Focus Groups 31
Focus Group Design 32
Administrator Interviews 32
Interview Design 33
Focus Group and Interview Protocols 34
Pilot Study 34
Data Analysis 35
Data Reduction and Display 35
Data Conclusions 36
Research Quality 36
Credibility 36
Transferability 37
Reliability 38
Researcher Positionality 38

CHAPTER 4 41

FINDINGS 41
Instructor Perceptions. 41
Differences between High Schools and Community Colleges 42
Time-Intensity of Dual-Enrollment Courses 45

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

Chapter Page

Benefcial Aspects. 47
Summary of Instructor Perceptions 49
Perceptions of Community College Administrators 50
Differences between High Schools and Community Colleges 50
Professional Development for Dual-Enrollment Instructors 53
Beneficial Aspects 54
Time-Intensity of Dual-Enrollment Courses 54
Summary of Administrator Perceptions 55
Review of Documents 55
Institutional Documents 56
Instructor Documents 57
Student Documents 57
Summary of Findings 58

CHAPTER 5 60

CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS 60
High Self-Efficacy for Course Content 60
Low Self-Efficacy for the High School Environment 61
The Failure of Administrators to Distinguish Dual-Enrollment from Regular College Courses . 62
Inconsistencies between Policy and Practice 76
Summary of Self-Efficacy Theory and CTE Dual-Enrollment 65
Implications of the Study 66
Seek Alignment between Community College and High School Class Schedules 66
Consider the Financial Needs of Students beyond the Cost of Tuition 67
Create Admissions Process for Dual-Enrollment Students 67
Improve Communication between High School Staff and Dual-Enrollment Instructors 69
Summary of Conclusions and Implications 70

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

Chapter Page

REFERENCES 72
APPENDICES 83
A. FACULTY FOCUS GROUP PROTOCOL 84
B. ADMINISTRATOR INTERVIEW PROTOCOL 85

CHAPTER 1

Dual-enrollment is identified as, "courses or programs that allow high school students to earn both secondary and postsecondary credits for the same course" (Karp, Bailey, Hughes, & Fermin, 2004, p. 1). These courses are provided through various arrangements between the secondary and postsecondary institutions including Advanced Placement Programs that permit high school students to test out of college courses, concurrent offerings that allow high school faculty with the correct credentials to teach high school courses for college credit at the local high schools, and courses and technical programs offered at local community colleges for high school students. This research study focuses upon dual-enrollment programs that provide Career and Technical Education (CTE) courses to high school students at the community college and are instructed by community college faculty (Kansas Board of Regents, 2013b).

A contemporary educational trend utilizes CTE dual-enrollment courses as a strategy to increase workforce development. The fastest-growing jobs through 2020 are predicted to require some postsecondary education (Henderson, 2012). In his 2009 Address to the Joint Session of Congress, President Obama explained he would like every United States citizen to acquire one year of post-secondary education by 2020 and challenged institutions of higher education to develop strategies to generate more graduates to meet the national goal for the United States to have "the highest proportion of college graduates in the world" (Obama, 2009). He reiterated the need for every citizen to obtain education beyond the secondary level during the 2015 Address to the Joint Session of Congress when he announced his proposal to provide free tuition at the community college level (Obama, 2015).

A number of states have actively begun prioritizing degree attainment and technical certifications using technical dual-enrollment programs. Some states view the strategy of

increasing graduates from technical programs as one way of creating a trained workforce to meet future economic needs (National Association of State Directors of Career and Technical Education Consortium, 2010). Technical dual-enrollment programs, traditionally viewed as vocational programs, are educational programs that allow high school students to enroll in career and technical education courses for college credit. Incentives, such as free tuition, encourage high school students to obtain a one or two-year technical certificate that provides an avenue for obtaining an industry-recognized credential by the time they graduate from high school. Prospective students begin the program in their junior year and complete the program by their senior year. One state that has created and implemented dual-enrollment programs for the purpose of workforce development is Kansas. Policymakers have passed legislation that allows all high school juniors and seniors to enroll in tuition-free postsecondary technical education courses. These courses are offered as a part of new CTE Initiatives that Kansas is using to build the future economy of the state (Kansas Board of Regents, 2013b).

Career and Technical Education Initiatives in Kansas

Recognizing that the state economy is struggling to regain its momentum after the Great Recession and that more than 64% of future jobs in Kansas will require some type of postsecondary certificate or degree, Kansas leaders created polices with the goal of growing the economy and building a sound fiscal future for the state (Brownback, 2010b). Some of these policies placed a renewed emphasis upon Career and Technical Education (CTE). In January 2012, Governor Brownback introduced a *Roadmap for Kansas.* Brownback describes the Roadmap as his strategy for energizing Kansas' economy, claiming, "It's a plan to grow our economy, it's a plan to create private-sector jobs, it's a plan to excel in education, it's a plan to support our families, it's a plan to move forward (Brownback, 2010a). The Roadmap includes

the Governor's Career and Technical Education Initiative, which is often titled, *Excel in Career and Technical Education*. In response to this proposal, the legislature unanimously passed Senate Bill 155 (SB 155) to fund the governor's CTE Initiative (Kansas Department of Commerce, 2012). This policy allows Kansas high school students to enroll in approved CTE courses without cost at state community colleges and technical schools. Under the plan, the Kansas Board of Regents (KBOR) reimburses community colleges and technical schools for tuition costs. To qualify, students must enroll in technical courses that allow them to obtain an industry-recognized credential in a high-need occupation. This policy initially provided $1000 to high schools for every student receiving a certification allowing entry into one of the authorized occupations upon high school graduation (Kansas Board of Regents, 2013b). The funding was reduced in 2015 to $450 per student due to budget restraints. The bill also requires KBOR to develop statewide articulation agreements on CTE programs among high schools, technical schools, and community colleges, allowing students to align their junior and senior years of high school education with postsecondary education. Additionally, SB 155 included CTE transportation aid for high schools to transport students to a community college or technical school for training. The amount provided was based on a formula that uses the type of vehicle, mileage, and number of trips to the college or technical school. Furthermore, $50,000 was designated for marketing CTE programs to high school students (Kansas Board of Regents, 2013b).

The incentives created by Senate Bill 155 increased high school CTE enrollment at postsecondary institutions and generated an increase in credit hours. According to KBOR (2013b), by the end of the Fall 2012 semester, 3,500 students were participating in the program and it had generated more than 43,000 CTE credit hours. This was an increase of 52% in credit

hours from the previous year. Enrollment has continued to increase since the inception of the program and generated 79,488 credit hours in 2016 (Kansas Board of Regents, 2017). In response to the increased enrollment, the state has continued to increase funding each fiscal year. The Kansas Legislature approved $20,750,000 for fiscal year 2017 for this program (Kansas Division of Budget, 2015).

Problem Statement

Dual-enrollment courses have traditionally been general education courses, such as English and Math, that transferred to postsecondary degree programs and were offered only to high-achieving high school students who possessed the dedication and ability to perform well in college-level academic work. However, based on a belief that an early start with college coursework and training will benefit low-achieving students and reduce the high school drop-out rate, many states are now offering dual-enrollment courses to *all* junior and senior high school students (Association for Career and Technical Education, 2007; Brand, 2013; Pretlow & Wathington, 2014). Local community colleges and technical schools provide many of these courses. As a result, high school students and college students are often integrated in the classroom and instructed by college faculty. In terms of dual-enrollment programs, community colleges are effectively becoming a de facto extension of the traditional high school. Many rural community colleges have embraced the opportunity to increase enrollment and receive additional funding through dual-enrollment offerings.

However, critical differences exist between high school and postsecondary expectations and cultures (Fives & Looney, 2009). The level of preparation required to succeed in postsecondary courses is profoundly different from the competence required to succeed in the high school environment (Conley, 2006). Community college professors are not formally trained

pedagogues but subject-area experts in their respective fields who are provided more autonomy and academic freedom in their classes than is typically provided to high school instructors (Fives & Looney, 2009). College instructors have substantial latitude in course content, instructional methods, and course management strategies. Consequently, high school and college courses may share the same title but are instructed differently. College instructors teach the material at a quicker pace than do high school instructors. College instructors also expect students to solve complex problems about the subject rather than memorize and reiterate facts from the textbook (Gollub, Bertenthal, Labov, & Curtis, 2002). In addition, college students are expected to be self-motivated and seek academic supports available outside the classroom when they struggle with the course material.

High school instructors are required to teach specific curriculum standards mandated by the state and therefore do not have as much academic freedom as college instructors. They must address state assessment requirements. Stringent requirements must be met to become certified as a secondary instructor. Most state licensure programs require credit hours in not only content area but also in pedagogical techniques that are appropriate for instructing minors.

The cultural expectations differ between the postsecondary and high school environments as well. High school classes have a highly-structured format and often operate on the calendar year. The learning environments of high schools are nurturing and positive. Instructors provide note-taking aids, handouts, and other study tools to help students. Additionally, students struggling in subject areas are often allowed to perform extra credit work to ensure they pass the course (Martell, Navin, & Sullivan, 2006). Students often interact with the same instructors throughout the school year. High school instructors perform a pastoral role in the lives of their

students that provides the opportunity for students to develop close relationships with their high school teachers (Blum, 2007).

Conversely, community college classes typically follow a semester schedule and do not instruct the same group of students for an entire year. Moreover, college instructors are not accountable for state assessment requirements and therefore are likely to be unaware of the requirements of these examinations. Typically, college instructors do not exhibit a pastoral role with their students but display a formal and professional demeanor. High school students unprepared for the broader expectations of college instructors and the less nurturing culture of college classrooms may experience them as unstructured and impersonal. Without the classroom structure and support they are accustomed to, high school students may struggle emotionally and academically, responses that can have a detrimental effect on the self-efficacy of community college instructors.

Theoretical Framework

The theoretical framework is the set of assumptions that supports the research and provides boundaries for the study (Merriam, 2009). Bandura's model of self-efficacy will be the lens used in this study to view community college instructors' perceptions regarding the teaching of high school students enrolled in CTE dual-enrollment courses. Self-efficacy is defined as the belief in one's ability to accomplish a specific task (Bandura, 1986b). Self-efficacy differs from self-esteem. Self-esteem is a general concept that measures a person's overall evaluation of self-worth while self-efficacy is a task-oriented assessment of context for specific abilities (Marsh & Shavelson, 1985). According to Bandura (1993b), perceived self-efficacy influences how individuals think, feel, motivate themselves, and ultimately behave in specific circumstances.

These actions are accomplished through four interrelated processes: cognitive, motivational, affective, and selection (Bandura, 1993b).

Cognitive Processes

Individuals' beliefs regarding their abilities affect their cognitive functioning and the types of goals they set for themselves (Bandura, 1993b; Dweck & Leggett, 1988; Nicholls, 1984). Those with high levels of self-efficacy focus their energy towards finding solutions to problems while those with low self-efficacy dwell on their deficiencies (Bandura & Jourden, 1991). Additionally, those with high levels of self-efficacy believe that intelligence is an acquirable skill that is increased through experience and the attainment of additional knowledge. Consequently, they seek out opportunities for professional and personal growth. However, those with low self-efficacy believe that intelligence is inherent and cannot be easily changed (Dweck & Leggett, 1988). Instructors with increased levels of self-efficacy have better planning and organizing skills (Allinder, 1994). Efficacious instructors set higher standards for themselves and have more confidence in overcoming classroom challenges (Good & Brophy, 2003; Wood & Bandura, 1989).

Self-efficacy also relates to mental effort and persistence. Efficacious individuals are more likely to overcome obstacles to successfully achieve their goals than those with lower levels of efficacy (Bandura, 1997). Highly efficacious instructors have been shown to persist longer with low-achieving students (Brouwers & Tomic, 2000; Gibson & Dembo, 1984) and have more confidence in overcoming challenges within the classroom (Good & Brophy, 2003; Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2001). Furthermore, Gibson and Dembo (1984) found that instructors who exhibit a high degree of teaching efficacy communicate higher expectations for students,

provide less criticisms, and persist with students until they obtain the correct answer rather than quickly moving to another student.

Affective and Selection Processes

Self-efficacy beliefs also affect the emotional well-being of individuals, contributing to a psychological state that indirectly affects the choices they make. Fear of failure is a strong inhibitor and prevents less efficacious individuals from attempting challenging tasks that will increase their knowledge and experience. These individuals view failure as a threat to their intelligence and therefore, most often choose comfortable activities that will minimize the risk of errors. In contrast, individuals who believe they can manage stressors are better able to control anxiety. They view failures as a part of the natural process of gaining knowledge and are not distressed by failure (Bandura, 1993b). Therefore, they more often choose challenging tasks that will improve their knowledge and broaden their range of competencies.

The beliefs and judgements of teachers influence their sense of teaching efficacy and the types of classroom activities and learning environments they provide (Ashton & Webb, 1986; Clark, 1988; Goodman, 1988; Weinstein, 1989). Instructors who believe in their teaching ability are more likely to believe in their students. Moreover, instructors with higher levels of efficacy use strategies that aid in the development of self-directed learners (Allinder, 1994; Lee, Cawthon, & Dawson, 2013). Guskey (1988) discovered that instructors with higher levels of teaching efficacy were more open to using an assortment of instructional techniques compared to instructors with a lower sense of efficacy. In contrast, teachers who believe that external factors control their teaching effectiveness were shown to spend less time on academic curriculum (Bandura, 1997). Additionally, instructors with external loci of control were also found to rely on extrinsic rewards for students rather than use methods that increase students' internal

motivation or create an environment that encourages student autonomy and self-discipline (Lee et al., 2013; Woolfolk & Hoy, 1990).

Contextual Factors of Self-Efficacy

Self-efficacy is not universal. Rather it is based upon a set of self-beliefs that are associated with distinct tasks or functions. Levels of self-efficacy for teaching are dependent on a variety of factors including subject matter and student population (Raudenbush, Rowan, & Cheong, 1992). Faculty are more likely to exhibit higher levels of self-efficacy in an environment where they feel competent (Bitto & Butler, 2010).

Therefore, instructors may have a high level of self-efficacy for teaching one subject or one group of students and lack self-efficacy for teaching a different set of students or a different subject area. Self-efficacy is related to specific domains (Bruning, Schraw, & Ronning, 1999). Education is a highly-specialized field. Each level of education whether elementary, secondary, or postsecondary has specific degree requirements. Instructors who are educated to teach students in one domain may not experience self-efficacy for teaching at another level. Ross, Cousins, Gadalla, and Hannay (1999) found that teaching outside one's subject area or teaching different student populations can have a negative effect on teaching efficacy.

