Spring 4-4-2015

Communicating Value: Understanding Adjunct Typology, Job Satisfaction Levels, and Professional Development Interests

Lisa P. Davidson

Communicating Value: Understanding Adjunct Typology, Job Satisfaction Levels, and Professional Development Interests

By

Lisa P. Davidson

Faculty Research Committee:

Chair: Patrick Allen, Ph.D.

Members: Rebecca Addleman, Ed.D., Karen Buchanan, Ed.D.

Presented to Educational Foundations and Leadership Department and the School of Education,

George Fox University

In partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Education

April 14, 2015

George Fox University
School of Education
Newberg, Oregon

"COMMUNICATING VALUE: UNDERSTANDING ADJUNCT TYPOLOGY, JOB SATISFACTION LEVELS, AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT INTERESTS," a Doctoral research project prepared by LISA P. DAVIDSON in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Doctor of Education degree in the Educational Foundations and Leadership Department.

This dissertation has been approved and accepted by:

April 9, 2015 Patrick Allen		Committee Chair
Date	Patrick Allen, PhD	Professor of Education
4/10/15 Rebecca Addleman		
Date	Rebecca Addleman, EdD	Associate Professor of Education
4/10/15 Karen Buchanan		
Date	Karen Buchanan, EdD	Professor of Education

Abstract

Higher education institutions are navigating budget cuts, changing enrollment, and the need to differentiate from the competition. Reductions in government funding and budgetary constraints are prompting universities to reduce the number of full-time, tenure-track faculty and rely more heavily on adjunct faculty to meet their demand for instructors. Therefore it is important to determine the distinct needs and satisfaction levels of this faculty group in order to provide appropriate resources and development opportunities for them.

This study sought to determine if adjunct faculty job satisfaction levels differ based on adjunct typology (Gappa & Leslie, 1993) or institutional affiliation, and to determine professional development interests of adjunct faculty. Adjunct faculty from three institutions of higher education participated in the study. Significant differences were identified using analysis of variance tests and the results were discussed. Recommendations for senior academic leaders and department heads were offered, including a recommendation to evaluate their institutions to determine the unique distribution of adjunct types represented therein and customize interventions to address the adjuncts' distinct interests and needs. This research describes the differences in demographics and job satisfaction needs among the four adjunct types (Gappa & Leslie, 1993), and discusses the faculty development interests of the adjunct participants. Based on the findings, the researcher suggests that academic leaders address a broad spectrum of adjunct needs in order to improve satisfaction levels and attend to professional development interests.

Dedication

I dedicate this dissertation to my family. This educational journey would not have been possible without your support, encouragement, patience, and sacrifice. First of all, I want to thank my wonderful husband, Alan, who continually encouraged me to pursue my dreams and accomplish my goals. He took on additional jobs around the house, changed his schedule to accommodate my class schedules and homework load, worked extra hard to allow me to lighten my consulting commitments, and bought me roses to commemorate each major milestone. Thank you, Alan. I love you. I also want to thank my father, Douglas, who taught me the importance of education and learning, and who convinced me that with dedication and commitment I could do anything I wanted. Thank you, Dad, for your life-long support of my educational journey. A special thanks goes to my mother, Anita, who always encouraged me and taught me to dream big dreams. Thank you, Mom, for providing whatever support I needed to enable me to focus and succeed. Thank you to my daughter, Kimberly, who was the first to respond with words of affirmation when I mentioned an accomplishment--large or small. Thank you as well to my son, Eric, my brothers and sister, and my extended family for all the supportive words and encouragement throughout this process. It is so wonderful to have a loving family that has walked this road with me. I am blessed beyond measure.

Acknowledgements

In addition to my family, I would like to acknowledge other individuals who have provided support and encouragement throughout this educational journey.

Thank you to the GFU faculty who have designed creative, engaging curriculum and given constructive feedback to help me sharpen my skills and explore exciting new theories and ideas. I have enjoyed working with you, and have appreciated your transparency, authenticity, and dedication to excellence.

Thank you to my dissertation chair, Dr. Patrick Allen, for keeping me on track and expanding my view of the future. You provided quick responses and gave great guidance on the countless drafts you reviewed during this process. You have provided encouragement and been a wonderful mentor. I have appreciated your wisdom and insight.

Thank you to Dr. Rebecca Addleman and Dr. Karen Buchanan for your help during this journey. Your feedback and suggestions encouraged me to reach for academic excellence throughout this process. Your attention to detail allowed me to produce a high quality product. Thank you for your support.

I would also like to give praise and thanks to God who gave me the strength and ability to pursue my educational dreams and who has blessed me with a rich, full life and a tremendous support network of friends and family. God deserves all the glory for this project. May I go on from this place to live a life worthy of God's calling on my life.

Table of Contents

Chapter 1

Higher education institutions are navigating budget cuts, changing enrollment, and the need to differentiate from the competition. The U.S. Department of Education (2013) expects total college enrollment to increase by 13% between 2011 and 2021. Reductions in government funding and budgetary constraints are prompting universities to reduce the number of full-time, tenure-track faculty and rely more heavily on part-time faculty to meet their demand for instructors. According to the American Association of University Professors (AAUP, 2004), in 1970, 22% of faculty in U.S. higher education institutions were part-time. By 2003, 47% of the professoriate working in United States 4-year higher educational institutions, and 76% of faculty at 2-year institutions were part-time (American Federation of Teachers [AFT], 2009; Pannapacker, 2013). The U.S. Department of Education (2013) reported that the overall average ratio of full-time to part-time faculty reached 50%. Public four-year institutions averaged 33.6% part-time faculty, public two-year colleges averaged 70% part-time faculty, and private for-profit institutions averaged 86% part-time faculty. The number of adjuncts hired between 1970 and 2003 grew by 422%, while full-time faculty increased by 70% (Altbach, 2011; Shuster & Finkelstein, 2006). Discenna (2007) reported that part-time faculty represented more than 70% of the employment growth in the 1990's.

The terms part-time, adjunct, and contingent are used interchangeably in the literature. The terms refer to individuals who are employed as non-tenure-track faculty and are employed less than full time, often on a semester-by-semester basis. In some institutions there may be differences in the benefits packages, job security, and work responsibilities of part-time versus contingent faculty; however, the literature does not distinguish between part-time, salaried faculty, and contingent faculty who are hired on a semester-by-semester basis.

Adjuncts primarily teach lower-division, undergraduate courses, or specialized courses, leaving the upper-division courses for the full-time faculty (Cross & Goldenberg, 2003; Green, 2007; Townsend, 2003). Adjuncts are generally hired to teach rather than perform administrative duties and are often practitioners in their discipline. They utilize current, industry-specific examples in class and may bring connections with the community to the institution (Gappa, 2000; Green, 2007; Rajagopal, 1996).

Although adjunct faculty make up a large percentage of the faculty body, their working conditions are quite different from full-time faculty. According to the 2010(a) *Report of the American Society of Higher Education*, part-time faculty earn an average of 60% less than full-time faculty for their teaching load. The American Association of University Professors reports that adjuncts average $2,700 per class and receive no benefits (Pannapacker, 2013, Wilson, 2013b). Adjuncts are not offered tenure or promotion opportunities or long-term employment contracts, and do not have job security (ASHE Higher Education Report, 2010; Gappa & Leslie, 1993; Green, 2007; Waltman, Bergom, Hollenshead, Miller, & August, 2012). Support services, office space on campus, supplies, and equipment for part-time faculty are a low priority. Office spaces may be closed on evenings and weekends and support staff unavailable when part-time faculty are at work making it difficult to prepare for classes or meet with students (Gappa, 2000). Adjuncts usually do not visit the campus unless they are teaching a class, and are often unacquainted with most of their colleagues at the institution. Because adjunct faculty have few opportunities to meet and talk with peers, they experience a great sense of isolation and feelings of alienation from the academic life of the institution (Cox, 2004; Hudd, Apgar, Bronson, & Lee, 2009; McLaughlin, 2005). Part-time faculty members report that they desire to belong to a collegiate community and work collaboratively with colleagues (Gappa, Austin, & Trice, 2007).