Community College Context

Self-efficacy relates to an instructor's confidence in his or her capability to successfully accomplish a specific teaching task within a distinct context (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2001). Community college instructors are accustomed to teaching adults. The average age of a community college student is 29 (American Association of Community Colleges, 2015). The differences between high school and college environments are significant. While high school students may be academically prepared for the content of college courses, they may not be

emotionally mature enough to handle the stress and expectations of college courses (Ferguson, Baker, & Burnett, 2015). Lynch, Harish, Fletcher, Thornton, and Thompson (2007) found that over half of dual-enrollment instructors in Georgia struggled with the immaturity level and lack of discipline of high school students enrolled in their college courses and another quarter of the dual-enrollment instructors identified classroom management problems and disrespectful students as ongoing issues. College instructors are accustomed to concentrating upon the content of the course and less upon the rules of the classroom.

High school students may be too immature to handle the college environment and college material. Expectations exist that the students desire to learn the material and do not need constant reminders to study the material outside of class or to submit assignments on time (Edmunds et al., 2010). If students are not mature enough to handle this level of freedom, they may struggle to succeed in college courses and force college instructors into the role of high school instructors, who must manage a higher level of classroom disciplinary issues than most college instructors (Dougan, 2005). Managing student discipline issues places a burden upon college instructors and prevents them from improving the content of the course and their teaching skills because they are forced to spend time mediating classroom disciplinary issues (Blase, 1986). Therefore, teaching immature high school students who are not emotionally prepared for college courses could possibly affect the self-efficacy of college instructors, who feel pressed into this unfamiliar role. Instructors who exhibit low levels of self-efficacy for teaching this student population may not only affect the achievement of these students but also affect the ability for the institution to meet institutional goals.

Institutional Implications of Self-Efficacy

The success of any organization is dependent upon its ability to continually improve its operations (Alfred R, Ewell, Hudgins, & McClenney, 1999). Academic institutional improvement is highly focused upon student achievement. Because community colleges are public institutions dependent upon federal, state, and local funding, they are accountable to stakeholders. Therefore, community colleges must be conscientious in establishing Institutional Effectiveness (IE) for both internal and external stakeholders. Institutional Effectiveness does not have a standardized definition in the literature. However, for the purposes of this research study it is defined as the ability for the academic institution to meet its mission and goals (Alfred, Shults, & Seybert, 2007). Therefore, the goal of Institutional Effectiveness is to gather quality information to make informed decisions. Institutional Effectiveness involves the collaboration of stakeholders to develop and obtain student learning goals and meet program review guidelines. The process of IE generates the data used for strategic planning and accreditation standards. It is a determining factor for the development of a healthy academic institution.

Because achieving IE is dependent upon student achievement, higher education institutions are dependent upon the motivation of faculty members to create the learning environments needed to foster student learning. Self-efficacy affects the motivation and performance of faculty and can affect the overall effectiveness of educational institutions. Self-efficacy relates to behavior change and the adoption of new techniques to improve student outcomes. Instructors may not implement new methods if they doubt their ability to successfully implement the changes (Smylie, 1988). A correlation exists between the teacher's self-efficacy and student achievement. Students who were instructed by highly efficacious instructors

consistently scored better on standardized tests than those students taught by instructors with lower levels of self-efficacy (Gordon, 2001; Henson, 2001) .

Furthermore, instructors with a low perception of teaching efficacy were shown to have a pessimistic attitude toward their students, exhibit burn-out, and have a weak commitment to the teaching profession (Bandura, 1993b). Evers, Brouwers, & Tonic (2002) found that instructors with lower levels of self-efficacy experience more job-related stress and are at a higher risk for leaving the teaching profession than instructors with high-self efficacy. High instructor turnover affects the cohesion and community of institutions. Cohesion is defined as the determination of a group or team to remain united to meet its goals (Carron, 1982) and is often viewed as a key indicator for institutional effectiveness (Ingersoll, 2001; Parsons, 1959; Rosenholtz, 1989).

Purpose and Significance of the Study

The purpose of this qualitative study is to explore faculty perceptions of self-efficacy as it relates to teaching dual-enrollment CTE courses to high school students in rural Kansas community colleges. This study will investigate how rural community college faculty respond to a sudden influx of high school students in their classrooms and how the presence of this student population affects classroom environments and the teaching dynamics college instructors find comfortable.

Although studies have examined the effectiveness of dual-enrollment courses from the perspectives of students and the high school teachers who teach these types of courses, little research exists about the perceptions of community college professors who teach CTE dual-enrollment courses to high school students. Because community college faculty are a critical factor in the implementation of dual-enrollment programs, this study has the potential to contribute to the knowledge base regarding community college teaching efficacy and provide important information about the implementation of future dual-enrollment programs.

Research Questions

The following questions will guide this study:

1. What are the perceptions of self-efficacy among community college faculty teaching CTE dual-enrollment high school students?
2. What factors influence self-efficacy among community college faculty teaching CTE dual-enrollment high school students?
3. What level of awareness do community college administrators have concerning the self-efficacy of faculty members teaching dual-enrollment CTE high school students?
4. How are community college administrators addressing the self-efficacy of faculty teaching dual-enrollment CTE high school students?

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter provides a history of Kansas community colleges and their integration with secondary education. It also provides an organizational overview of Kansas technical education relevant to dual-enrollment programs. Additionally, I analyze the benefits and issues associated with dual-enrollment programs and examine the pertinent literature related to self-efficacy.

History of Kansas Community Colleges

The establishment of junior colleges in Kansas followed a similar pattern seen in other states. In their early history, the colleges were extensions of local school districts and overseen by the superintendent of schools. The Kansas legislature authorized the extension of public high schools to offer freshman and sophomore college courses through the act of 1917. Furthermore, this law allowed local boards of education to levy a tax that did not exceed two mills, on the assessed valuation of the district. The state did not give financial support for the colleges. Thus, this law established the expectation that local communities would support junior colleges (Flint, Herr, & Heinrich, 1968). Because junior colleges were not separate institutions, they shared instructors and resources with the school district.

Junior colleges remained under the control of the local school districts until the passage of the Community College Act of 1965. This act awarded flexibility to junior colleges and allowed them to develop into comprehensive institutions that could meet their community's needs. In addition, this act allowed junior colleges to form a Board of Trustees and therefore, separate from high school governance. Moreover, this act also allowed junior colleges to raise funds by both mill levies and bond issues and established accreditation standards. Within four months after the passage of the Kansas Community Junior College Act, all 17 existing colleges

were reorganized as separate institutions (Flint, 1968). Although the act gave credibility to junior colleges and allowed them to have community governance, the colleges were still not fully recognized as an institution of higher education. Junior colleges remained under the governance of the Kansas Board of Education, along with public K-12 educational institutions, even though the Kansas Board of Regents regulated universities.

Kansas Board of Regents

Junior colleges in Kansas would remain under the Board of Education's authority until 1999 when the legislature drastically changed the governance of junior colleges by passing the Kansas Higher Education Coordination Act. This act abolished the Kansas Board of Regents and created a newly organized Regent system that would govern the six state universities and coordinate the nineteen community colleges, eleven technical schools, and all postsecondary education in Kansas. This act not only placed junior colleges under the direction of KBOR but also mandated that all junior colleges change their name to community colleges (Kansas Board of Regents, 2013a).

Technical Education

In 2007, the Kansas Legislature changed the governance of postsecondary technical education. House Bill 2552 established the Postsecondary Technical Education Authority. This authority is composed of 12 members and includes two members from the Board of Regents, one representative of community colleges that offers vocational education, and one representative of technical colleges in the state. The board also consists of three members who are appointed by the governor. These members include one representative of Kansas business and industry and two members who represent the public (one appointed by the Senate and one appointed by the

Speaker of the House), and three ex-officio members including the Commissioner of Education, the Secretary of Commerce, and the Secretary of Labor (Kansas Board of Regents, 2014).

Under the direction of the Board of Regents, the Authority coordinates statewide planning for existing and proposed postsecondary technical education programs, reviews requests of state funding, develops benchmarks and indicators for programs, develops an annual policy agenda for postsecondary technical education, and conducts studies to locate methods for maximizing resources (Kansas Board of Regents, 2014).

Although the 1999 Kansas Higher Education Coordination Act placed some technical schools under the authority of KBOR, a few were still under the control of the Kansas Board of Education. These schools operated as a part of the public-school system even though many post-secondary students attended them. In an effort to coordinate all technical education programs KBOR, mandated that all technical and vocational schools be placed under the authority of a university or community college or form their own board of trustees and become a free-standing technical college in 2008. This mandate successfully ended the Board of Education's control over technical programs associated with post-secondary institutions.

Kansas Community Colleges

There are 37 community colleges in Kansas. Twenty-nine of these schools are public and 8 are private and together they serve 89,754 students. The colleges vary in size and types of students they serve. For example, one rural community college in Kansas has an enrollment of only 1,417 students while another community college has over 19,429 students (United States Department of Education, 2014b). Some schools serve rural locations while others are located near metropolitan areas. Students enrolled in community colleges in Kansas have diverse backgrounds. Some schools have a majority of non-traditional students while others support a

more traditional college population. These differences among the community colleges impact how dual-enrollment programs are implemented at the specific community college.

Secondary and Postsecondary Integration Programs

The integration of college-level coursework with high school curriculum falls into three general categories: Advanced Placement (AP courses) which are examination-based courses, course-based credit such as concurrent and dual-enrollment courses, and competency-based credit that is often awarded through agreements between local high schools and colleges.

Advanced Placement Programs

The Advanced Placement (AP) program is the oldest form of secondary and postsecondary curriculum integration. It was founded by the College Board in 1952 to allow secondary students access to advanced level curriculum. The College Board develops coursework in a variety of subjects and administers the annual AP examinations. Students must pay a fee and obtain a specific score on an exam to receive college credit. Each college and university sets minimum score requirements to obtain credit from their institution (Board, 2014).

Course-Based College Credit

Course-based college credit is usually offered to high school students in the forms of either concurrent courses which allow qualified high school faculty to teach college-level courses at the high school or in the form of dual-enrollment courses which are usually offered on the college campus by college faculty. While there are no national statistics tracking the number of students participating in these courses, Karp, Bailey, et al (2004) provided a comprehensive matrix of state-by-state concurrent enrollment policies. They supplied information on about 40 states' dual-enrollment policies. However, the goal of the study was to report the different

policies of state dual-enrollment programs. Therefore, analysis of the impact of these policies was limited.

A new sub-set within the concurrent/dual-enrollment category is becoming more prevalent. Many states are now offering online dual-enrollment opportunities. These courses are becoming useful to a variety of students including rural students, home-schooled students, and those wanting to obtain a credit for a course that is not provided by their local school (Brown, Murphy, & Nanny, 2003). Seventy-percent of school districts indicate that online courses are imperative for offering advance placement or dual-enrollment courses to students (Picciano, 2009).

Middle Colleges

Middle College high schools are high schools that are physically located on college campuses. Many serve as educational alternatives for students who are at risk of dropping out of high school (Allen, 2010). The goal of Middle Schools is to provide broader opportunities for students who are located at a smaller school and would not otherwise have these opportunities available (Lerner & Brand, 2006). Middle Schools became more prevalent with the support of the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation in 2001. Over 200 Middle Schools have been created with the help of this organization (Melinda Karp et al., 2004).

Competency-Based Programs

Competency-based programs focus upon learner outcomes rather than time spent in the classroom and allow for flexibility in how the student earns credit. Strategies utilized may be project-based, online, or some other method. The over-arching goal of these programs is to make the content relevant to the student (United States Department of Education, 2014a). It is highly student-centered in its approach of organization. Career and Technical Education dual-

enrollment programs are often competency-based because credit is based upon the student's ability to perform a task such as welding or auto body repair rather than based upon the amount of time the student spent in the classroom. Often credit is awarded through articulation agreements between the high school and college. The National Career Clusters Framework is a competency based program that has organized career and technical education programs into specific pathways for the purpose of aligning high school and post-secondary career and technical programs (National Association of State Directors of Career and Technical Education Consortium, 2014).

CTE and Dual-Enrollment Courses

The federal government has created CTE economic initiatives and has promoted them as a measure for economic growth for the nation. U.S. Secretary of Education, Arne Duncan (2012), declared these new CTE initiatives will sustain the nation's recovery from the recent recession and in the 2012 State of the Union Address, President Obama identified CTE as an important part of his economic plan for the country. In addition, he signed the *Blueprint for Transforming Career and Technical Education* in 2012 that calls for the reauthorization of the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006 which is one of the main sources for federal funding of Career and Technical Education. The document also mandated secondary and postsecondary schools to work together to allow students to begin working on a postsecondary CTE certificate or degree while in high school (Duncan, 2012).

Every state offers CTE programs at both the secondary and postsecondary levels and every state has adopted the Career Clusters model for Career and Technical Education. The National Career Clusters Framework is a curriculum organizing tool that has a total of 16 Career Clusters representing 79 Career Pathways. Students follow a specific pathway to obtain the

required courses for a specific field of study (National Association of State Directors of Career and Technical Education Consortium, 2014). Colleges and high schools use these pathways to develop articulation agreements to allow students to obtain college credit for high school CTE courses. These state CTE initiatives are also promoted as a measure of creating entrepreneurship, job growth, and capacity within communities (Duncan, 2012).

Advantages and Disadvantages of Dual Enrollment Programs for Students

Dual-enrollment programs offer several benefits. Students save time and money by accelerating the progress of degree attainment (Andrews, 2000; Greenberg, 1989; Karp et al., 2004; Kruger, 2000; Pierce, 2001). Kruger (2000) analyzed U.S. Department of Education data and found a reduction in time to degree attainment exists for students who complete concurrent or dual-enrollment courses. His analysis revealed the average time to complete a baccalaureate degree was 4.65 years for students with no dual-enrollment courses compared to 4.25 years for students who earned at least 9 credit hours while still enrolled in high school (Kruger, 2000).

Disadvantaged students are provided access to college courses through dual-enrollment courses (Kruger, 2000). Additionally, proponents for dual-enrollment programs claim that other students benefit from the increased opportunities presented by these programs. Rural and small schools often have limited resources and faculty for broad curriculum and activity choices. According to Bailey, Hughes, and Karp (2002), the combination of college and high school resources allow small schools to provide CTE coursework and programs for students and may also provide needed technical employees for those small communities.