Contingent faculty are hired to teach specified courses or complete pre-arranged projects, and are not included in the general activities of the institution. Contingents experience a lack of emotional connection, loneliness, marginalization, a sense of inferior status, and even face competition between colleagues (Block, 2009; Meixner, Kruck, & Madden, 2010; Remmik, Karm, Haamer, & Lepp, 2011; Rice, Sorcinelli, & Austin, 2000). They also report a sense of second-class status reflected in the institutional policies and experienced from interactions with administrators and full-time faculty (Benjamin, 2003a; Gappa & Leslie, 1993; McLaughlin, 2005). Adjuncts are sometimes invited to participate in collaborative program work but are generally offered no financial incentive to do so (Klausman, 2010). Adjunct working conditions create a sense of inequity and compromise the ability of the professoriate to form a cohesive faculty community.

The research implies that the adjunct community is a homogeneous group; however, that is not the case. Adjuncts can be classified into typologies based on their reasons for selecting part-time work. Several typologies will be discussed in this paper. Gappa and Leslie (1993) developed a typology that was used in this study to explore job satisfaction levels. The four typologies outlined by Gappa & Leslie are *career-enders, specialists, aspiring academics,* and *freelancers*. This research will analyze differences in job satisfaction levels based on those four adjunct typologies.

The administrative move to hire more adjuncts was primarily a response to market and economic pressures rather than a strategic, carefully designed restructure to enhance the delivery of education to the student population. Because part-time faculty are teaching a majority of the undergraduate classes, there is a need to determine their distinct needs and satisfaction levels with aspects of their work environment in order to provide appropriate resources and

development opportunities to them. This will enable the higher educational institutions to provide the best educational experience for students, and address their missional goals and promises to the students and community.

Statement of the Problem

The purpose of this study was three-fold. First, to determine if job satisfaction levels differed based on adjunct typology. Second, to ascertain professional development interests and scheduling preferences for part-time faculty. Third, to explore if job satisfaction levels differed based on university affiliation. A survey was conducted with adjunct faculty at three liberal arts universities to discern job satisfaction levels and professional development interests including scheduling preferences. The study differentiated job satisfaction results based on adjunct typology according to Gappa and Leslie's (1993) research. A secondary objective of this research was to discover if using the typologies would provide data that could inform institutions of the distinct needs of their part-time population.

Primary Research Questions

1) What are the overall adjunct faculty job satisfaction levels by category?

2) What are the unique job satisfaction ratings for each type of adjunct?

3) What are the professional development interests of adjunct faculty?

Secondary Question

4) What are the differences in faculty typology distinctions, job satisfaction levels, and professional development interests among participating institutions?

Key terms:

There are many terms used interchangeably in literature that refer to part-time faculty. Those who have limited terms, such as one-year contracts may be called:

Clinical Visiting Lecturer Associate Faculty Fixed-term Temporary

Senior Lecturer Sessional Faculty (Canadian term)

Faculty who have a contract with an institution, but are not working full-time are considered part-time faculty. Many institutions also call the temporary instructors who teach less than full-time, usually on a term-by-term basis, part-time faculty. Part-time may refer to adjunct, contract instructors as well as part-time instructors who are serving under a non-tenure-track part-time contract at a university.

Other common names for instructors who teach on a term-by-term basis are:

Adjunct Contingent Adjunct Faculty Instructor

Adjunct Professor Adjunct Instructor

Other Key Terms:

***Adjunct typology*—**for this study, I used Gappa and Leslie's (1993) adjunct typology as the framework by which to identify types of adjuncts. Gappa and Leslie's typology is the standard that is used to measure part-time faculty (Lyons, 2007).

Job Satisfaction—a feeling that one's needs, expectations, and wishes are respected and addressed. This research measures the following aspects of job satisfaction based on the Hoyt et al. (2007) study.

1) Overall satisfaction—a sense that overall, the faculty member is pleased with his/her teaching job,

2) Recognition—the faculty member feels respected, valued and recognized for his/her contribution,

3) Work preferences—the desire to teach rather than do a different job,

4) Autonomy—the level of freedom to design course content, select materials, and make decisions about the course,

5) Classroom facilities—the cleanliness and adequacy of classroom space and equipment,

6) Faculty support—the level of assistance and support provided by the academic department,

7) Honorarium—the adequacy and fairness of the teaching wages,

8) Teaching schedule—the convenience and flexibility of teaching schedule.

Faculty Development—faculty development refers to the specific work enhancement training that faculty members can participate in on campus or online. Faculty development includes all activities that are designed to improve an instructor's teaching effectiveness in the delivery of courses in a classroom setting or online.

Limitations

This study utilized an online survey instrument. The instrument limited the results to questions contained in the survey. The online format negatively impacted the ability to obtain in-depth responses or code additional participant comments.

Gappa and Leslie's typology (1993) may not have adequately identified all of the current adjunct types, but the survey format did not allow for detailed development of additional categories. In addition, the typology was developed in 1993, which may not have accounted for a newer category of adjunct faculty.

Adjuncts are sometimes difficult to contact because they may not check their university e-mail accounts unless they are teaching that term. That may have impacted the response rate. Another impact to the response rate is that survey research limits the respondents to those who are interested and willing to give their time to participate, which may have skewed the results to represent the opinions and preferences of more active, engaged adjunct faculty.

Delimitations

Three private, liberal arts universities inside and outside the Portland, Oregon metropolitan area were selected due to pre-approved access to the adjunct roster, so the results may not have adequately represented the greater adjunct community. In addition, the adjunct sample was limited to those adjuncts who have taught in the previous 12 months in an effort to include those who are current on the university rosters. The non-probability, purposive sample makes the findings non-generalizable to the whole adjunct population (Gay et al., 2012).

Because part-time faculty are hired on a semester-by-semester basis, there can be a large turnover of employees. Limiting the sample to those who have taught in the past year may have minimized the number of adjunct participants with contracts that were not renewed, but it also eliminated those who teach every other year, or who took a year off from teaching.

This study utilized existing survey instruments rather than creating new instruments. The survey instruments focused on specific job satisfaction levels and professional development interests, but they did not address all areas related to job satisfaction that are addressed in the literature review.

Summary

Part-time faculty represent 50% of the professoriate; however, because they are considered temporary, institutions often do not invest the resources to discover their unique motivations and interests, areas of satisfaction and dissatisfaction, or professional development interests. This may have a negative impact on the adjuncts' ability to feel they are integrated, valued members of the collegiate community. It is important for institutions to recognize that all faculty have administrative, professional, and relational needs and desire growth and development opportunities in order to improve their teaching skills and provide the best

educational experience for the students. The goal of this study was to determine if job satisfaction levels differ based on adjunct typology or university affiliation, and to provide data that could inform institutions of the distinct professional development and scheduling needs of their adjunct population.