Even though researchers have determined that specific benefits exist with the offering of dual-enrollment programs, they have also discovered concerns within these programs (Andrews, 2000; Barnett, 2010; Catron, 2001; Ferguson et al., 2015; Johnston & Kristovich, 1999). The

savings of time and tuition cost marketed by these programs are not always realized by the students. Through the use of a survey, Frazier (2000) determined that students had to pay for some or all of their college tuition for dual-enrollment courses in 28 states. Some states require students to pay for the tuition cost because of the practice of "double dipping" which suggests that the state ends up funding both high schools and colleges for the same dual-enrollment students (Bailey et al., 2002).

Some dual-enrollment students have discovered to their dismay that completing dual-enrollment CTE courses has severely harmed their overall high school class rankings. Often, the CTE dual-enrollment courses are weighted as electives, which is weighted the same as a physical education course. Therefore, a student who is ranked as 11th in the class could fall to the 24th after completing 18 credit hours of CTE dual-enrollment courses, even if this student scores a 4.0 in each of these courses (Grimm, 2016). Class ranking is often a determining factor for college scholarships and for admission to some colleges and universities. Thus, lowering a student's ranking in the class can have a detrimental effect upon the student's ability to attend highly-ranked colleges and universities. In the long-term, students who believed they were improving their future by completing these courses, may have unknowingly harmed it.

Some students have trouble transferring credits obtained through dual-enrollment to other colleges or universities and therefore must pay additional money to retake those courses (Frazier, 2000; Johnston & Kristovich, 1999). One reason that some institutions will not transfer dual-enrollment courses is the attitude that these courses are not as rigorous as traditional college courses. Concerns exist as to whether these courses are truly held to the same standards as traditional college courses (Andrews, 2000; Johnston & Kristovich, 1999; Kruger, 2000).

Advantages and Disadvantages of Dual-Enrollment Programs for Institutions

Benefits may also exist for the colleges who offer these programs. Some colleges have seen increased retention of students because some students who complete dual-enrollment courses while in high school enroll in the same college after high school graduation. According to the American Association of State Colleges and Universities (2002), dual-enrollment programs may also recruit local high school students who otherwise may not have considered enrolling in courses at their local community college.

Offering dual-enrollment programs provides an opportunity for community colleges to aid in local workforce development, which is often a central portion of the mission of community colleges. The programs often strengthen the relationship between the college and the community it serves by generating a positive image with the high school and local businesses (Boswell, 2001; Kruger, 2000).

However, the organizational culture of colleges differs from the culture of high schools. Differences in governance structures, values, funding, methods of assessment, and expectations of faculty exist between the two systems. Much of the logistics of how and when courses are offered differ between the two types of organizations. All of these differences have the potential for becoming sources of tension between the two systems when integrating courses. Levine (2007) noted that these differences between the two systems begin during teacher preparation programs when individuals choose either the pathway for teaching at the secondary or postsecondary level.

Faculty workload is another issue associated with dual-enrollment programs. Community college professors are responsible for a heavy workload associated with teaching 15 credits per semester, selecting textbooks, participating in recruitment activities, serving on

committees, and advising their college students. In many cases faculty serve in a variety of roles at small community colleges. Assigning them the extra tasks associated with having under-aged students in their classrooms can become burdensome. Often, these instructors are assigned the extra tasks of providing daily attendance to the high schools, providing guidance to high school instructors who are teaching concurrent enrollment courses, and coordinating courses with the high school without extra compensation or release time from their previous duties (Catron, 2001).

Institutions must be aware of the differences in laws for secondary and postsecondary educational institutions. For example, disability accommodations are governed by Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 and The Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (ADA) for postsecondary education while the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) provides the oversight of disabled students at the secondary level. IDEA provides provisions for special education for students with disabilities but colleges are not required to lower academic standards or provide special education. Colleges are only mandated to provide educational supports to aid in the access to education.

Self-Efficacy Theory

Although numerous studies focused upon self- efficacy in teaching, the majority are quantitative. One of the earliest studies was performed by Barfield and Burlingame (1974) who used the 5-item Political Efficacy Scale to measure the influence that a teacher's efficacy has upon their teaching practices. They found that teachers with high levels of self-efficacy demonstrated more sensitivity toward their students than those with low self-efficacy. Researchers from the RAND organization developed an instrument to measure teacher efficacy as the extent to which teachers believed they had control of their actions rather than the

environment controlling them. The researchers grounded their study in the social learning theory developed by J.B. Rotter who addressed the attribution of teacher control. Teachers indicated their level of agreement with two statements. The sum of the two statements was titled TE (teacher efficacy) Teacher efficacy was determined to mean the level of control of the learning process that instructors believed they possessed (Barfield and Burlingame 1974). Through the years, researchers built upon the work of the RAND researchers and refined the instruments used to measure self-efficacy.

Qualitative Self-Efficacy Studies

One of the first qualitative studies of self-efficacy was performed by Ashton and Webb (1986) when they added interview questions to their mixed study. The researchers discovered that the concept of self- efficacy for instructors is an important construct in the understanding of how an instructor views his or her role within the classroom. They also found that this attitude affects not only their work but also their relationships with their students. The researchers concluded that self- efficacy is a valuable tool in the development of school improvement. They expressed a need for more research to be performed to understand how the tool of self- efficacy could be used to increase educational opportunities (Ashton, Florida Univ, & et al., 1982). Very few qualitative studies about the self-efficacy of teachers have been published since Ashton and Webb. No qualitative studies have measured the self-efficacy of community college instructors who teach CTE courses for dual-enrollment.

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

This chapter presents the methodology and data collection techniques that I used in this study. I employed a qualitative approach because I believed it provided the most informative opportunity to learn about the experiences of faculty members who teach dual-enrollment courses. Qualitative researchers examine a phenomenon through a holistic lens rather than through the lens of specific variables. Using a broader lens for research analysis develops an in-depth understanding of the interpretation, experiences, and culture of the participants (Ary, Jacobs, Sorensen, & Walker, 2013). Denzin and Lincoln (2005) explain that qualitative researchers view participants in their natural settings and interpret the meanings people assign to them. Studying faculty members in their natural college settings aided in the interpretation of their experiences and feelings of self-efficacy with teaching dual-enrollment courses. A variety of approaches is available for use in qualitative research (Ary et al., 2013; Denzin & Lincoln, 2005; Marshall & Rossman,1999; Merriam, 2009; Patton, 2005). An ethnographic research design was chosen because it provided a holistic interpretation of a social group by using a rich, thick description of the participants' experiences (Marshall & Gretchen, 1999; Wolcott, 1990).

Rural Community Colleges as Research Site

I chose Kansas rural community colleges as my research sites because small to medium rural community colleges often provide dual-enrollment CTE courses to high school students. Additionally, these small to medium-size schools, with enrollments between 500 and 5,000 students, often rely upon the funding and increased enrollments these programs provide. Rural community colleges face unique challenges as compared to institutions located within

metropolitan locations. The majority of individuals who attend rural community colleges are part-time students. However, state funding is usually available only for full-time enrollments.

Small to medium-size rural community colleges often have smaller tax bases than colleges located in metropolitan regions (Phillips, 1975; Vineyard, 1979). Additionally, small and medium-size rural community colleges often experience difficulty receiving grant funding because they often do not have the staff to pursue these opportunities (Fluharty & Scaggs, 2007). Pennington, Williams, and Karovonen (2006) identified both funding and obtaining grants as challenges shared among the rural community colleges in Kansas. Therefore, rural community colleges may lack the funds to offer a broad range of academic programs and support services (Hardy & Katsinas, 2007).

Although these institutions face funding issues, rural community colleges are often expected to act as an economic engine for the community by offering both workforce development courses and support services, such as resume' writing and interviewing workshops for the community (Pennington et al., 2006). These expectations, along with funding challenges, provided strong motivation for rural community colleges to take advantage of the funding offered by SB 155 for providing dual-enrollment CTE courses. Offering these courses not only provided additional funding for community college vocational programs but they also provided a means for meeting the mission of the college by creating workforce development programs for their communities. This strong emphasis upon dual-enrollment programs made rural community colleges suitable research sites for this study of the self-efficacy of community colleges instructors who taught these courses.

The Carnegie Classification System of Institutions of Higher Education identifies small and medium-sized public rural-serving associate level institutions. According to the Carnegie

Classification System, rural community colleges reside outside of Metropolitan Statistical Areas. Small community colleges are defined as those institutions with an unduplicated student headcount of at least 500 but fewer than 2000 FTE while medium community colleges have an unduplicated student headcount of at least 2000 but fewer than 5000, based upon the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) data for 2014 (Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 2010). To locate Kansas community colleges that meet these criteria, I followed these steps:

- Community colleges that met the enrollment criteria were identified on the Kansas Board of Regents Website. Seven community colleges were identified as having at least 500 full-time students but less than 5000. One community college was eliminated as a possible research location because I was a previous employee at the institution. This left six community colleges as possible locations for the study
- The community colleges' locations were compared with the Census Bureau's listing of Metropolitan Statistical Areas to find out if the colleges qualified as rural. All six qualified as rural-serving institutions under the Carnegie Classification System. I reviewed each college's website and current 2015 academic catalog for the offerings of dual-enrollment courses that qualify for SB 155 funding. According to the websites and academic catalogs, all six community colleges were participating in the SB 155 program by offering some courses to high school students.
- To determine which community colleges were heavily vested in dual-enrollment programs with college faculty teaching these courses and to locate which of these community colleges would be willing to participate in this study, I contacted each

community college's Chief Academic Officer by telephone. Out of the six possibilities, three community colleges agreed to participate in this study.

Description of Flowerville Community College

Flowerville Community College is located in Flowerville, Kansas which has a population of 27,005 (United States Census Bureau, 2015). The college is classified as an Associate's Public Rural-serving Medium Institution (Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 2010). The college has an enrollment of 2,099 students (United States Department of Education, 2014b). The college employs 55 full-time and 77 part-time faculty members (United States Department of Education, 2014b). The college grants Associate of Arts (AA), Associate of Science (AS), Associate of Applied Science (AAS), and Associate of General Studies (AGS) degrees. Additionally, the college offers certificates for the completion of technical education programs (United States Department of Education, 2014b).

Description of Riverview Community College

Riverview Community College is located in Riverview, Kansas. Riverview has a population of 28,117 (United States Census Bureau, 2015). The college is classified as an Associate's Public Rural-serving Small Institution (Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 2010) with an enrollment of 1,779 students. Riverview Community College employs 54 full-time and 133 part-time faculty members (United States Department of Education, 2014b). The college grants Associate of Arts (AA), Associate of Science (AS), Associate of Applied Science (AAS), and Associate of General Studies (AGS) degrees. Additionally, the college offers certificates for the completion of technical education programs (United States Department of Education, 2014b).

Description of Brooke Land Community College

Brooke Land Community College is located in Brooke Land, Kansas. Brooke Land has a population of 9,252 (United States Census Bureau, 2015). Brooke Land Community College is classified as an Associate's Public Rural-serving Medium Institution (Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 2010) with an enrollment of 2,067 students. The college employs 57 full-time and 130 part-time faculty members (United States Department of Education, 2014b). The college grants Associate of Arts (AA), Associate of Science (AS), Associate of Applied Science (AAS), Associate of General Studies (AGS) degrees, and certificate programs (United States Department of Education, 2014b).

Research Participants

In qualitative research, a population is defined as a group of individuals who share common characteristics and can provide specific information about the study (Cox & West, 1986). The cost of studying an entire population group is often prohibitive. Therefore, it is common to choose a purposeful sample for a research study. Purposeful sampling identifies participants who represent the attributes desired for the study, are aligned with the research questions and have the greatest potential for generating insights and an understanding about a specific phenomenon (deMarris, 2004; Lincoln, 1985; Marshall & Rossman 1999; Patton, 2005).

My goal in this study was to examine the self-efficacy of community college faculty who taught dual-enrollment SB 155 CTE courses. Therefore, I identified and selected a sample of full-time faculty members who taught these courses along with administrators who were supervising the institutions' dual-enrollment programs. Eligibility criteria for participation in this study were full-time employment at the chosen research locations and actively teaching or supervising the SB 155 dual-enrollment courses during the 2016-2017 academic year.

I selected each sample of participants with the help of the academic officer at each community college. I shared the criteria with the proper academic officer at each college who then contacted the eligible individuals at their institution and organized the focus groups and interviews.

Data Collection

Qualitative research data are collected through a variety of techniques such as interviews, focus groups, observations, and document analysis. A variety of data collection techniques should be used to gain a better understanding of the phenomena that is the focus of the study (Denzin & Lincoln, 2005). In this study, I collected data through document analysis, faculty focus groups who instructed dual-enrollment CTE courses that qualified for SB 155 funds, and the interviews of administrators at each institution who supervised these dual-enrollment programs at three rural community colleges in Kansas. Through these varied techniques, I was able to triangulate my data to provide a better understanding of this topic (Boeije, 2009).

Review of Documents and Artifacts

Reviewing documents and artifacts provides the history and context of a specific setting and supplements the data obtained through interviews and other qualitative methods (Marshall & Rossman 1999). A review of documents such as program and class policies, syllabi, instruments used by instructors to achieve student outcomes, tools used to effectively lead the course and institutional policies and procedures related to dual-enrollment courses, was reviewed and analyzed. The review of course documents provided a foundational background and understanding about the administration of dual-enrollment courses at each community college. This understanding assisted me in developing relevant questions for both the focus groups and individual interviews.

According to Merriam (2009), a systematic procedure for organizing the content of documents is content analysis through coding the information presented in the documents. I organized my notes from the review of documents into categories: institutional documents, instructor documents, and student documents.

Focus Groups

Focus group discussions are group discussions with individuals who have knowledge of a specific topic. They are used to collect a shared understanding of a phenomenon (Stewart & Shamdasani, 2014). Focus groups have specific advantages over individual interviews for qualitative studies. For example, focus groups encourage the participants to guide the direction of questioning through group interaction, snowballing, and spontaneity (Panyan, Hillman, & Liggett, 1997). Although individual interviews allow for the sharing of individual perspectives, they do not have the group dynamics that focus groups offer to faculty members. Faculty members may be apprehensive about sharing individual experiences with a researcher if they believe they are the only faculty members having specific experiences. Therefore, patterns often emerge from the interaction of the focus group members that would otherwise not be revealed (Morgan, 1997).