Chapter 2

Review of Literature

This review identifies characteristics of adjuncts and outlines some of their current needs. It will also explore the benefits and challenges of utilizing adjuncts to the institution, the students, and the part-time faculty. Other significant areas that will be reviewed in the literature are part-time faculty's teaching effectiveness based on student achievement, job satisfaction, and faculty development interests.

Who are the Part-time Faculty?

The need for flexibility in scheduling, the high demand for undergraduate courses, declining government funding, and budget constraints have reshaped the traditional faculty model. In 1975 full-time tenured and tenure-track faculty comprised 58.8% of the academy, full-time non-tenure-track faculty represented 13% of the faculty body, and part-time faculty held 30.2% of faculty positions. By 2007 the percentage of tenured and tenure-track faculty had decreased to 31.2%, full-time non-tenure-track percentages rose to 18.5%, and part-time faculty had increased to 50.3% (Thedwall, 2008). Although there are challenges with this new tiered structure, there is consensus throughout the literature that there are enough benefits to all stakeholders that institutions of higher education will not be going back to the old model.

Part-time faculty are not a homogeneous group who are utilized in the same way at all institutions. Some institutions treat all contingent faculty as expendable, temporary employees who are part of an indistinguishable group. They meet the institution's needs but are not long-term employees who are given any incentive to stay and make a commitment (Gappa & Leslie, 1993; Lyons, 2007). The media has perpetuated an image of part-time faculty as a dissatisfied group of individuals who carve out a living by teaching at many institutions simultaneously and

anxiously apply for limited full-time appointments (Antony & Valadex, 2002; Leslie & Gappa, 2002). Although this is partly accurate for some adjuncts, many part-time faculty are staying in their current teaching assignments for long periods of five to ten or more years (Leslie & Gappa, 2002; Lui & Zhang, 2007). Many part-timers have other full or part-time jobs, and prefer part-time work to supplement their income (Benjamin, 1998; Conley, Leslie, & Zimbler, 2002; Leslie & Gappa, 2002). Although many adjuncts report that they prefer part-time work, studies show that 40 to 50 % of part-time faculty would accept a full-time position if available (Bergmann, 2011; Christensen, 2008; Maynard, & Joseph, 2008; Schneirov, 2003).

Typologies

Typologies have been developed that help to categorize adjunct faculty based on their lifestyles and teaching motivation. An earlier typology developed by Tuckman (1978) included seven categories: *semi-retireds, graduate students, hopeful full-timers* (would like a full time position), *full-mooners* (have a full-time job outside of academe), *homeworkers* (caregivers to their families), *part-mooners* (have multiple part-time jobs), *part-unknowners* (unknown motives for selecting part-time work). A study by Rajagopal (1996) identified two categories of part-time faculty: *classics* who have full-time employment outside of academe and teach a few classes from their area of specialization, and *contemporaries* who would like full-time work and consider teaching to be their primary job. Contemporaries are completing and publishing research, pursuing higher education, and engaging in professional development on their own. Baldwin and Chronister (2001) developed a framework that includes *tenured faculty*, *alternate-career model* (full time, non-tenured faculty enjoying the same benefits as tenured with the exception of tenure), *integrated model* (contract-renewable appointments for specialists who complement the tenure-track faculty), and the *marginalized model* (contract-renewable, part-time

employees who are hired to teach in order to control costs and increase flexibility). Gappa et al. (2007) named three faculty appointment categories: *tenure track*, *contract renewable* (full-time non-tenured), and *fixed-term* or *temporary* (part-time or contingent). The revised typologies are designed to recognize all types of faculty as members with different responsibilities in the academic community.

In 1993 Gappa and Leslie revised Tuckman's typology by modifying some categories and combining others. The typology they developed is still considered to be the standard typology for part-time faculty (Lyons, 2007). Gappa and Leslie have identified four categories: 1) career-enders—retired or moving toward retirement, 2) specialist, expert, or professional—employed full-time elsewhere. They are hired because of their expertise, and they do not rely exclusively on the teaching income. They teach because they enjoy being a part of academe, 3) aspiring academic—would like full-time work, but currently teach at multiple institutions to create full-time work, and 4) freelancers—have other part-time jobs or care for their home/children. They supplement their income with teaching and appreciate the flexibility of part-time work. Gappa et al. (2007) discussed that the aspiring academic category makes up approximately 16% of all part-timers even though the media indicates this category is representative of the whole adjunct community. Researchers are wondering if the aspiring academic group has grown due to the reduction in tenure-track jobs (Kezar, 2012). Yee (2007) reported that the University of Central Florida surveyed their faculty and found that aspiring academics represent 32% of their faculty. It is unclear if the disparity of results is due to geographic location, percentage of adjuncts at an institution, type of institution—research or teaching, or if the percentage of part-timers looking for full-time work has increased.

General Needs of Part-time Faculty

There are some consistent needs that have frequently been expressed by part-time faculty; needs that are not being met in the academic community. Maslow (1987) developed a hierarchy of needs that lists the basic needs of survival and security that must be met before addressing the higher level needs of belonging, respect, and fulfillment. Part-time faculty express needs of job security, belonging to a collegiate community, and recognition and respect for their work. According to Maslow's hierarchy, three of the four significant needs are not being adequately addressed for contingent faculty.

Self-determination theory suggests that people have three basic psychological needs: competence, autonomy, and relatedness (Deci & Ryan, 2000). The needs of adjunct faculty align with Deci and Ryan's theory. Part-timers report that they need professional development opportunities, performance reviews in order to gain feedback on their performance, and instructional support, which all speak to their need for competence. Advancement options and opportunities to fully engage their intellectual talents are areas that correspond to the need for autonomy. The need for relatedness is reported through part-timers' request for involvement in governance, participation in collaborative academic projects, and activities to give them a sense of belonging to the academic community (Fagan-Wilen, Springer, Ambrosino, & White, 2006; Gappa et al., 2007; Hoyt, 2012; Umbach, 2007). Flexibility is also a need for part-time faculty (Gappa et al., 2007; Klausman, 2010). Trower (2010) found that non-tenure faculty are looking for professional development opportunities, support to improve teaching effectiveness, balance between work and life activities, and a feeling of community in the workplace.

According to Social Exchange Theory, individuals develop reciprocal relationships with those who provide valued resources (Umbach, 2007). Adjuncts hold a significant responsibility

for teaching and they voice a need for the same level of support as their full-time colleagues (Gappa & Leslie, 1993; Hoyt, Howell, Glines, Johnson, Spackman, Thompson, & Rudd, 2008). Commitment levels increase when part-time faculty feel the institution values their contribution. Some areas that communicate value to adjuncts are: orientation programs, classroom management training, respect, rewards, recognition, equitable pay, administrative support, and relationship building activities (Gappa et al., 2007; Lyons, 2007).

If someone has the ability to make choices related to their job, it positively impacts perceived competence, performance, intrinsic motivation, and sense of autonomy (Patall, Cooper, & Robinson, 2008). Adjuncts have requested a voice in course scheduling and review as well as establishing prerequisites, determining class size, content and assessments. They want their curriculum expertise to be valued; therefore they want to be paid for their development and consultation time. (Klausman, 2010; Lefebvre, 2008; Thedwall, 2008).

The next section of this review will explore the adjunct faculty model's impact on key stakeholders. It will discuss the significance to the university, students, and faculty.

University Impact

Benefits of hiring part-time faculty.