In addition, focus groups often empower participants by valuing them as experts and providing them a voice on a specific topic. This empowerment creates a comfortable atmosphere for the participants to share their experiences about the topic and allows the researcher to enter the world of the participants (Byron, 1995; Krueger & Casey, 2000, 2009). The social nature of focus groups and the voice they provide to participants made them a good choice for learning about the experiences of faculty members who taught CTE dual-enrollment courses because they

allowed the faculty members to share their perspectives and experiences in the classroom about this specific student population.

Focus Group Design

According to Patton (1990), focus groups are most often comprised of people with similar characteristics. Interviewing peers rather than a mixture of faculty and administrators created a feeling of security for the participants. This feeling of security encouraged openness and engagement with one another (Morgan, 1997). Focus groups that contain a mixture of authority levels may create a perception of a power differential that could inhibit some participants from engaging in the group discussion (Krueger & Casey, 2000). Creating a comfortable environment for the participants to interact with one another is a significant factor for discovering the faculty members' authentic perceptions about teaching dual-enrollment courses.

I organized two faculty focus groups with faculty members who taught CTE dual-enrollment courses at three community colleges. Nineteen instructors were interviewed among three community colleges. The instructors' years of experience teaching at the community college level ranged from one to 18 years and the years teaching in dual-enrollment CTE programs ranged from one year to 8 years. All focus groups, except for one, were conducted face-to-face. The exception was a focus group which included four members, who due to their distant location, participated using Zoom conferencing software. However, with the use of a Zoom meeting room that included cameras, they were able to fully participate in the discussions.

Administrator Interviews

Creating effective organizations depends upon strong partnerships between leadership and staff (Carless & De Paola, 2000). Researchers have discovered that staff cohesion in higher

education institutions is related to student achievement (Bryk & Schneider, 2002; Louis & Marks, 1998) and faculty are more likely to stay committed to the institution and their students when trust exists between administration and faculty (Tschannen-Moran, 2009). Therefore, to gain a fuller understanding of the concept of the self-efficacy of community college instructors who teach dual-enrollment courses, I interviewed administrators who supervised the implementation of these courses at their respective institutions to determine how they addressed the issue of the self-efficacy of instructors who taught dual-enrollment courses.

Interview Design

According to Maxwell (2013), purposeful selection allows researchers to choose specific settings, persons, or activities that will provide information that cannot be easily acquired from other choices. Additionally, Patton (2002) identified the individuals chosen for purposeful selection as key informants. Key informants are individuals who have specific knowledge about the topic and are able to provide understanding of a phenomenon. Interviews are chosen for the administrators rather than focus groups because my goal is to collect in-depth data from the individuals who can provide expert knowledge and experience with dual-enrollment programs at the institutional level. Interviews provide rich detailed data by providing the researcher an opportunity to probe for additional information and capture individual perspectives about specific experiences (Creswell, 2012; Hatch, 2002; Marshall & Rossman, 1999; Rubin & Rubin, 2011). Purposeful selection was used to select 2 administrators at each institution who supervised dual-enrollment courses.

Community college administrators' perspectives were collected through face-to-face individual interviews. Six administrators were interviewed among the three community colleges. Each of the administrators supervised dual-enrollment courses at their specific college. Titles of

the administrators interviewed included Executive Vice-President of Academic Affairs, Vice-President of Instruction & Student Services, Dean of Outreach & Workforce Development, Dean of Outreach, and Director of Outreach. The years of experience supervising dual-enrollment courses among the administrators ranged from 6 months to 26 years.

Focus Group and Interview Protocols

I was the primary instrument for data collection and analysis. I used a semi-structured interview protocol for both the instructor focus-groups (See Appendix A) and the administrator individual interviews (See Appendix B). Using a semi-structured interview protocol made use of predetermined themes to answer the research questions but did not prevent the asking of additional questions to probe deeper into a specific topic (David & Sutton, 2004). Open-ended questions allowed all participants to provide responses about their experiences in their own words and provided unanticipated responses which supplied a better understanding of the phenomenon under study (Merriam, 2009).

Each focus group and interview was approximately 60-90 minutes. The focus group and individual interviews was digitally recorded and transcribed verbatim. All recordings and transcriptions was secured online in a password-protected program and will be maintained for three years as required by the Wichita State University IRB office. Data will be stored in a safe and structured environment (Hatch, 2002).

Pilot Study

According to Fink and Kosekoff (1985), field testing the data collection instrument reveals information about its reliability before using it in the study. Additionally, testing the instrument can prevent logistical issues in the interview process by disclosing ambiguous questions and providing information about the time needed for the interview process (Baker &

Risley, 1994). Therefore, I tested the interview protocols in a pilot study with sample educators to reveal any weaknesses or ambiguities that might exist within the interview protocols. I organized a pilot focus group with three educators who teach dual-enrollment courses and two pilot interviews with administrators in institutions that were not a part of this study. Based upon the feedback received from members of the pilot study, I did not make any changes to the interview protocols.

Data Analysis

Locating the commonalities among the massive amount of data collected during a research study is a challenge (Hatch, 2002). Merriam (2009) emphasizes the preferred data analysis method for qualitative research is to do it concurrently with data collection while the data are fresh on the mind of the researcher. According to Miles and Huberman (1984), three activities must occur simultaneously during data analysis: data reduction, data display and data conclusions.

Data Reduction and Display

According to Miles and Huberman (1984), organizing data throughout data analysis is essential. Data reduction is a method of condensing the data throughout a research study and is often performed concurrently with data display. Coding data enables researchers to reduce the data and locate recurring words, phrases, and ideas within the larger body of collected data (Goetz & LeCompte, 1984). This sorting of data permits the researcher to continually analyze the data for patterns and sort it through a theoretical context (Hoffman, 2005) This sorting process requires constant comparative analysis. Constant comparative analysis allows the researcher to compare data to determine similarities and differences. I unitized the data gathered from the review of documents, focus groups, and interviews and entered it into an Excel Worksheet. I

chose valid, mutually exclusive, and exhaustive code titles to ensure the validity of the data. I then used these code titles to label the data and located the recurrences. Locating recurrences within the data was the first step in discovering the major themes of the study (Creswell, 2003; Merriam, 2009; Ryan & Bernard, 2000).

Data Conclusions

A list of the major themes of the study was created once data collection and organization was completed. A list of the major themes of the study was systematically determined by identifying recurrent conceptual and theoretical patterns in the data (Braun & Clarke, 2006; Creswell, 2003; Maxwell, 2013; Merriam, 2009; Wolcott, 1990). I used a matrix to build relationships among the themes and to begin filtering these relationships through the lens of Bandura's Self-Efficacy Theory. According to Miles and Huberman (1994), matrices are used in qualitative research as a multidimensional summary of the data for the purpose of intensive data analysis. This examination of the data allowed me to find the meanings that community college faculty attribute to their level of self-efficacy with teaching dual-enrollment courses.

Research Quality

The quality of qualitative research is determined by the trustworthiness of the data collected. Trustworthiness refers to the balance, fairness, and completeness of the data. Trustworthiness is established through the credibility, transferability, and reliability of the research (Lincoln, 1985; Merriam, 2009).

Credibility

Credibility refers to the methods used to collect and analyze data. Credibility ensures that the findings of a study accurately reflect the subject realities of participants (Merriam, 2009). Qualitative research generates a large amount of data. Therefore, to maintain the credibility of

data, I used an organizational system to organize the data for retrieval, analysis, and interpretation (Merriam, 2009). I used the visual matrix to help me verify the relevance of findings before writing my final conclusions.

The use of focus group interviews contributed to the credibility of data collection by providing accurate data. According to Patton (1990), participants are less likely to provide incorrect responses or extreme answers during a focus group with their peers. Additionally, the use of both focus group and individual interviews permitted me to observe the non-verbal clues that occur during the interview session and provided a more detailed understanding of the participants' experiences. Member checks is the process of allowing interviewees to review the transcribed data for accuracy (Merriam, 2009). I used member checks for both interview and focus group data to protect the credibility of the data. I provided each participant the opportunity to review their interview transcript to verify my interpretations. Each participant was emailed a copy of the transcript and asked to review it and provide comments within two weeks.

Transferability

Transferability is the ability of the results to relate to other contexts (Lincoln, 1985; Merriam, 2009; Miles & Huberman, 1994). I achieved transferability in this study through the development of a detailed description of the perceptions of faculty members regarding their self-efficacy with teaching dual-enrollment CTE courses to high school students. I developed this detailed description through data collection at several representative community colleges in the state. In addition, I included a mixture of individuals from different backgrounds, ages, gender, and teaching experiences in the focus groups to provide different perspectives and experiences of teaching dual-enrollment CTE courses.

Reliability

Reliability in qualitative research refers to the consistency and dependability of data. The results of qualitative research must align with the data collected (Merriam, 2009). I triangulated my data by using multiple methods and multiple sources of data. Reviewing documents and conducting focus groups at three community colleges added rigor, breadth, and richness to the study (Flick, 2004).

Additionally, my research was strengthened with the use of a detailed audit trail. Audit trails provide evidence of the systematic organization and analysis of research data and create a path for other researchers to follow (Lincoln, 1985; Miles & Huberman, 1994). According to Merriam (2009), audit trails provide transparency in the research process by providing information about how data were collected, coded, and interpreted. I used a research journal to create a clear audit trail of my research process and to establish my positionality with this topic. In addition, I continued to gather data until the data was saturated, ensuring an understanding of the self-efficacy of community college faculty who teach dual-enrollment CTE courses Merriam, 2009).

Researcher Positionality

The process of qualitative research is accomplished through interactions between the researcher and the participants (England, 1994). Researchers are the primary data collection instrument used in their studies. Because qualitative researchers interact directly with their participants, they can have a profound effect upon the outcome of their research (Bourke, 2014; Lincoln, 1985; Merriam, 2009). Personalities influence the researchers' awareness of others and their expectations of how others perceive them. Therefore, our assumptions and biases about individuals can influence the research process (Denzin, 1989; Kezar, 2002). Acknowledging the

biases and assumptions that qualitative researchers may bring to the research process is important (Creswell, 2012; Maxwell, 2013).

I have been a community college instructor for twelve years. I was employed ten of these years at Seward County Community College/Area Technical School in Liberal, Kansas. During this time, most of my courses have been CTE courses. I have also instructed high school dual-enrollment courses. My teaching experiences has served as both an asset and a liability during this research study. Because I have been an instructor of dual-enrollment courses, I have an increased level of interest in this topic. This increased interest level about the research topic has enabled me to have better insight for the data collection and analysis than researchers who are not as familiar with the topic (Yin, 2009). Additionally, serving in the same job role as my participants may have increased the level of trust between the participants and me. This level of trust may have encouraged the participants to provide candid responses to the interview questions.

However, having a close relationship to the research topic may have also created a bias toward the subject and participants. Therefore, during this research study, I utilized the art of reflexivity to provide transparency within the research study and reduce the impact of bias. I acknowledged assumptions and biases by writing self-reflective passages in my research journal throughout the research process that allowed me to maintain and review my interactions with my participants and analyze my thoughts about my research topic.

It was important for me to remain as objective as possible to protect the reliability of the responses from focus group members. Glesne & Peshkin (1992), explain the reliability of the interviewing process can be preserved through the process of exposing researcher assumptions and values. The entries I wrote in my research journal allowed me to develop strategies to use for

self-analysis and helped me organize my reflections, clarify my research goals, and assisted me to critically analyze the decisions I made during the research process.

CHAPTER 4

FINDINGS

The perceptions of self-efficacy as they relate to teaching dual-enrollment CTE courses to high school students in rural Kansas community colleges were explored in this study. Data were collected through document analysis, focus groups consisting of faculty who taught in dual-enrollment CTE programs that qualified for SB 155 funds, and interviews of administrators who supervised these dual-enrollment programs at three different Kansas community colleges. I analyzed the data from these sources and identified specific themes that were prominent throughout all focus and interview groups. These themes were also reinforced by the review of documents. This section integrates these themes to provide an overall understanding of the findings for this study (Creswell, 2009; Maxwell, 2012; Merriam, 2009). The results of the findings are presented below.

Instructor Perceptions.

Asked about their perception of the SB 155 dual-enrollment courses, instructors provided both positive and negative aspects about teaching these courses. These positive and negative experiences related to the instructors' self-efficacy of teaching dual-enrollment CTE courses. Negative experiences diminished the community colleges instructors' self-efficacy for teaching dual-enrollment courses while positive experiences enhanced their self-efficacy and encouraged the instructors to continue teaching dual-enrollment courses. Positive experiences included helping students obtain employable skills, working with a younger generation, and the satisfaction of teaching students who would one day provide a service to the community. As one instructor explained, "It is so neat to see our high school students go on and become nurses and

take care of you at the hospital. That is an awesome experience." Negative aspects involved differing policies between the high school and the community college, lack of access to financial resources for students and the lack of admission standards for a few of the programs. I have organized instructor perceptions of teaching CTE dual-enrollment courses by common themes and present them below.

Differences between High Schools and Community Colleges

Differing policies and procedures between the high school and community college environments were challenging for community college instructors who taught dual-enrollment courses. These challenges negatively affected their self-efficacy by making them change the delivery of their curriculum, expecting them to accommodate students who did not have access to the required textbooks and materials for courses, expecting them to have knowledge of students who had Individualized Educational Plans (IEPs) and placing them in an unfamiliar role of navigating two types of systems for grading and attendance reporting. Instructors found organizing the curriculum to accommodate the scheduling policies of both the high school and the community college to be especially challenging.

Policies that required students to remain in class a specific length of time caused scheduling issues with the traditional manner in which college courses are arranged. College students have less hours in the classroom than high school students. College classes typically meet on Monday, Wednesday, and Friday or on Tuesday and Thursday, but high school classes usually meet five days a week. Consequently, faculty were often required to change the delivery of curriculum to meet the scheduling needs of the high school students. This conflict of scheduling often required the community college instructors to add additional activities to their curriculum to occupy the high school students during the additional time they were on campus or

to rearrange the typical college curriculum to ensure that all students were receiving important information. One instructor explained:

> For example, they [colleges students] come Monday, Wednesday and Friday for 1 hour and 45 minutes each day where as my high school students are there 5 days a week for the same amount of time every day. So, they are actually there extra hours because the high school requires them to be there Tuesdays and Thursdays. I have to curve my curriculum. Today I lectured. Tomorrow I will find something hands-on for the high school students only to do. Wednesday, I will go back and lecture again when I have my college students so I am not missing anything by having to back track for the college students.