In the 1980's, 44% of public institution's revenue came from state budgets. In 2005 the state revenue portion was down to 32% (Liu & Zhang, 2007). Universities have needed to find ways to cut budget expense, and they experience a cost savings by employing part-time faculty. In addition to low wages, lack of benefits and office support, institutions save money by providing little instructional support and faculty development opportunities to adjunct faculty (Baldwin & Chronister, 2001; Liu & Zhang, 2007; Reichard, 2003). Institutions can also eliminate the long-term financial commitments embedded in the full-time, tenured faculty model

if they employ adjuncts on a contract basis (Beem, 2002). Some institutions say that part-timers protect the salaries and tenure of full-time faculty and fill the needs when enrollment pressures cannot be addressed with existing staff and budgets (Gappa & Leslie, 1993).

There is greater scheduling flexibility when hiring adjunct instructors. Universities can design a course schedule that includes evening, weekend, hybrid, and online classes, and then contract with adjuncts to teach the classes (Meixner et al., 2010; Gappa, 2008). Adjuncts are often hired to teach the least desirable, lower-division, high enrollment, core courses freeing up the full-time faculty to teach upper-division courses and focus on research or student advising (Cross & Goldenberg, 2002; Liu & Zhang, 2007).

Universities hire part-time, experienced practitioners who bring work related examples to class. Adjuncts who are working in their field bring practical, relevant stories, exercises, and projects to the classroom (Baldwin & Wawrzynski, 2011; Lyons, 2007). The average part-time instructor has five to six years of teaching experience, and more than 30% have over 10 years experience. Universities retain their best instructors for many years (Conley et al., 2002; Hoyt, 2012; Leslie & Gappa, 2002).

The part-time workforce is a highly educated academic community. Part-time faculty are more likely to have master's degrees and full-timers are more likely to have doctorates, especially in four-year institutions, however the percentage of part-time faculty who hold doctorate degrees is between 19.6% and 25% (Antony & Valadex, 2002; Conley et al., 2002; Eagan & Jaeger, 2009). Many part-time instructors of virtual courses are retired and have extensive work in higher education. One report showed that 70% to 90% of instructors of virtual education hold doctoral degrees (Lefebvre, 2008).

Disadvantages of utilizing a part-time workforce.

Once the institution moves toward hiring part-time faculty, the lower cost structure becomes embedded in the financial planning and is very hard to change. Although the literature indicates that administrators and faculty are concerned about the new faculty composition, few changes are being made.

Hiring decisions of tenure track faculty are carefully monitored and controlled, but department chairs often make hiring decisions for part-timers (Gappa et al, 2007). This may change the nature of the professoriate without the university leaders' awareness (Cross & Goldenberg, 2003).

High quality, experienced adjunct faculty may find alternate work, which creates a less stable workforce and may impact the quality of the educational experience for students. In rural institutions, part-time faculty may have low turnover and longer appointments. In urban institutions where there is a larger labor supply, there is higher turnover and, in some universities, there may be policies that limit appointment duration (Cross & Goldenberg, 2009).

Some adjuncts are strong practitioners but may need additional professional development to learn androgogical best practices. Universities often do not budget for professional development for adjuncts or provide development options at a time when part-time faculty can attend. It takes extra resources and time to accommodate part-time instructor's schedules and communicate university initiatives, so this support is often neglected, which further erodes the connections between the faculty and university (Gappa, 2000; Lyons, 2007).

Use of part-time instructors leaves the full-time tenured faculty with the added burdens of running departments and taking on additional advising loads, committee appointments, and administrative duties (Gappa & Leslie, 1993; Kezar & Maxey, 2012). This does not allow them

time to handle all of their responsibilities thoroughly, and their time for research and development is negatively impacted reducing the institutional prestige that results from published work from resident faculty.

Fear of unionization is a major factor that limits the collection of data to review working conditions. Institutional leaders do not want to engage in collective bargaining and fear that the discussion of working conditions will bring the inequities and substandard working conditions to light (Kezar & Maxey, 2012). Additional research is needed to hear the voice of part-time faculty. Tenure track faculty, who may not understand the complexity of the issues regarding part-timers, typically conduct the research. It is also challenging to get part-time faculty to participate and return surveys (ASHE Higher Education Report, 2010b).

University considerations.

To determine the best balance and use of tenured, full-time, and part-time faculty, universities need to develop carefully designed strategic faculty plans that are tied to their mission but not based on financial exigency (Baldwin & Chronister, 2001; Gappa, 2000). The AAUP, American Federation of Teachers, National Education Association, and some vocal researchers are calling for caution when it comes to hiring of part-timers and are urging institutions to increase tenure track positions instead (Benjamin, 2003b; Benjamin, 2003c; Schneirov, 2003).

The importance of inculcating adjunct faculty with a commitment to the institutional mission cannot be understated. Each institution has a unique mission that guides the utilization of resources, provides a framework for decision-making, and informs the methods for assessing success. Part-time faculty are front-line instructors who are often the primary interface with students. If adjuncts do not understand and embrace the mission, they may not fully grasp the

purpose of the organization or its commitments to stakeholders (Jacobson, 2013; West, 2010). Adjunct faculty represent the institution to the students and community in the same way that full-time faculty and staff exemplify the institutional mission on and off campus. In order to realize the organizational mission, adjunct faculty must not only know and embrace the mission, they must experience the institutions' commitment to faculty support and academic excellence in order to demonstrate the mission in their interactions.

Policies, practices (the day-to-day execution of the policies), and principles (the culture of the institution) need to be examined and modified to include contingent faculty without tier or status driving the decisions. Leaders should look for implicit or explicit value statements that are exclusionary for part-time faculty (Kezar, 2012). Rather than bifurcating the faculty into tenure-track versus contingent faculty, institutions need to come up with more employment options that account for the changing needs of the academy and students. Instead of blaming the part-time faculty for quality issues, the academy would be better served by examining and enhancing the support mechanisms, professional development opportunities, job security measures, and integration programs that are provided to adjuncts (Gappa & Leslie, 1993; Schneirov, 2003), which is, in part, a goal of this study. There is a need to acknowledge that a change in faculty composition has occurred and develop a model that fully integrates all faculty positions and recognizes and honors the new faculty majority (Kezar & Sam, 2012).

Student Impact

Student benefits of working with part-time faculty.

Students enjoy a practitioner approach to their learning. They benefit from instructors who are current in their field, who have access to current pedagogical knowledge, and who are aware of the new developments in education (Thompson, 2003). Adjunct instructors bring

current, real-life examples into class, and can discuss immediate application of learning to the student's workplace (Baldwin & Wawrzynski, 2011; Lyons, 2007).

When adjuncts are utilized, students have a wider variety of instructors to choose from. If a large contingent of adjuncts each teach a few classes, there is greater variety in the content, examples, and design of the courses. Students can take multiple classes from their favorite instructor, and select instructors who have extensive experience in their disciplines.

Students benefit from more flexible course scheduling options that meet their needs. Part-time instructors are hired to teach evenings and weekends, which accommodates a working student's schedule (Meixner et al., 2010; Gappa, 2008). Adjunct faculty can also teach during the day, in a hybrid format, or online, which expands the course choices for students.

The utilization of part-time faculty keeps costs down for the students, because adjuncts are paid less than full-time faculty. The use of adjuncts controls costs in public and private institutions, which gives students more university choices within their budget (Baldwin & Chronister, 2001). Cost is a major consideration for students when selecting a university.

Student disadvantages of working with part-time faculty.