Another instructor explained that some schools use Block Scheduling, which is difficult to align with the college CTE curriculum, "Block scheduling causes the high school students to leave and we just have to keep teaching in Cosmetology." she said. "Then, when they return, we have to go back and get them caught up on what we have already covered that day in class." A Certified Nursing Assistant (CNA) instructor mentioned having the same problem:

> Dealing with high school block hours has been an issue for our program. It seems the high school has so many days off or late start days. We are forced to then to catch up the high school students, who are behind the college students.

Other policies that differed between the educational systems included the availability of financial aid, and the use of Individualized Education Programs (IEPs). The inability of high school students to obtain the needed supplies required for the courses was also a concern in some technical programs as one instructor explained,

I can tell you the biggest need is money: no access to Financial Aid. This hurts them when purchasing books and supplies. My book in my class is over $200. Some students just can't afford it and are surprised when they find out they have to buy it. They are used to having everything provided at the high school. Some high schools purchase textbooks for students but as one instructor explained, this solution created problems of its own, "The issue is the high school students have older editions while the college students have newer editions he said. "I have to go through and make changes to tests etc. because there are always minor changes between editions." Another instructor explained that the inability to afford some of the required medical tests that all healthcare interns must receive before working in a healthcare facility limited the choices available for these students. "The medical tests they are required to have for clinicals is a problem," she said. "Because some can't afford the required tests, they are limited where they can do their clinicals."

Instructors also pointed out regulatory differences between the high school and college environments. One of these differences was the use of IEPs, which were an ongoing source of tension. An instructor noted he was often unware of which students in his class who had an IEP:

> Sometimes I'm not told right off the beginning of the year and I will have a mad mother calling me or father calling me wanting to know why little Johnny's grade is the way it is. I'll say its test scores and they will tell me he is on an IEP and should have a para [paraprofessional] helping him and I'm like, 'Well I don't get this information.' So, that is where I struggle with these high school kids because I get a few on an IEP. They may have difficulty with larger words or their reading level is not up to par with the grade level they are in. That's probably my biggest struggle.

Time-Intensity of Dual-Enrollment Courses

Inherent differences between the two educational systems demanded additional time from instructors teaching dual-enrollment courses. One time component discussed by the faculty was maneuvering between the high school and community college networking and administrative systems. Learning the logistics of two administrative systems negatively influenced the self-efficacy of community college instructors because of the differences between the community college and high school systems. Most high schools did not provide guidance or training to the community college faculty regarding the use of the high school's networking system. Using an unfamiliar system to report daily grades and attendance or understanding who to contact about attendance issues added stress to this already unfamiliar task for community college instructors unaccustomed to this daily tracking. Instructors explained that some schools required daily attendance to be reported while other high schools required grades to be entered into an additional system at the high school. This was in addition to the regular grade reporting, at the community college. Said one instructor,

> There are a lot more hoops to jump through; I'm talking about the logistics. For example, for attendance issues, I have to talk to several people here and at the high school instead of just the student and maybe a person here on campus.

Another instructor confirmed the complexities of trying to navigate two types of systems:

> The reporting and recording becomes quite difficult. It is like dual tracking. Trying to do the grades on the high school side and then having to get into the community college system. We don't have access or I don't have access to the high school stuff so that becomes quite challenging.

Instructors stated their courses required the same academic expectations for both high school and college students. However, working academically with high school students often required more time because college instructors were used to working with a more mature population. "The main difference is the maturity level," said one instructor. "I have to ride my high school students a little more than my college students." A second instructor confirmed having a similar experience:

> Maturity is often an issue with high school students. You would not think there would be that much difference between a 17 and 18-year-old but something happens during that summer after high school graduation. They seem to understand that after that summer they have to be an adult and take responsibility for their actions. I see a difference in the maturity level of students who graduate from high school and take [regular community-college] courses the following fall versus taking dual-enrollment courses.

Another instructor discussed spending additional time with her high school students to help them keep up with their college assignments, "Not that I lessoned my teaching to them [high school students]," she explained. "But I did spend more time with them to help them stay up with my other students. There was a lot more after-class work with them than with my college students."

The lack of a formal student admission process for dual-enrollment programs negatively influenced the instructors' self-efficacy because it not only added time to the instructors' already busy schedules but it also forced instructors to witness students doing poorly in their courses. "I wish there would be a better screening process," remarked an instructor. "I don't want to have to weed out the problem kids myself. It takes a lot of time and it's not fair to put kids into the program who will be unsuccessful." Another instructor further explained, "We were getting 35 students who were not college ready [below college-level curriculum] and we could not do

anything about it. We started only taking juniors and seniors and it has gotten better." A third instructor further explained about the time and effort required to choose appropriate students,

> We sit down with them [prospective students] and explain exactly what is involved and how much work the program is. We also work with the counselors to decide which students will be successful. We don't want to set anyone up to fail. It's helped to educate the high schools about how much work is involved.

Despite the added workload of dual-enrollment courses, instructors also noted some beneficial aspects of teaching dual-enrollment courses. I describe these themes below.

Beneficial Aspects.

Instructors discussed several beneficial aspects of dual-enrollment courses that positively affected their teaching self-efficacy. These aspects provided the community college instructors with a sense of satisfaction and accomplishment for teaching dual-enrollment courses. Other direct and indirect benefits included providing students with opportunities to obtain employable skills and education without debt, improving the future supply of employees that would be available for community businesses, raising the level of appreciation for technical education that was occurring because of CTE dual-enrollment offerings, and enjoyment of teaching a younger population. These positive themes encouraged community college instructors to continue teaching dual-enrollment courses in spite of the drawbacks previously mentioned.

Several instructors concurred that dual-enrollment CTE programs provided students a good opportunity to obtain industry-recognized certifications, employable skills, and education without acquiring a large amount of debt. Instructors felt a strong sense of satisfaction teaching dual-enrollment programs because they believed they were providing lower income students the opportunity to attend college. They also found satisfaction in knowing they were providing initial

opportunities for students who planned to continue their education. They enthusiastically discussed examples of students who had successfully completed their individual programs and either used those skills for employment or continued their education to receive a higher degree. One instructor explained,

> What makes me feel proud is a kid I had as a junior, come back as a senior and graduate. He then came back and finished his English, Math, got his Associates Degree, and went on until now he is getting ready to finish his bachelor's degree. Those are the things that make me proud. And it was in the construction field.

Another described a high school student success story that stood out in her mind:

> One of my highest results on the CNA [Certified Nursing Assistant] credential exam was from a high school student who scored a 99%. I have never seen that and that just happened in the last year. It was exciting to see that it was a high school student.

Teaching dual-enrollment courses also positively influenced the self-efficacy of some dual-enrollment instructors because they found teaching high school students more enjoyable than teaching adult students. They felt high school students displayed more curiosity and interest in the subjects they taught, which they found refreshing, compared to the greater reticence and detachment of adult learners. As one instructor stated,

> High school students listen to me because they have not been exposed to welding before. They pay attention to the demonstrations whereas college students have preconceived ideas. They may have an uncle or other relative who is a welder. I love my high school students. They are excited about learning.

Another confirmed this sentiment: "My high school students keep me young. I like my high school students."

Some instructors viewed the new emphasis placed upon technical education by Senate Bill 155 and the expansion of CTE dual-enrollment courses as a valuable strategy that has helped students who would not otherwise attend college. An instructor explained, "Superintendents are all behind technical education now. So are principals. Everyone's attitude towards it has completely changed. CTE has made the guidance counselors help the kids they weren't necessarily helping before." Another instructor noted that dual-enrollment CTE programs seemed to be motivating high school students who struggled with the traditional academic curriculum in high schools. For example, one instructor made this observation, "Some of my high school students who floundered in high school have done well here; they feel more motivated. They don't like high school but they like college." A different instructor described how completing a CTE dual-enrollment program helped a student, facing several academic challenges, to make positive changes in his life:

> I had a student that completed the course with a lot of academic barriers in the way. Now he has a job working Heating, Venting and Air Conditioning and aspires to own his own mechanical company in the future. He came back and visited me after graduation and it is real rewarding to see people changing their lives with this opportunity that Kansas has given to its students.

Summary of Instructor Perceptions

In summary, faculty revealed both positive and negative attributes about dual-enrollment CTE courses that influenced their teaching self-efficacy A sense of gratification from helping students achieve a college education, providing the community with future employees, and teaching a younger generation who were openly excited to be enrolled in the courses boosted the self-efficacy of instructors teaching dual-enrollment courses. Negative components of dual-

enrollment programs that diminished the self-efficacy of community college instructors included the various challenges of having to maneuver between two educational systems, the inability of high school students to obtain needed resources for the courses, a lack of knowledge about students who had IEPs, and the absence of an admissions process to ensure that students enrolled in these programs are academically successful.

Perceptions of Community College Administrators

A majority of administrator comments were overwhelmingly positive and affirmed that dual-enrollment courses were beneficial for the growth and sustainability of the community colleges, for students, and for the development of more robust and relevant CTE programs overall. Administrators believed the program motivated many students to graduate from high school by providing them alternative courses not offered at the high school. Administrators expressed similar concerns as the instructors about the problems caused by inconsistent policies between the high school and college environments. Administrators also described the challenge of offering dual-enrollment courses to several high schools within their service area. Administrators differed in their viewpoint toward the amount of time instructors needed to invest teaching dual-enrollment courses. While faculty viewed dual-enrollment courses as being more time intensive than regular community college courses, administrators did not believe that dual-enrollment courses required any more time to teach than regular college courses. The themes related to the administrator perceptions of CTE dual-enrollment programs are described below.

Differences between High Schools and Community Colleges

Administrators expressed concerns regarding the differing policies and practices between the high school and college environments. Scheduling of classes was often a challenge because the college and the high school class schedules often conflicted. These discrepancies required the

community college to alter their class schedule to accommodate the high schools, which had notably less scheduling flexibility. As one administrator stated,

> They [high school students] have to be in classes five days a week so if they are coming across the street and they are taking a college class that is usually offered only Monday-Wednesday-Friday at 10:00, we have to make sure we have an additional college class available at that same time on Tuesday and Thursday. Scheduling is problematic.

Another administrator further explained that the bell schedule of the high school often did not align with the college's class schedule:

> Well, they [high school] have funky times. The odd minutes of the bell schedule at the high school is the source of the problem. If it was just us-our college schedule might be Monday-Wednesday-Friday from 8 to 10, which is our two-hour block. But there it might be 8:03 to 10:13 or some other odd thing.

Because of the scheduling challenged presented by the differences between class start and end times, the community college administrators were often asked by the high school administrators to make allowances for high school students who may need to come to class later than the normal start time or to leave before the class ended to ensure arriving at the high school on time for the next class.

A scheduling issue especially relevant to rural community college administrators was operating within the schedules and resources of several regional high schools. Community colleges often offered dual-enrollment courses to several high schools located within their service area, which made the scheduling of classes difficult. As one administrator explained, "We serve 14 high schools in 9 different counties so the differences in the geographic locations, the size, and resources of each high school makes it difficult." Another administrator noted that

the individual high schools had to work together to solve some of the scheduling problems for their respective institutions:

> We have multiple school districts driving their schools in to our facility so the 8:00 class has been the most popular class. Our local school has been very gracious and said they would put their students in the midmorning and late afternoon sessions because it is easier for those remote schools to drive in in the morning than in late afternoon because it cuts into other classes they have during the school day or into after school practices.

Administrators also described the differences in school policies, especially the use of IEPs and FERPA (The Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act) that are sometimes difficult for students to comprehend. Students often do not realize that the rules and policies that pertain to the high school are not necessarily relevant in college. They tend to assume the rules and procedures are the same as one administrator explained, "It takes students getting used to, with the help of the counselors, to understand that the IEP does not automatically transfer over here. They have to request services."

Another difference discussed by administrators was parental involvement. Colleges must follow the strict privacy guidelines mandated by FERPA. Privacy guidelines prohibit colleges from sharing student information to individuals without the consent of the student (United States Department of Education, 2017). Just as students were confused about IEPs, parents do not necessarily understand the regulatory differences between the high school and college environment in relation to the privacy of their child's information. This lack of understanding occasionally creates misunderstandings among parents and students. One administrator described the privacy distinctions between high school and college in this way:

> It pertains to issues that relate to classroom or parental concerns that are addressed to administrators and things of that nature. Our common practice is to tell the student and the parents that we are following FERPA guidelines here. We tell them, 'Your son or daughter is in higher education and we follow the confidentiality and privacy rights that FERPA outlined.' But, depending what the nature of the concern may be, and if their son or daughter is a dependent under 18 years of age, it can create a difficult situation.

Professional Development for Dual-Enrollment Instructors

Asked about the availability of additional training or professional development for instructors of dual-enrollment courses, most administrators stated their institutions did not provide anything different from what was provided to college faculty who did not teach dual-enrollment courses. The reason for this policy was a strong belief that high school students should be treated the same as college students. As one administrator fervently stated, "These are college classes and we treat them [high schoolers] like college students." However, dual-enrollment faculty at one community college attended professional development activities hosted by the local high school. One administrator explained,

> The faculty that are teaching [dual-enrollment] CTE courses typically go to the high school in-services as well so they kind of belong to two different families so to speak. They go to the meetings and the in-service days when they can at the high school and they also come to ours.

None of the community colleges, however, had a formal process for training faculty who taught dual-enrollment courses.

Beneficial Aspects

Like instructors, administrators spoke highly of dual-enrollment programs and felt they provided many benefits. Most importantly, the administrators believed the emphasis on technical programs motivated not only high-risk students to stay in school but motivated all students to continue their education. Expressed one administrator, "Superintendents and principals tell me they would have had students drop out of high school had they not had a trade or some kind of hands-on technical skill to go into." Another confirmed that the availability of dual-enrollment programs often stimulated students to explore a specific career pathway: "It opens their eyes to what they can do and how there is something out there that can give them a livable wage in these [hard economic] times." Additionally, administrators believed that the CTE dual-enrollment programs furnished benefits to the community colleges and individual CTE programs. As one administrator explained, "They provided the college a better retention rate because it is easier to keep students once they begin here in high school."

Time-Intensity of Dual-Enrollment Courses

Administrators' perceptions regarding the amount of time involved to teach dual-enrollment courses as compared to regular-community college courses were different from faculty's overall perceptions. When asked if teaching dual-enrollment courses differed from teaching normal college courses, most administrators believed they did not differ from regular college courses. "I don't think it has made any difference in teaching," judged one administrator. Another confirmed this belief: "They [instructors] just have to report their grades and attendance to both entities. I don't think they are teaching any differently." A third administrator echoed this viewpoint when he stated, "They may have a few more emails than normal but I really don't

think the classes are any more time-consuming than other [regular] courses because they are teaching the same curriculum."

Summary of Administrator Perceptions

In summary, the majority of administrator comments regarding the dual-enrollment courses offered through SB 155 were positive. Administrators believed the programs provided students an opportunity to obtain skills while completing high school. They also believed the programs helped the community colleges and individual CTE programs by increasing enrollments. Some challenging issues discussed by administrators included differences of scheduling policies between the high school and community college, offering dual-enrollment courses to a geographically dispersed set of high schools within their school district, and addressing parental concerns. The views of administrators about the time-intensity required to teach dual-enrollment courses were notably different than the faculty members who actually taught the courses.

Review of Documents

I collected and reviewed documents connected to dual-enrollment courses from each community college with the purpose of developing a deeper understanding of each community colleges' processes as they related to dual-enrollment and the delivery of these types of courses. I divided these documents into three categories: Institutional Documents, Instructor Documents, and Student Documents. Institutional documents from each of the community colleges included policies and procedures used to effectively manage the dual-enrollment programs. To maintain academic consistency, all three community colleges provided the same academic documents such as student handbooks, syllabi, and IDs to high school students as they provided their regular college students. Specific contracts or memorandums of understandings had been developed with

each high school where dual-credit courses were offered and various parental and marketing documents were created to meet the needs of each community college. An analysis of these documents is provided below.

Institutional Documents

My review of institutional documents included documents developed at the community college level for the purposes of creating policies and procedures used to manage the dual-enrollment CTE programs effectively and ensuring quality and consistency within the programs. Examples included academic policies and memorandums of understandings with the individual high schools where dual-enrollment courses were offered. The community colleges in which I collected data had not developed separate academic documents for high school students and regular college students. Dual-enrollment students received the same student handbook and other information as regular college freshman. One administrator explained,

> We tell our high school students that when they enroll in a college curriculum, they leave their high school status behind. They walk into a college curriculum, it is a college program and they get a college ID. They are subject to the college's discipline policies and all that other stuff. We have not really viewed it as doing this thing for this group and this thing for that group. It is a college class.

Each community college had specific contracts or memorandums of understandings with the high schools where they provided dual-enrollment courses. These contracts outlined the specific duties of each institution about providing faculty to teach the courses, providing equipment, financial arrangements about who would be responsible for student tuition, how the program costs would be paid and due dates for receipt of payments.

Two institutions created Release of Information Forms for students to sign. By signing these forms, students granted permission to the schools to give FERPA-protected information to parents. One school developed a Parental Information Brochure that delivered general information about dual-enrollment courses and an estimate of potential costs associated with specific CTE programs, such as medical testing required for the completion of medical internships or the cost of unusual supplies.

Instructor Documents

Instructor documents included documents that provided information about the outcomes and expectations of the course such as syllabi and class policies. Instructors used syllabi containing the same outcomes and policies for high school students enrolled in dual-enrollment courses, they provided to their adult students. High schoolers received the same documents to maintain consistency among the courses. As one administrator explained,

> You have a common syllabus and the expectations are laid out in the same manner. Students' expectations for the course requirements, objectives, and policies like plagiarism, and conduct are all handled in the same format and the same manner regardless if it is a class face-to-face, on campus or in a dual-credit fashion.

Student Documents

Some colleges had created marketing documents in the form of brochures and fliers to recruit students for dual-enrollment courses. Some of these documents were created to provide general information about the college's offerings of dual-enrollment courses. For example, the marketing brochures and fliers developed by one college were designed to attract both high-school students and their parents. These documents provided information about SB 155, technical education, and the cost-savings for both students and parents. Other brochures and

fliers were created to recruit students into specific CTE programs that offered dual-enrollment programs such as the Certified Nursing Assistant Program which stressed the ability to obtain a CNA license and obtain a job in healthcare with one semester of training or to use that training as a foundation towards a nursing career. Most of these marketing materials contained contact and website information where prospective applicants could obtain more information about the program.

Summary of Findings

The purpose of this study was to explore the perceptions of self-efficacy of instructors as they related to teaching dual-enrollment CTE courses to high school students in rural Kansas community colleges. Data was collected through focus groups consisting of faculty who taught in CTE dual-enrollment programs and individual interviews of administrators who supervised dual-enrollment programs at three community colleges. Through data analysis, themes were identified that captured both positive and negative effects on the self-efficacy of the instructors teaching dual enrollment courses. Positive themes identified in the instructor focus group data included a general satisfaction with helping students receive their education and providing their communities future employees. Negative themes included various issues produced by differences between the policies and procedures between the high school and the community college. Administrator data revealed an overall positive view of CTE dual-enrollment programs although administrators commented on some of the same challenges as the instructors. However, the administrators and community college faculty viewed the time involved to teach dual-enrollment courses differently. Faculty viewed dual-enrollment courses as more time-intensive than regular college courses while administrators felt dual-enrollment courses did not involve any more time than regular college courses.

Documents connected to dual-enrollment at each school were analyzed with the purpose of developing a deeper understanding of each school's processes as they related to dual-enrollment and the delivery of these types of courses. The documents were categorized by institutional, instructor, and student documents. Analysis of these documents revealed that the community colleges in which I collected data had not developed separate academic documents for high school students and regular college students. Dual-enrollment students received the same student handbook and other information as regular college freshman. Community colleges and high schools had developed memorandums of understanding that outlined responsibilities as they related to the delivery of dual-enrollment courses between the community college and the high school. Some community colleges had developed specific marketing brochures and informational packets for high school students. These findings were used to both generate conclusions and implications about the self-efficacy of community college instructors who teach dual-enrollment CTE courses. The next section discusses the conclusions and implications based upon the study's guiding research questions and the findings.

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

The purpose of this qualitative study was to explore community college faculty perceptions of self-efficacy as they related to teaching dual-enrollment CTE courses to high school students in rural Kansas community colleges. The study investigated how this younger high-school population affected the overall teaching dynamics for faculty who were accustomed to teaching a college-aged student population. Data was gathered from teaching faculty and from administrators responsible for supervising these programs within three rural Kansas community colleges. The data was analyzed through the theoretical framework of Bandura's Self-Efficacy Theory to address the research questions posed in the study. The conclusions of the study are presented first and are followed by a discussion of the study's implications.

High Self-Efficacy for Course Content

Community college instructors had high self-efficacy for teaching their content specialty to high school students. They did not feel teaching the content to high school students was any different from teaching it to college students. As one instructor explained, "My confidence is the same because I teach the same content." Another confirmed the same sentiment, "I feel pretty confident in what I am teaching and where I am welding; lab based, I can walk around and see the work and watch the guys weld and see where they need to improve. If they are not improving, I try a different approach with each student; just as I do with my college students."

Instructors at all three community colleges provided a variety of positive comments in response to teaching dual-enrollment students. They enthusiastically described the enjoyment they received providing students the opportunity to obtain college credit without incurring a large amount of debt and also providing students an opportunity to discover a variety of career

paths available to them. Some instructors also expressed the pleasure they received presenting their subject matter to students who seemed genuinely interested in the course content and the enjoyment they experienced by teaching this younger population. One instructor pointed out an unexpected bonus he received from teaching in a dual-enrollment classroom: “Teaching high school kids keeps me young.”

Additionally, instructors described strategies they developed to overcome some of the issues that had arisen from the implementation of the dual-enrollment courses. These strategies included making accommodations for high school schedules, providing assistance to some high school students who were ill-prepared for college-level work, and devoting more time to class preparation for dual-enrollment courses. These actions align with Bandura’s conclusions that self-efficacy relates to the cognitive processes of individuals. Individuals with high-self-efficacy for teaching academic content overcome any challenges that occur in the delivery of that content rather than dwelling on problems that may arise (Bandura & Jourden, 1991). Because the community college instructors in this study demonstrated high-self-efficacy for their individual subject area content, their belief in their abilities to teach a high-school aged student population was enhanced. This strong belief in their ability to effectively teach their subject content positively affected their actions (Bandura, 1993a) and motivated them to continue to teach dual-enrollment courses, even though they experienced challenges. Bandura (1993a) explained that individuals with strong-self-efficacy for a task are highly motivated to overcome obstacles rather than easily give up on the task.

Low Self-Efficacy for the High School Environment

Although, community college instructors had high-self-efficacy for teaching coursework in their content areas, they had low self-efficacy for functioning within the high school

environment. Instructors at each of the three community colleges expressed frustrations with the scheduling differences between the high school and community college, their lack of knowledge about which students had Individualized Educational Plans (IEPs) and the inability of students to obtain the required resources for the individual courses. Several instructors also described the problems associated with their general lack of knowledge about using high-school student tracking systems, particularly the confusion they experienced and the additional time they had to allot to maintain the dual-tracking requirements for attendance and grade reporting required by some high schools. The explanation of one instructor was indicative of this issue, "I still struggle with attendance tracking at the high school."

These findings relate to contextual factors of self-efficacy. According to Bandura (1986a), self-efficacy is not a global trait but is based upon distinct tasks and functions. For the community college instructors who participated in this study, self-efficacy depended on a variety of factors including how competent and prepared each instructor believed him or herself to be (Raudenbush et al., 1992). Faculty are more likely to have lower levels of self-efficacy in an educational environment that makes them feel incompetent (Bitto & Butler, 2010). Instructors felt incompetent in the high school environment because they lacked knowledge and experience about important organizational processes and policies.

The Failure of Administrators to Distinguish Dual-Enrollment from Regular College Courses

Administrators were not aware of the differences that existed between teaching dual-enrollment CTE courses and regular community college courses. Comments from the administrators, who supervised dual-enrollment programs in the community colleges, revealed a belief that the time involved to prepare and teach both types of courses were equal because the

subject content was the same. Administrators at all three community colleges explained that identical academic documents were provided to both high school students and college students. It was a point of pride among administrators that high school students were not treated in a different manner than regular community college students. However, while the content of the course was identical, the instructors described several key differences between the college and high school managerial processes that increased the workload and time involved with delivering dual-enrollment courses. Some of these differences included daily reporting of grades, attendance, monitoring of students on Individualized Educational Plans, and the altering of curriculum to satisfy high school scheduling needs.

Because administrators were unaware of the differences between teaching dual-enrollment CTE courses compared to teaching regular community college courses, administrators did not address the self-efficacy of faculty who were teaching dual-enrollment CTE high school students. None of the three community colleges provided formal professional development or training opportunities specifically designed for instructors teaching dual-enrollment courses. Moreover, only one community college's dual-enrollment faculty was included in the high school meetings and notifications. Interview statements from the administrators revealed that because the administrators did not view the courses any differently from regular college courses, they did not believe a need existed for additional training for these instructors. This perspective contrasted with that of several instructors who described at length the confusion that existed maneuvering between the high school and college environments and the ensuing frustration they experienced from their unfamiliarity with high school policies and systems. Frustration is a strong emotional response. According to Bandura (1986a), strong emotional reactions such as frustration and stress about a specific task can lead to low self-

efficacy with the task. Community college instructors' lack of knowledge about high school regulatory systems in general and their frustrations that stemmed from attempting to learn the intricacies of a particular system's logistics led to low self-efficacy and lower than necessary functioning within the high school environment.

Inconsistencies between Policy and Practice

Because administrators believed the content of both dual-enrollment and regular college courses were the same, it logically followed that they also believed the courses were instructed in the same manner and that dual-enrollment and college students were treated equally. This viewpoint contrasted with instructors who provided several examples of how they altered courses to accommodate high school students. For example, instructors discussed at length how they altered their curriculum to align with high school schedules. For example, instructors would add activities for students who had to remain on campus additional hours during the day. Students who had block scheduling at their respective high schools were allowed to arrive to class late or leave early to ensure they would be at the high school on time for their next class.

The lack of an admissions process meant there was no selective identification and screening process for high school students, who were not ready for the higher academic and behavioral demands of college courses. Consequently, instructors spent additional time with these students ensuring they were able to keep up with the college-level workload. Additionally, instructors were expected to abide by the policies and procedures of the high school such as daily attendance and grade tracking and monitoring. These accommodations provided to high school students altered the instructional delivery of the college courses. Therefore, while high school

students received the same content as college students in dual-enrollment courses, they often did not receive it in the same format as college students.

Summary of Self-Efficacy Theory and CTE Dual-Enrollment

Bandura defined self-efficacy as the belief in one's ability to accomplish a specific task (Bandura, 1986a). It influences how individuals think, feel, and behave through cognitive, motivational, and affective, processes (Bandura, 1993a). Bandura further explained that sources of self-efficacy are developed through four main practices: mastery experiences, vicarious experiences, social persuasion, and emotional reactions. Mastery experiences are the successful experiences an individual has with a task and creates the strongest belief in one's self-efficacy.

Most of the instructors in this study were seasoned community college instructors. All but one instructor had been teaching at the community college level for over 5 years. Additionally, they were teaching at rural community colleges whose institutions had an open-door policy concerning the admission of students. Instructors were accustomed to teaching diverse student populations within their courses and experienced mastery experiences when teaching content to dual-enrollment students. According to Bandura (1993), it was these instructionally based mastery experiences that were principally responsible for shaping a sense of strong self-efficacy in the instructors.

However, these same instructors did not have comparable mastery experiences with the tasks associated with understanding the policies and procedures of the high school environment. Additionally, many of the instructors expressed a lack of knowledge with the logistics of the high school environment. Administrators were markedly unaware of important differences between teaching regular community college courses and dual-enrolment courses. Therefore, they did not

recognize nor think to address professional development or training needs of the instructors. The lack of knowledge and preparation among instructors created confusion about the use of the high school systems. The strong emotions of stress and frustration coupled with the lack of mastery experiences for administrative and logistical tasks created low self-efficacy for instructors maneuvering within the high environment (Bandura 1993).

Implications of the Study

This section discusses the implications of the study. The implications were derived from empirical research, the findings, and the conclusions of this study. Bandura's Self-Efficacy Theory was used to analyze the perceptions of the community college instructors who taught dual-enrollment courses. The implications are meant to guide community college administrators, faculty members, policymakers, and researchers in the continued implementation and support of dual-enrollment courses.