Institutions are relying more heavily on part-time faculty, especially in lower-division core undergraduate courses, but they have not thoughtfully evaluated the consequences of the utilization of part-timers on student learning (Elman, 2003). There are three main issues that are of concern to students: availability of faculty, advising resources, and teacher preparedness.

Students report that they want to access instructors to get prompt feedback, discuss grades, and explore ideas outside of class (Benjamin, 2003c). He suggests that part-time instructors do not connect with students at the same level as full-time faculty. This negatively impacts students' ability to engage in faculty-student communication. According to Benjamin,

full-time faculty spend up to 100% more time on instruction and student interaction per credit hour than part-time faculty. Part-time faculty spend less time preparing for classes than their full-time colleagues. This is partly due to the method of paying instructors by the class rather than working hour or pro-rated full-time wage (Benjamin, 2002).

Adjuncts often do not have offices (*ASHE Higher Education Report*, 2010b). Lack of office space and lack of invitation to participate in faculty governance create a sense of detachment for part-time instructors (Levin, Kater, & Wagoner, 2006). Part-time faculty do not get paid to hold office hours or work with students outside of class. This negatively impacts the students' ability to access their teachers, which is a key factor in student success and completion rates (Benjamin, 2003c; Eagan & Jaeger, 2009).

The practice of "just-in time" hiring of adjuncts provides great flexibility for the institution, but it is not helpful to students who want to choose their instructors. It also does not allow the instructor to adequately prepare to create the best learning environment for the students (Kezar & Maxey, 2012; Waltman et al., 2012). Institutions list "staff" or "TBD" as the instructor, so students do not know who is teaching the course and cannot locate their preferred instructors. The use of part-time instructors also makes it difficult for students to get letters of recommendation or advice from teachers who may not be around or available from term-to-term (Nutting, 2003).

Faculty assume greater responsibility for counseling and advising students at community colleges than they do at four-year institutions. Counseling and advising as well as providing developmental education is deemed crucial to students (Jacoby, 2006). Advising students in a four-year institution is a concern due to the number of lower-division, undergraduate courses being taught by part-time faculty. The part-time faculty are not available and are not being paid

to advise students, but the first and second year undergraduate students need the most advising. The adjunct instructors are the faculty that the first and second year undergraduate students know. There are fewer full-time tenured faculty to advise students, and they may not know the students. Students do not have the opportunity to form cohesive relationships with faculty, which is an important factor in a quality education (Thompson, 2003).

Benjamin (2003, 1998) is a strong voice in the debate of part-time faculty quality of instruction. He cites that part-time instructors' higher turnover rates, less time to prepare for classes, little collegial interaction, and less time to advise students all influence educational quality. Benjamin also discusses that part-time faculty use fewer essay exams due to the time needed for grading and often mentions adjuncts' lower overall percentage of doctoral degrees. Benjamin (2003a) indicates that because part-time instructors may be less qualified and receive less support, there may be a negative impact on undergraduate student learning. Townsend (2003) suggests that the exploitation of part-time faculty extends to exploitation of students in that they receive less education while the university receives the same tuition.

According to some reports, reliance on part-time faculty may negatively impact student social and intellectual integration into the academic community, which may lower student retention and graduation rates. Jacoby (2006) discusses that there is a highly significant negative correlation between the ratio of part-time faculty at community colleges and graduation rates. Schools with low part-time faculty ratios have higher graduation rates than schools with high part-time faculty ratios. Even though schools with high part-time ratios have higher faculty to student ratios, the faculty to student ratios cannot compensate for the high part-time faculty ratios (Jacoby, 2006).

Not only is there a negative correlation between the students' exposure to part-time faculty and graduation rates, there is also a negative relationship between exposure to part-time faculty in a two-year college and the student's likelihood of transferring to a four-year institution (Eagan & Jaeger, 2009). Eagan and Jaeger suggest that office space for part-time faculty and compensation for extra hours spent with students outside of class may positively impact the student's exposure to faculty and advising time, which may improve the likelihood of the students transferring to a four-year institution.

There is also data that suggest that students who take multiple classes from adjuncts perform significantly worse than those who take classes from tenured faculty as measured by the student's success and preparedness for follow-up courses (Kezar & Maxey, 2012). Kezar and Maxey suggest that the data indicate there is a negative impact on student achievement due to working conditions of part-time faculty.

Considerations for students.

A study conducted by Braxton, Bray, & Berger (2000) revealed student retention information that could inform institutional faculty development decisions. The researchers found that the more the student perceives that the teacher is organized and prepared, the greater commitment the student has to the institution. Students who perceive that their teachers are organized, prepared, clear, and skilled may be able to spend more of their energy on social integration than those students who are working with instructors who do not exhibit those skills as readily. Students' social integration impact their commitment to the institution, which in turn impact student departure decisions. Social integration and institutional commitment both positively correlated to the student's intent to re-enroll. According to the research, factors that impact social integration and student's intent to re-enroll are the student's perception of the

teachers' preparedness, organization, instructional skill and clarity. Students' perception of faculty teaching skills have a direct correlation with their desire to re-enroll.

Faculty Impact

Benefits to part-time faculty.

Part-time instructors enjoy teaching and desire to be a part of the academic community (Leslie & Gappa, 2002; Schneirov, 2003; Schuster & Finkelstein, 2006). Ninety-two percent of part-time faculty say their primary academic responsibility is teaching (Conley et al., 2002). Many adjuncts cite helping students learn, staying connected with colleagues in their disciplines, and keeping current in their field as reasons for choosing part-time work (Hoyt, 2012). Part-time faculty feel that academic work fulfills their intrinsic career aspirations. Some choose part-time work because it lacks the full-time work demands, they are better able to balance home and work life, they gain professional status, and are in a position to find full-time work (Rajgopal, 1996).

Non-tenured faculty who have professional jobs outside of the academy enjoy the benefits of extra income, the ability to maintain an affiliation with the academic community, and the prestige that comes from working in academe (Gappa et al., 2007; Schuster & Finkelstein, 2006; Thedwall, 2008). Part-time faculty may have flexible scheduling options that allow them to work evenings, weekends, or online so as not to conflict with other work responsibilities.

Benjamin (2003c) states that 75% of part-time faculty prefer contingent appointments, and almost 75% have additional jobs. The benefit of part-time work includes no requirement for research and publication or participation in committee work. Adjunct faculty who have master's degrees are able to teach in their discipline whereas the majority of full-time faculty positions require a doctorate. Part-time faculty also appreciate their ability to balance life and work with less pressure from their academic responsibilities (Bergom & Waltman, 2009). Part-time

instructors are dedicated to quality teaching and the students, and desire to improve society through their work. Even though there are needs that are not satisfied with certain aspects of their jobs, they are strongly committed to their academic work and have great enthusiasm for teaching (Antony & Valadex, 2002; Gappa & Leslie, 1993).

Disadvantages to part-time faculty.

It is universally acknowledged that part-time instructors receive low wages (ASHE report, 2010; Cross & Goldenberg, 2002; Gappa, 2000). Gappa and Leslie (1993) use the term "exploitation" to describe the pay adjuncts receive. The rate of pay per hours worked for contingent faculty who have masters or doctorate degrees compares to a fast food worker or theater attendant (Schneirov, 2003). Many part-time faculty feel that the institutions are taking advantage of their experience and education by not providing appropriate wages and incentives (Gappa & Leslie, 1993). This calls into question institutional mission and the institution's commitment to social justice. The aspiring academic, in order to earn a minimal, living wage, needs to teach at multiple universities, which cuts into time available to grade papers, prepare for class, and work with students. Teaching at multiple universities also makes it difficult to know the culture, policies and procedures at multiple campuses (Nutting, 2003; Townsend, 2003). Adjuncts are generally not compensated for professional development or time spent discussing curriculum or pedagogical improvements (Thedwall, 2008).

Part-timers who have careers outside of the academy are very critical of the way they are treated in academe, because they are recognized as professionals in other fields and have a great deal of experience. Adjuncts are aware of the employment inequities and notice that they are not treated with the respect afforded them in their other jobs. In the academic community adjuncts experience second-class status (Gappa & Leslie, 1993). Full-time faculty socially exclude part-

time instructors, and adjuncts report limited inclusion in departmental meetings and social events (Townsend, 2003). Full-time faculty report that they feel animosity toward part-time instructors who they perceive compete for courses or jobs, have lesser qualifications and teaching skills, negatively impact the collegial environment, and lower the institution's educational quality (ASHE Report, 2010b; Cross & Goldenberg, 2009; Kezar & Sam, 2009). Adjuncts feel invisible, un-welcome, unappreciated, and disrespected (ASHE Report, 2010b; Gappa, 2000; Klausman, J, 2010; Waltman et al., 2012).

Adjuncts feel that faculty and administrators consider them to be marginal, dispensable, peripheral academic employees, and only useful in the least desirable jobs (Liu & Zhang, 2007). Part-timers desire to be involved in the field professionally and intellectually, but feel excluded from full participation in their programs and faculty governance (Klausman, 2010; Nutting, 2003). The sense of second-class status is not imagined. A provost shared an observation about part-time faculty during Gappa and Leslie's (1993) extensive study:

> Part-time faculty offer us "fine wine at discount prices." They are often very fine teachers, and our money goes much farther than when we put it all into full-time faculty. Furthermore, we can "pour it down the drain" if they have any flaws at all. We have no big investment in part-time faculty. (p.141)

Although many administrators and full-time faculty are working hard to change this bifurcated model, there are still those who do not acknowledge the part-timer's commitment to excellence and desire to provide the best educational experience for the students.

Adjuncts have support challenges as well. They receive limited administrative support during the non-traditional hours they are on campus, often receive no office space to prepare for classes or meet with students, and have no place to store their materials. They often do not have

electronic support or access to computers, and they are lacking the resources needed to teach their classes (Conley et al., 2002; Hoyt, 2012; Liu & Zhang, 2007). Levin et al. (2006) conclude that part-time community college faculty feel a significant sense of detachment from their affiliated institution due to lack of office space and being largely uninvolved in institutional governance.

Townsend (2003) suggests that we have become complacent about the part-time wage inequity, limited resources for support and faculty development, and adjuncts' exclusion from the life of the academic community. Contingents are generally not invited to participate in learning communities to collaborate with colleagues. In those institutions where adjuncts can become vested based on teaching hours, universities often cut their hours to exclude them from the vesting option (Nutting, 2003). The new policy in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act requiring institutions to pay benefits to those part-time instructors who work more than 30 hours a month has resulted in a reduction of hours for part-time faculty so universities can avoid paying health care benefits (Dunn, 2013a; Dunn, 2013b). This has negatively impacted those part-time faculty who formally enjoyed a more stable work environment.

Lack of job security and benefits are major concerns for part-time instructors (Gappa, 2000; Waltman et al., 2012). Adjunct faculty can lose their teaching appointment if a tenured faculty member is available to teach or needs the class to maintain his/her load. There is no long-term commitment to contingent employees and they can be hired or fired based on curricular needs and enrollment (Nutting, 2003; Thedwall, 2008). The lack of job security compels some faculty to spend time looking for alternative jobs rather than investing time in departmental projects. They feel disconnected and dispensable (Bergom & Waltman, 2009).

Some institutions hire adjunct faculty on an "as needed" basis. When those hiring decisions are made just a few days before the class starts, it gives the instructor very little preparation time or opportunity to update course materials (Gappa et al., 2007; Kezar & Macey, 2012). Sometimes adjuncts are asked to teach classes outside of their discipline, which further erodes the quality of education offered to students (Nutting, 2003). The term-by-term appointments that are often last minute or can be cancelled at the last minute lead to insecurity, instability and financial difficulty for part-timers (ASHE Report, 2010b; Gappa, 2000).

Because adjuncts have few opportunities to meet and converse with peers, they experience feelings of isolation, marginalization, lack of emotional connection, and they lack collaborative opportunities to work with colleagues (Block, 2009; Cox, 2004; Meixner et al., 2010). These findings have additional repercussions. If there is a discrepancy between current job practices and an individual's desired job, employees will feel deprived and it will impact their attitudes, job satisfaction, and professional commitment (Feldman & Turnley, 2004). Feelings of isolation, loneliness, exclusion, and vulnerability can lead to mental distress and depression (Narayan, Chambers, Shah, & Petesch, 2000). According to Manning & Curtis (2012):

> The roots of engagement are in human motivation, the realization that people want survival and security, but they also want a sense of belonging, respect from others, and the opportunity to make a difference in the world. Employees have the need to be accepted. If they feel ignored, they slip into indifference. Employees want to be important. If they feel disregarded, they lose self-esteem. Employees want to live meaningful lives and accomplish something important. (p. 263)

There is great psychological benefit to those who belong to a supportive community. Negative social capital is created when community benefits and mutual support are provided to some but exclude others (Roffey, 2013). This behavior marginalizes members who are rejected or excluded and can have a devastating effect on the whole community. Roffey posits that being accepted and included in your social group is a primary psychological need. Self-Determination Theory suggests that membership in a social group increases feelings of relatedness and connection (Ryan & Deci, 2000).

Adjuncts have few opportunities to connect and collaborate with colleagues and are often not invited to faculty gatherings or decision-making bodies, so they feel isolated and alienated from the academic life of the institution (Cox, 2004; Hudd et al., 2009; McLaughlin, 2005). Because part-time faculty are not systematically evaluated, good teachers are not recognized and struggling teachers are not given support and assistance (Nutting, 2003). Lack of faculty assistance in addressing areas of teaching difficulties will have ramifications for student learning as well.

Part-time faculty considerations.

The literature reveals many areas of concern for the part-time faculty, but there are opportunities presented as well. Administrators, department chairs, and faculty are looking into ways to honor the contributions of all faculty. The literature suggests that the challenges have been evident for some time, but not much progress has been made to rectify the concerns. There are efforts on the part of administrators to create better working conditions and provide professional development for adjuncts. Unions are active in helping adjuncts gain better working conditions and contingent faculty are coming to the realization that they may not be able to change the job stability and full-time employment options without collective bargaining

(Klausman, 2010; Schneirov, 2003). Some institutions are proactively working with adjuncts to improve recognition and rewards. For example, there are programs that honor the long-term adjuncts with extended contracts so they can plan ahead (Bergom & Waltman, 2009). Other examples will be discussed in the "Faculty Development" section of this chapter. Each institution will need to work with the faculty community to determine how best to support all faculty members.

Teaching Effectiveness

One of the most significant controversies surrounding the use of part-time faculty is the question of teaching effectiveness. In this section we will explore some studies that indicate there is no significant difference between the teaching effectiveness of part-time and full-time faculty. Other studies point to differences in quality and negative student outcomes. It is important to review the literature to understand the findings.