Seek Alignment between Community College and High School Class Schedules

Class scheduling issues were a constant source of tension between the high schools and community colleges. Additionally, the different types of schedules were burdensome for community college faculty because these discrepancies required them to adapt curriculum and repeat lecture material for high school students who had different schedules from regular college students. Policies should be created to ensure that both high school students and regular college students are following the same class schedule for dual-enrollment courses. Having high school students follow the community college class scheduling policies would not only lessen the burden for community college faculty and administration offering these courses to local high schools, but could serve as a strategy for adapting students to the culture of college courses. According to Karp and Hughes (2008), there is a direct correlation between high school students'

understanding of the expectations of college courses and their perceived authenticity of their dual-enrollment courses. If differences exist between regular college students and dual-enrollment students in regards to expectations, class delivery, or college experience, high school students may form an incorrect assessment about the discipline and time management skills required to succeed in college courses. Therefore, high school students may benefit from dual-enrollment courses that resemble college courses in both academic content and culture.

Consider the Financial Needs of Students beyond the Cost of Tuition

Qualifying college students have access to financial aid and scholarships to offset the cost of textbooks and other course resources. However, high school students do not have these options. Offering dual-enrollment courses to high school students without providing financial assistance to purchase course resources creates a barrier for economically disadvantaged students to access these courses. Additionally, it creates a hardship for instructors attempting to teach students who lack adequate resources that would enable them to excel in their courses. If policymakers want to continue to promote SB 155 as a viable opportunity for students to obtain technical skills while attending high school, funds for course supplies should be provided to economically disadvantaged students. These funds could take the form of state grants and scholarships based upon student needs.

Create Admissions Process for Dual-Enrollment Students

Community college instructors expressed the need for an admissions process specifically targeted at dual-enrollment students. Community colleges and high schools should collaborate to create an effective admission process to ensure students who are expected to be successful in dual-enrollment courses are allowed to enroll. Attending college while in high school is a major transition for high school students who may lose their connections to friendships, familiar

teachers, and their overall sense of security (Blum, 2007). The change from the familiar surroundings and supports of the high school environment could negatively affect the achievement of some high school students who are not emotionally ready for this transition. Additionally, attempting to complete both a high school diploma and a college level program simultaneously, which is the goal of Senate-Bill 155, could be stressful for high school students unprepared for the rigors of college courses. Enrolling high school students, who may lack the emotional maturity or the academic readiness to succeed in college courses increases the workload of the instructors who teach these courses. An effective admissions process could ensure that only those students who fully understand the expectations of college courses and possess the academic readiness to succeed in dual-enrollment programs would be allowed to enroll in these courses. Enrolling only qualified students in these programs could not only positively affect the self-efficacy of the instructors who teach the courses, it could improve the outcomes of dual-enrollment programs.

However, implementing too stringent an admissions process could potentially limit access to these programs for some of the student population groups the dual-enrollment program are seeking to attract. The primary population groups SB 155 is attempting to reach includes at-risk students in need of additional motivation to complete high school and students, who do not plan to attend college after high school and could benefit from acquiring skills and knowledge that would enhance their employability. To maintain the balance between meeting mandated standards and providing access to the program, some dual-enrollment programs have adopted tiered systems. For instance, a student may be required to have a specific grade point average or pass a competency exam to enroll in dual-enrollment courses unless he or she has the permission of the high school principal to enroll in the courses (Karp & Hughes, 2008).

Improve Communication between High School Staff and Dual-Enrollment Instructors

The lack of communication about policies, student IEPs, and other items prevented the dual-enrollment instructors from teaching the courses as effectively as possible. Instructors were often unaware of which students required additional support and several expressed frustrations with the inadequate information provided them concerning high school systems and policies. Developing a seamless dual-enrollment program that spans institutional boundaries requires the collaboration and integration of both institutions (Hoffman, 2005). The integration of systems would allow information to flow more easily between the institutions and between faculty and students (Karp & Hughes, 2008).

Developing strong memorandums of understandings to fully addresses all details of the dual-enrollment program and the responsibilities of each institution would aid in systems integration. This contract should outline more than the basic details regarding the provision of faculty to teach the courses, equipment needs, and financial arrangements for dual-enrollment courses. These contractual documents should also specifically address in what areas the two institutions will collaborate and if a liaison will be used to communicate between the high school and the college. If a liaison is going to be used, the duties of this position should also be made explicit. Having a principal leader to serve in a communication role for dual-enrollment instructors and students is an important element in the success of dual-enrollment programs (Andrews, 2000). Finally, training and professional development regarding high school systems and policies should be provided to community college dual-enrollment instructors. Providing access to high school email accounts, announcements, and in-service meetings would increase not only the level of communication between the two institutions but would also increase collaboration between both institutions' faculty members.

Summary of Conclusions and Implications

This study of the perceptions of self-efficacy of community college instructors who teach dual-credit CTE courses in rural community colleges was analyzed through the lens of Bandura's Self-Efficacy Theory. The study revealed that the instructors who teach these courses had high self-efficacy for teaching content because of their previous mastery experiences with teaching their subjects and their familiarity with teaching a diverse student population. However, they had low self-efficacy for functioning within the high school environment. Lower self-efficacy for this task stemmed from a lack of mastery experiences within the high-school environment and the frustration that arose when attempting to work within an institutional environment whose system and policies were unfamiliar. Instructors specifically addressed the frustration that stemmed from inadequate communication about IEPs, networking systems, absence of an admissions policy for students, and lack of student funding for critical course resources. The community college administrators who supervised dual-enrollment programs were unaware of the time involved teaching dual-enrollment courses and therefore, did not provide additional training to these instructors.

Inconsistencies between the policies and assumptions for teaching dual-enrollment courses and the realities of the classroom were neither recognized nor addressed. For example, there was an assumption that because course content was the same for both regular college courses and dual-enrollment courses, students receive the course in a similar format. However, instructors identified many accommodations made for dual-enrollment students that made the delivery of these courses different from regular college courses. These accommodations included curriculum modifications that provided additional activities for students remaining on campus additional hours during the day, allowance of late and early arrival to classes, and policy and procedural differences.

Recommendations for improving instructors' self-efficacy and program outcomes include aligning the high school and community college class schedules, addressing the need for funding for textbooks and supplies, creating a comprehensive admissions process for students, and improving communication between the high school staff and community college faculty.

REFERENCES

REFERENCES

Alfred R, Ewell, P., Hudgins, J., & McClenney, K. (1999). Core indicators of effectiveness for community colleges: Toward high performance..(Report No. JC990083). *Washington, DC: American Association of Community Colleges. Retrieved from ERIC database.(ED426749)*.

Alfred, R. L., Shults, C., & Seybert, J. A. (2007). *Core indicators of effectiveness for community colleges*. Washington D.C.: Amer. Assn. of Community Colleges.

Allen, D. (2010). *Dual enrollment: A comprehensive literature review and bibliography*. New York: CUNY Collaborative Programs, Office of Academic Affairs

Allinder, R. M. (1994). The relationship between efficacy and the instructional practices of special education teachers and consultants. *Teacher Education and Special Education: The Journal of the Teacher Education Division of the Council for Exceptional Children, 17*(2), 86-95.

Andrews, H. A. (2000). Lessons Learned from Current State and National Dual-Credit Programs. *New Directions for Community Colleges, 2000*(111), 31-39.

Ary, D., Jacobs, L., Sorensen, C., & Walker, D. (2013). *Introduction to research in education*. Belmont: Cengage Learning.

Ashton, P. T., Florida Univ, G., & et al. (1982). *A Study of Teachers' Sense of Efficacy. Final Report, Volume I*. Retrieved from http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=eric&AN=ED231834&site=ehost-live

Ashton, P. T., & Webb, R. B. (1986). *Making a difference: Teacher's sense of efficacy and student acheivement*. New York: Longman.

American Association of Community Colleges (2015). Students at Community Colleges Retrieved from http://www.aacc.nche.edu/AboutCC/Trends/Pages/studentsatcommunitycolleges.aspx

American Association of State College and Universities (2002, May). *The open door: Assessing the promise and problems of dual enrollment* (Issue Brief No. 1 pp. 1-10) Washington D.C.: Author

Association for Career and Technical Education. (2007). Career and Technical Education's role in dropout prevention and recovery, 1-8. Retrieved from www.acteonline.org

Bailey, T. R., Hughes, K. L., & Karp, M. M. (2002). What role can dual enrollment programs play in easing the transition between high School and postsecondary education? Washington D.C.: U.S. Department of Education

Baker, T. L., & Risley, A. J. (1994). Doing social research (2nd ed). New York: McGraw-Hill

Bandura, A. (1986a). *Social Foundations of Thought and Action: A social Cognitive Perspective*. Englewood Cliffs: Princeton-Hall.

Bandura, A. (1986b). *Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory*. Cliffs, New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Bandura, A. (1993a). Perceived Self-Efficacy in Cognitive Development and Functioning. *Educational psychologist, 28*(2), 117-148.

Bandura, A. (1993b). Perceived Self-Efficacy in Cognitive Development and Functioning. *Educational Psychologist, 28*(2), 117.

Bandura, A. (1997). Self-efficacy. *Harvard Mental Health Letter, 13*(9), 4.

Bandura, A., & Jourden, F. J. (1991). Self-regulatory Mechanisms Governing the Impact of Social Comparison on Complex Decision Making. *Journal of personality and social psychology, 60*(6), 941.

Barnett, E. S., Liesa. (2010). *Dual enrollment: A strategy for educational advancement of all students*. Teacher's College, Columbia University, Retrieved from http://192.168.1.1:8181/http://www.blackboardinstitute.com/pdf/bbinstitute_dualenrollment.pdf

Bitto, L., & Butler, S. (2010). Math Teacher Self-Efficacy and its Relationship to Teacher Effectiveness. *Journal of Cross-Disciplinary Perspectives in Education, 3*(1), 40-45.

Blase, J. J. (1986). A qualitative analysis of sources of teacher stress: Consequences for performance. *American Educational Research Journal, 23*(1), 13-40.

Blum, R. (2007). Best practices: Building blocks for enhancing school environment. *Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health*.Retrieved from http://www.jhsph.edu/research/centers-and-institutes/military-child-initiative/resources/Best_Practices_monograph

Board, T. C. (2014, 12-31-2014). AP Report to the Nation 2014.

Boeije, H. (2009). *Analysis in qualitative research*. Thousand Oaks: Sage publications.

Boswell, K. (2001). Dual enrollment programs: Accessing the American dream. *Update on Research and Leadership*,Office of Community College Research and Leadership, University of Illinois at Urbana Champaign 13(1), 1-3.

Bourke, B. (2014). Positionality: Reflecting on the Research Process. *The Qualitative Report, 19*(33), 1-9.

Brand, B., Valent, Andrew, Browning, Andrea. (2013). How Career and Technical Education can help students be college and career ready: A primer. *American Institutes for Research*, 1-16.

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative research in psychology, 3*(2), 77-101.

Brouwers, A., & Tomic, W. (2000). A longitudinal study of teacher burnout and perceived self-efficacy in classroom management. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 16*(2), 239-253.

Brown, C., Murphy, T. J., & Nanny, M. (2003). Turning Techno-Savvy into Info-Savvy: Authentically Integrating Information Literacy into the College Curriculum. *Journal of Academic Librarianship, 29*(6), 386-398. doi:10.1016/j.jal.2003.08.005

Brownback, S. (2010a). Remarks of Governor Brownback – Victory Election Speech. Retrieved from https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=71UdnA3BUK4

Brownback, S. (2010b). *Road Map for Kansas*. Topeka Retrieved from http://governor.ks.gov/road-map/roadmap-kansas.

Bruning, R. H., Schraw, G. J., & Ronning, R. R. (1999). *Cognitive psychology and instruction*. Upper Saddle River: ERIC.

Bryk, A., & Schneider, B. (2002). *Trust in schools: A core resource for improvement*: Russell Sage Foundation.

Byron, S. (1995). Computing and other instructional technologies: Faculty perceptions of current practices and views of future challenges. *Denton, TX.: University. of North Texas*.

Carless, S. A., & De Paola, C. (2000). The measurement of cohesion in work teams. *Small group research, 31*(1), 71-88.

Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. (2010). The Carnegie Classification of Institutions of Higher Education Retrieved from http://carnegieclassifications.iu.edu/

Carron, A. V. (1982). Cohesiveness in sport groups: Interpretations and considerations. *Journal of Sport psychology, 4*(2).

Catron, R. K. (2001). Dual enrollment in Virginia. *New Directions for Community Colleges* (113), 51-58. doi:10.1002/cc.8

Clark, C. M. (1988). Asking the right questions about teacher preparation: Contributions of research on teacher thinking. *Educational Researcher, 17*(2), 5-12.

Conley, D. T. (2006). What we must do to create a system that prepares students for college success: San Francisco: WestEd.

Cox, R. C., & West, W. L. (1986). *Fundamentals of research for health professionals*: Rockville MD: Ramsco Publishing Company.

Creswell, J. (2003). *Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed method approaches* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Creswell, J. (2012). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Creswell, J. W. (2009). *Research design: Qualitative and Mixed Methods Approaches*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

David, M., & Sutton, C. D. (2004). *Social research: The basics*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

deMarris, K. (2004). *Qualitative interview studies: Learning through experience*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Denzin, N. K. (1989). *Interpretive biography* (Vol. 17). Newbury Park: Sage.

Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (2005). *Qualitative research* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Dougan, C. P. (2005). The Pitfalls of College Courses for High-School Students. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, B20-B20.

Duncan Arne, (2012). *Investing in America's future: A blueprint for transforming Career and Technical Education*. U.S. Department of Education, Office of Vocational and Adult Education Retrieved from http://www.ed.gov/ovae/.

Dweck, C. S., & Leggett, E. L. (1988). A social-cognitive approach to motivation and personality. *Psychological review, 95*(2), 256.

Edmunds, J. A., Bernstein, L., Glennie, E., Willse, J., Arshavsky, N., Unlu, F., . . . Dallas, A. (2010). Preparing Students for College: The Implementation and Impact of the Early College High School Model. *Peabody Journal of Education, 85*(3), 348-364.

England, K. V. (1994). Getting personal: Reflexivity, positionality, and feminist research. *The Professional Geographer, 46*(1), 80-89.

Evers, W., Brouwers, A., & Tomic, W. (2002). Burnout and self-efficacy: A study on teachers' beliefs when implementing an innovative educational system in the Netherlands. *British Journal of Educational Psychology,* 72 (20. 227-243.