Research indicates that part-time instructors compare favorably to full-time instructors in terms of teaching effectiveness even though part-timers receive little support (Gappa & Leslie, 1993; Lyons, 2007; Schuster, 2003). Gappa (2000) shares:

> The new faculty majority includes people with high-level professional experience, cutting-edge clinical and research skills, broad and unusual life experience, distinguished records of community leadership, perspectives from different cultural points of view, creative and original artistic ideas, experience in politics and government leadership, and a deep genuine humanity that may not be measurable in conventional terms. (p. 84)

Gappa emphasizes that the part-time faculty who are serving in institutions are very capable, talented individuals who have a great wealth of experience, ideas, and knowledge to share. Students appreciate learning from practitioners and gaining practical, hands-on experiences that

can be immediately put to use in their lives and careers. The preconception that part-time faculty are under-qualified and not attentive to their teaching and student responsibilities is invalid (Leslie & Gappa, 2002). Even though research suggests that the lack of support for adjunct faculty may impact teaching effectiveness and student interaction, Cross & Goldenberg (2003) found that according to course evaluations, part-time faculty receive consistently higher ratings than full-time tenured faculty.

There is an assumption that part-time faculty are less stable employees who are only hired for short appointments. Yet, part-time faculty have an average of five to six years of teaching experience and over 30% have over ten years experience (Leslie & Gappa, 2002). Kezar (2012) confirms that full-time faculty do not serve longer terms than adjuncts in many cases.

Lack of professional development is a concern in the literature. Leslie & Gappa (2003) discussed that although institutions provide little support to adjunct faculty in the form of professional development, part-timers personally spend about the same time on professional development as full-time faculty. They take responsibility for their development interests (Leslie & Gappa, 2002).

On the other hand, there is evidence that teaching effectiveness is negatively impacted by the use of part-time instructors. Some research clearly shows areas for improvement, other publications build logical arguments without conclusive data, and others show bias to a position. This section will review researchers' results and opinions in order to better understand their findings.

Benjamin (2003c) argues that because contingent faculty are not as carefully selected, have less advance training through doctoral studies, and are less likely to be evaluated, they are

less qualified. He suggests that since adjuncts do not have the financial or administrative support of the institutions, they are less able to focus on improving student learning. He questions how four-year institutions can justify charging higher tuition rates for undergraduate education than the two-year colleges when they employ equally qualified adjuncts to teach the classes. Benjamin reviews the rigorous process for selection of tenure track faculty. He suggests that although some would say that part-time faculty are well qualified for their teaching assignments, they are generally not required to demonstrate their teaching or writing effectiveness prior to appointment. In his research, Benjamin finds that twice as many full-time instructors have doctoral degrees than part-time faculty. He posits that the doctoral process teaches instructors how to stay current and contribute to the knowledge in the field and is an important credential for all faculty. Benjamin is concerned about the erosion of academic quality—moving standards to the lowest common denominator.

Benjamin (2002) suggests that educational quality suffers because part-timers lack professional development, academic support, evaluation from departments, lack of interaction with full-time faculty, and limited engagement with student learning. He acknowledges that studies have shown that part-time faculty are committed, devoted teachers who receive positive student evaluations. However, he suggests that these vague measures of effectiveness have compromised the standards of faculty qualifications and performance measures that maintained a quality educational experience for students.

Researchers frequently suggest that the reason for the discrepancy in teaching effectiveness is due to lack of administrative considerations and professional development support from their institutions. Due to lack of job security, late notice of appointments, term-by-term hiring, and limitations on the amount of work available, adjuncts have little time to prepare

for classes and may need to spend extra time looking for work. This can have a negative effect on the quality of instruction. The faculty give less of themselves because the school is not investing in them. Some do extra administrative or advising tasks often without compensation in order to carve out a niche. Others try to stay quiet, thinking if they don't ruffle feathers they will be offered their teaching load again. As chairs change, the job security is unstable (Gappa et al., 2007; Waltman et al., 2012).

Kirk & Spector (2009) report that principles of accounting students taught by full-time instructors perform significantly better than students taught by part-time instructors. The students taught by adjuncts also have lower performance in their first intermediate accounting course. The authors assert that students who were taught by part-timers in their first accounting course are less likely to major in finance.

Grade inflation is another consideration and it seems to be more evident with part-time instructors. Evaluation of adjuncts is based primarily on student evaluations. Focusing on student evaluations may lead to grade inflation in order for adjuncts to keep their jobs (Thedwall, 2008). Part-time instructors' opportunities for contract renewal are based primarily on student evaluations so enforcing high academic standards that may result in lower student grades may be difficult for those wanting job stability (Fagan-Wilen et al., 2006; Jacoby, 2006; Thedwall, 2008; Waltman et al., 2012). Because many part-time instructors have multiple job responsibilities outside of academe, it may be challenging to find time to focus on academic integrity, checking sources for plagiarism, and using multiple formats to discourage student cheating. Adjuncts may also be hesitant to enforce complex integrity violation policies (Hudd et al., 2009).

Educational credentials of part-time faculty are another concern. Tenure-track faculty believe that their research keeps them current in their field and enhances their teaching. Because

most part-time faculty do not have their doctorates and have less time to spend on scholarly activities, they are viewed as less current and less credible (Thedwall, 2008). Senior faculty are concerned that part-timers are not as committed to the institution and do not devote enough attention to the students. They feel that part-timers negatively impact collegiality and the system of faculty governance (Cross & Goldenberg, 2009). Because there are fewer full-time faculty, full-timers do not have time to focus on teaching or research because of advising, curriculum development and program facilitation responsibilities. Pressures on full-time faculty to do everything means that some things are not getting done, which impacts the quality of education (Gappa & Leslie, 1993).

Parents and students are concerned that teachers without terminal degrees are teaching a majority of undergraduate classes. They are also concerned that the teachers do not have long-term commitments to the university, and they do not have time or space to meet with the students (Schneirov, 2003). There is also evidence that part-timers may use less time intensive grading options and assignments (Thompson, 2003). Adjuncts use fewer active and collaborative learning techniques, take less time to prepare for classes, have lower academic expectations of students, and have less interaction with students (Umbach, 2007). Part-time faculty at community colleges are less likely than full-time faculty to have received a teaching award, revised a course syllabus or attended a professional conference in the last three years, or prepared a multi-media presentation for a class (Leslie & Gappa, 2002). Part-time faculty are not as available to students, have less academic authority (as measured by publications), are not as active on campus, and may be more hesitant about discussing controversial issues due to their tenuous employment situation (Schuster, 2003).

Many institutions do not provide compensation for curricular design and development, reviewing program effectiveness, or advising students. When those activities become ancillary, the teaching-learning process is threatened (Elman, 2003). The author indicates that part-time faculty need to be involved in collegial and curricular activities in order to enhance the quality of education and further the institution's mission. Gappa & Leslie (1993) recommend that the academy re-examine the tenure system that subsidizes tenured faculty with part-timers who teach heavy loads at low wages. The authors suggest that bifurcating faculty into upper and lower class status impacts educational quality—not because part-time faculty provide lower quality teaching or have less teaching qualifications, but because the institutions do not provide the level of support to part-timers that promotes excellent quality.

Benjamin (2003c) indicates that asking adjuncts to attend orientation or faculty development events without compensating them will be a discouragement to attend and will not provide an avenue to build community. He suggests that the use of part-time faculty forces a decision of focusing on better pedagogy or remunerated work (Benjamin, 1998). Benjamin (2003c) posits that the bifurcated system is negatively impacting collegiality and collaboration between tenured and part-time faculty. He says that if part-timers were carefully selected based on their academic qualifications, and if they had longer-term contracts, the full-timers would be more open to forming collegial bonds and governance responsibilities with them.