Ferguson, C., Baker, P., & Burnett, D. (2015). Faculty members' perceptions of rigor in dual enrollment, accelerated programs, and standard community college courses. *New Directions for Community Colleges, 2015*(169), 83-91. doi:10.1002/cc.20135

Fink, A., & Kosecoff, J. (1985). *How to Conduct Surveys: A Step by Step Guide*. Newbury: Sage Publications.

Fives, H., & Looney, L. (2009). College Instructors' Sense of Teaching and Collective Efficacy. *International journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher education, 20*(2), 182-191.

Flick, U. (2004). Triangulation in qualitative research *A companion to qualitative research* (pp. 178-183). Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Flint, J. M., Herr, F. F., & Heinrich, C. L. (1968). The Kansas junior college: 50 years of progress. *Topeka: The State Department of Public Instruction*, 25-27.

Fluharty, C., & Scaggs, B. (2007). The rural differential: Bridging the resource gap. *New Directions for Community Colleges, 2007*(137), 19-26.

Frazier, C. M. (2000). Dual enrollment: A fifty-state overview. *Dual Credit Study (Tech. Rep. No. 2)*.

Gibson, S., & Dembo, M. H. (1984). Teacher efficacy: A construct validation. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 76*(4), 569.

Glesne, C., & Peshkin, A. (1992). *Becoming qualitative researchers: An introduction*. New York: Longman.

Goetz, J. P., & LeCompte, M. D. (1984). *Ethnography and qualitative design in educational research* (Vol. 19). Orlando: Academic Press.

Gollub, J. P., Bertenthal, M. W., Labov, J. B., & Curtis, P. C. (2002). Learning and Understanding: Improving Advanced Study of Mathematics and Science in US High Schools, NRC Report.

Good, T. L., & Brophy, J. (2003). *Looking in the classroom*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Goodman, J. (1988). Constructing a practical philosophy of teaching: A study of preservice teachers' professional perspectives. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 4*(2), 121-137.

Gordon, L. M. (2001). *High Teacher Efficacy as a Marker of Teacher Effectiveness in the Domain of Classroom Management.* Paper presented at Annual Meeting of the California Council on Teacher Education, San Diego, CA. Abstract retrieved from: https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED465731

Greenberg, A. R. (1989). *Concurrent Enrollment Programs: College Credit for High School Students. Fastback 284*. Bloomington: Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation.

Grimm, E. (2016, January 19). Hickert steps up as USD 480 Superintendent. *Leader and Times,* p. 1 & 3.

Guskey, T. R. (1988). Teacher efficacy, self-concept, and attitudes toward the implementation of instructional innovation. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 4*(1), 63-69.

Hardy, D. E., & Katsinas, S. G. (2007). Classifying community colleges: How rural community colleges fit. *New Directions for Community Colleges, 2007*(137), 5-17.

Hatch, J. A. (2002). *Doing qualitative research in education settings*. Albany: Suny Press.

Henderson, R. (2012). *Employment outlook: 2010–2020 Industry employment and output projections to 2020*. Washington D.C.: Bureau of Labor Statistics

Henson, R. K. (2001). Teacher self-efficacy: Sustantive implications and measurement dilemmas

Hoffman, N. (2005). *Add and subtract: Dual Enrollment as a state strategy to increase postsecondary success for underrepresented students.* Jobs for the Future. Retrieved from http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED497806.pdf

Ingersoll, R. M. (2001). Teacher turnover and teacher shortages: An organizational analysis. *American Educational Research Journal, 38*(3), 499-534.

Johnston, G. H., & Kristovich, S. A. R. (1999). *Looking for the Dual Credit Student and Finding the Under-Aged Student Ones. AIR 1999 Annual Forum Paper*. Retrieved from http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=eric&AN=ED433783&site=ehost-live

Kansas Board of Regents. (2013a). A brief history of the Kansas Board of Regents system.Retrieved from http://www.kansasregents.org/about

Kansas Board of Regents. (2013b). Governor's Career and Technical Education Initiative. Retrieved from http://www.kansasregents.org/resources/PDF/2120-Sec-PSCTEInitiativeFAQs_14Revised10.03.2012_.pdf

Kansas Board of Regents. (2014). Technical Education Authority. Retrieved from https://www.kansasregents.org/t_e_a

Kansas Board of Regents. (2017). Excel in CTE. Retrieved from http://www.kansasregents.org/workforce_development/excel_in_career_technical_education_initiative_senate_bill_155

Kansas Department of Commerce. (2012). Gov. Brownback highlights importance of career and technical education for high school students. Retrieved from http://www.kansascommerce.com/CivicAlerts.aspx?AID=579

Karp, M., Bailey, T.R., Hughes, K.L., & Fermin, B.J. (2004). *State dual enrollment policies: Addressing access and quality.* U.S. Department of Education, Office of Vocational Education.

Karp, M., & Hughes, K. (2008). Supporting college transitions through collaborative programming: A conceptual model for guiding policy. *Teachers College Record, 110*(4), 838-866.

Kezar, A. (2002). Reconstructing static images of leadership: an application of Positionality theory. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies, 8*(3), 94.

Krueger, R. A., & Casey, M. A. (2000). *Focus groups* (Vol. 3). Newbury Park: Sage.

Krueger, R. A., & Casey, M. A. (2009). *Focus groups: A practical guide for applied research*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Kruger, L. A. (2000). An Analysis of the Costs and Savings of the Concurrent Enrollment Program at Salt Lake Community College (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED457947.pdf

Lee, B., Cawthon, S., & Dawson, K. (2013). Elementary and secondary teacher self-efficacy for teaching and pedagogical conceptual change in a drama-based professional development program. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 30*, 84-98.

Lerner, J. B., & Brand, B. (2006). *The College Ladder: Linking Secondary and Postsecondary Education for Success for all Students*. Retrieved from Washington D.C.: http://hub.mspnet.org/index.cfm/13716

Levine, A. E. (2007). The School-College Divide And Teacher Preparation. *Education Week, 26*(17), 46-53.

Lincoln, Y. G., E. . (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Thousand Oaks: CA: Sage.

Louis, K. S., & Marks, H. M. (1998). Does professional community affect the classroom? Teachers' work and student experiences in restructuring schools. *American Journal of Education*, 532-575.

Lynch, R. L., Harnish, D., Fletcher, G., Thornton, G., & Thompson, J. (2007). *Dual enrollment in high schools and technical colleges of Georgia: Final Report*.

Marsh, H. W., & Shavelson, R. (1985). Self-Concept: Its Multifaceted, Hierarchical Structure. *Educational Psychologist, 20*(3), 107-123. doi:10.1207/s15326985ep2003_1

Marshall, C., & Rossman, G. (1999). *Designing qualitative research*. London: Sage Publications.

Martell, K., Navin, J. C., & Sullivan, T. S. (2006). Teaching College Economics in a High School Setting: Lessons Learned and Implementation Strategies. *International Review of Economics Education, 5*(1), 9-27.

Maxwell, J. A. (2013). *Qualitative research design: An interactive approach* (Vol. 41). Los Angeles, CA: Sage.

Merriam, S. (2009). *Qualitative Research: A guide to design and implementation*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1984). Qualitative data analysis: A sourcebook of new methods *Qualitative data analysis: a sourcebook of new methods*. Newbury: Sage publications.

Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis: An expanded sourcebook*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Morgan, D. (1997). *Focus groups as qualitative research* (Vol. 16). Thousand Oaks: Sage.

National Association of State Directors of Career and Technical Education Consortium. (2010). *Up to the challenge: The role of career and technical education and 21st century skills in college and career readiness.* Retrieved from www.p21.org/storage/documents/CTE_Oct2010.pdf

National Association of State Directors of Career and Technical Education Consortium. (2014). Career Clusters. Retrieved from http://www.careertech.org/career-clusters/glance/

Nicholls, J. G. (1984). Achievement motivation: Conceptions of ability, subjective experience, task choice, and performance. *Psychological review, 91*(3), 328.

Obama, B. (2009). Remarks of President Barack Obama – As Prepared for Delivery Address to Joint Session of Congress Tuesday, February 24th, 2009. Retrieved from http://www.whitehouse.gov/the_press_office/Remarks-of-President-Barack-Obama-Address-to-Joint-Session-of-Congress/

Obama, B. (2015). Remarks of President Barack Obama – As Prepared for Delivery Address to Joint Session of Congress Tuesday, January 20, 2015. Retrieved from http://www.cnn.com/2015/01/20/politics/state-of-the-union-2015-transcript-full-text/

Panyan, M. V., Hillman, S. A., & Liggett, A. M. (1997). The role of focus groups in evaluating and revising teacher education programs. *Teacher Education and Special Education: The Journal of the Teacher Education Division of the Council for Exceptional Children, 20*(1), 37-46.

Parsons, T. (1959). The school class as a social system: Some of its functions in American society. *Harvard Educational Review, 29*(4), 297-318.

Patton, M. (1990). *Qualitative evaluation and research methods*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Patton, M. (2002). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods*. Thousand Oaks: CA: Sage Publications.

Patton, M. (2005). *Qualitative research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Wiley Online Library.

Pennington, K., Williams, M. R., & Karvonen, M. (2006). Challenges facing rural community colleges: Issues and problems today and over the past 30 years. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 30*(8), 641-655.

Phillips, H. E. (1975). New Problems Confronting rural institutions.

Picciano, A. & Seaman, J. (2009). *K-12 Online Learning: A 2008 follow-up of the survey of U.S. school district administrators.* Retrieved from http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED530104.pdf

Pierce, D. R. (2001). Student pathways through high school to college. Preschool through postsecondary.

Pretlow, J., & Wathington, H. D. (2014). Expanding dual enrollment: Increasing postsecondary access for all? *Community College Review, 42*(1), 41-54. doi:10.1177/0091552113509664

Raudenbush, S. W., Rowan, B., & Cheong, Y. F. (1992). Contextual effects on the self-perceived efficacy of high school teachers. *Sociology of Education*, 150-167.

Rosenholtz, S. J. (1989). Workplace conditions that affect teacher quality and commitment: Implications for teacher induction programs. *Elementary School Journal, 89*(4), 421-439.

Ross, J. A., Cousins, J. B., Gadalla, T., & Hannay, L. (1999). Administrative assignment of teachers in restructuring secondary schools: The effect of out-of-field course responsibility on teacher efficacy. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 35*(5), 782-805.

Ross, J. A., & Gray, P. (2006). Transformational leadership and teacher commitment to organizational values: The mediating effects of collective teacher efficacy. *School effectiveness and school improvement, 17*(2), 179-199.

Rubin, H. J., & Rubin, I. S. (2011). *Qualitative interviewing: The art of hearing data*: Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Ryan, G. W., & Bernard, H. R. (2000). Data management and analysis methods (pp. 769-802). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Smylie, M. A. (1988). The enhancement function of staff development: Organizational and psychological antecedents to individual teacher change. *American Educational Research Journal, 25*(1), 1-30.

Stewart, D. W., & Shamdasani, P. N. (2014). *Focus groups: Theory and practice* (Vol. 20). Thousand Oaks: Sage publications.

Tschannen-Moran, M. (2009). Fostering teacher professionalism in schools the role of leadership orientation and trust. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 45*(2), 217-247.

Tschannen-Moran, M., & Hoy, A. W. (2001). Teacher efficacy: capturing an elusive construct. *Teaching & Teacher Education, 17*(7), 783-805. doi:10.1016/S0742-051X(01)00036-1

United States Census Bureau. (2015, 10-14-15). Quick Facts, State and City Population Estimates 2015. Retrieved from http://quickfacts.census.gov/qfd/states/20/2057625.html

United States Department of Education. (2014a). Comptency-Based Learning or Personalized Learning. Retrieved from https://www.ed.gov/oii-news/competency-based-learning-or-personalized-learning

United States Department of Education. (2014b). Institute of Education Sciences National Center for Education Statistics. Retrived from https://nces.ed.gov/

United States Department of Education. (2017). Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act. Retrieved from https://www2.ed.gov/policy/gen/guid/fpco/ferpa/index.html

Vineyard, E. E. (1979). The Rural Community College. *Community College Review, 6*(3), 29-45.

Weinstein, C. S. (1989). Teacher education students' preconceptions of teaching. *Journal of teacher education, 40*(2), 53-60.

Wolcott, H. (1990). *Writing up Qualitative Research*. Newbury Oaks: Sage.

Wood, R., & Bandura, A. (1989). Social cognitive theory of organizational management. *Academy of Management Review, 14*(3), 361-384.

Woolfolk, A. E., & Hoy, W. K. (1990). Prospective teachers' sense of efficacy and beliefs about control. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 82*(1), 81.

Yin, R. K. (2009). Case study research, 4th. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

APPENDICES

A. FACULTY FOCUS GROUP PROTOCOL

1. Please tell me your name, title, number of years teaching at the community college level and number of years teaching in dual-enrollment programs.

2. What is your overall perception of teaching dual-enrollment courses as compared to teaching traditional college courses?

3. How does teaching dual-enrollment courses differ from teaching typical college courses?

4. How does your level of confidence with teaching dual-enrolled high school students compare to teaching typical colleges students?

> Probe Question: In what aspects is your confidence level the same and in what aspects is it different?

5. Have you had a positive experience teaching dual-enrollment courses? Please explain.

6. Have you had an experience with a dual-enrollment course that you wish had gone differently? If so, what would you have changed?

7. Do dual-enrollment students have specific needs that are different from typical college students? If so, how do you address these needs?

8. Does teaching a dual-enrollment course affect your teaching methods?

> Probe Question: Does teaching dual-enrollment courses affect your teaching preparation time? If so, how?

9. In what ways does your institution support you in teaching dual-enrollment courses?

> Probe Question: What types of professional development has your institution provided to you for teaching dual-enrollment courses?

10. Is there anything else you would like to add?

B. ADMINISTRATOR INTERVIEW PROTOCOL

1. Please tell me your name, title, number of years that you have served as a community college administrator, and number of years you have supervised dual-enrollment programs.

2. What is your overall perception of teaching dual-enrollment courses as compared to teaching traditional college courses?

3. How does teaching dual-enrollment courses differ from teaching typical college courses?

4. Do dual-enrollment students have specific needs that are different from typical college students? If so, how has your institution addressed these needs?

8. How does teaching a dual-enrollment course affect the teaching methods used by an instructor?

    Probe Question: Does teaching dual-enrollment courses affect the preparation time

    of your instructors? If so, how?

9. In what ways do you support instructors who teach dual-enrollment courses?

    Probe Question: What types of professional development does your institution

    Provide dual-enrollment instructors?

10. Is there anything else you would like to add?