The research is contradictory. There is evidence that part-time faculty are highly qualified instructors who bring practical examples and current field experience to the classroom. Many adjuncts have extensive teaching experience and take responsibility for their own professional development. There is also research that suggests that part-time faculty members' unstable work environment, lack of terminal degrees, exclusion from collegial involvement, and

limited administrative and professional development support may negatively impact educational quality. One common concern shared by many researchers is that a bifurcated faculty model does not create a collaborative environment that supports all faculty equally.

Job Satisfaction

Job satisfaction and faculty development are both key factors in retaining a high quality, committed workforce. There are benefits and challenges, opportunities and responsibilities that relate to the adjunct model. Numerous studies have been conducted to identify areas that impact adjunct faculty members' satisfaction levels. Gappa & Leslie's (1998) extensive qualitative study provided specific feedback on adjuncts' needs and concerns. Data from surveys conducted by the American Association of University Professors (2009), American Federation of Teachers (2009), ASHE Higher Education Reports (2010) as well as research conducted by various community colleges and universities provide current information regarding the areas of satisfaction and dissatisfaction of adjuncts. If universities want to keep talented part-time instructors and provide support to help them develop professionally, job satisfaction considerations must be addressed (Trower, 2010).

The literature reports that many part-time instructors feel frustrated and marginalized, however, there is a large contingent of part-time faculty who are satisfied with their work situation (Antony & Valadex, 2002; Leslie & Gappa, 2002; Hoyt, 2012). Maynard and Joseph (2008) suggest that part-time faculty report higher satisfaction ratings if they choose to work part-time compared to those who desire full-time work but are unable to secure it.

The literature does not support the prevailing thought that all part-time faculty are angry and frustrated because they do not have full-time work. According to Antony & Valadez (2002), both full-time and part-time faculty rate overall satisfaction moderately high. The authors found

that part-time faculty are more satisfied with their roles than full-time, non-tenured faculty. Even though part-time faculty are dissatisfied with certain aspects of their jobs, they are strongly committed to their academic work, and would choose an academic career again if given the choice. Part-time faculty tend to feel as satisfied as tenure-track faculty over workload, control over professional time, and balanced work life (AFT, 2009). Maynard & Joseph (2008) suggest that even though part-time employees do not receive the same social and technical support as full-time faculty, part-time faculty have a slightly higher emotional commitment to the university than their full-time colleagues. The highest satisfaction ratings overall come from voluntary, part-time faculty. The high satisfaction ratings for part-timers come from their love of teaching, interaction with students, and commitment to lifelong learning (Gappa & Leslie, 1993).

There are satisfaction differences between disciplines. Part-time faculty in vocational fields such as health and business were significantly more satisfied than part-time faculty in liberal arts fields (Benjamin, 1998). The author suggests that the liberal arts faculty are more dependent on their teaching income, benefits and job security, they have lower household income, they express a greater need to stay current in their fields, and the exams and student access time requires more uncompensated time. Vocational adjuncts generally have full-time jobs outside of academe that provide security and insurance benefits and their grading and academic duties require less out of class time, so they can be a part of the academic environment without their lifestyle being compromised by low wages and lack of benefits (Benjamin, 1998). All part-time faculty are not the same and all disciplines do not have the same concerns (Gappa, 2000).

Those who work part-time but desire full-time work are the least satisfied employees. They are particularly less satisfied in the areas of advancement, compensation, and security

(Leslie & Gappa, 2002; Maynard & Joseph, 2008). Late career adjuncts are more satisfied than early career adjuncts. The more the part-timers are involved on campus and participate in faculty development, orientation programs, departmental affairs, and institutional service the more satisfied they are (ASHE Report, 2010a).

There are some major areas of dissatisfaction among part-time faculty. Community college faculty report a high level of dissatisfaction with job security and employment benefits (Conley et al., 2002; Eagan, 2007). Low wages, lack of benefits, no support during teaching hours, and limited opportunities for advancement are consistent causes of dissatisfaction (Antony & Valadez, 2002; Benjamin, 2003c; Hoyt et al., 2008). Lack of recognition and appreciation are de-motivators (Green, 2007; Hoyt, 2012). Adjuncts report dissatisfaction with faculty support and autonomy and would like to increase their time with full-time faculty and chairs, serve on committees, and collaborate on research (Hoyt, 2012).

Milyavskaya & Koestner (2011) suggest that satisfying of the needs of autonomy, competence, and relatedness leads to feelings of well being across all domains of family, friends, relationships, school, work, and activities. They also posit that if an individual's need for autonomy, competence, and relatedness are met it positively impacts feelings of well-being and personal motivation.

Universities retain their best adjunct instructors for many years even though they are hired on a semester-by-semester basis. Administrators work to retain them through a positive work environment and development of their teaching skills. There is a significant correlation between intent to leave and dissatisfaction with pay, job security, extrinsic rewards, and available resources (Hoyt, 2012). Hoyt suggests that a satisfied and loyal workforce will stay, giving the administration incentive to provide resources and development opportunities to create a more

qualified workforce. The author reports that the significant predictors of loyalty in order of preference are work preference, honorarium, classroom facilities, autonomy, faculty support, and quality of students. The significant predictors of satisfaction in order of preference are honorarium, work preference, quality of students, faculty support, teaching schedule, collaborative research, classroom facilities, and heavy teaching load (Hoyt, 2012). Waltman et al. (2012) suggests that institutions can increase job satisfaction and commitment level by focusing on support of teaching efforts, job security and advancement measures, and creating an inclusive community.

Benjamin (2003c) is concerned that part-timers report high satisfaction with the time for class preparation and time to advise students and yet they are not paid for either and do not have offices to advise students. They also report satisfaction with time to keep current in their fields but they do not receive scholarly support. He wonders if this is an erosion of their understanding of academic responsibility. Another explanation is that adjuncts are hired to teach rather than to advise students. They may be satisfied with the advising time because they do not have responsibility to advise or conduct research, so they do not feel dissatisfied with lack of paid time. Benjamin's concerns do call the ratings into question and suggest that there is a need to look at the instruments rating satisfaction to ensure that the questions relate to adjunct job responsibilities rather than full-time faculty responsibilities.

Gappa et al. (2007) reviewed the job satisfaction research results and developed a model that incorporates five key themes that impact faculty satisfaction. The hub of the model is respect. Respect is necessary to promote personal and institutional growth. The five themes they developed are as follows:

1) Faculty are concerned about equity and are dissatisfied if they perceive that inequity exists in their workplace.

2) Faculty value collegial relationships. Positive collegial relationships directly predict satisfaction. Lack of collegial community is significantly correlated with the intent to leave academia.

3) Satisfaction is tied to professional growth. Faculty are more satisfied when they have the resources to develop professionally and have a sense of accomplishment with their work.

4) Security in the form of tenure or a long-term contract that provides life/balance flexibility is highly valued.

5) Faculty feel more satisfied when they feel supported, receive recognition for their work, and feel that their salary is an accurate reflection of the quality of their work.

This framework is a good model to use to determine if the satisfaction ratings of adjuncts differs based on their reasons for selecting or accepting part-time employment.

Respect and recognition.

An area that has a large impact on job satisfaction is the respect and recognition that faculty receive. Some adjuncts feel they are valued, established members of the collegiate community. Others feel they are marginalized and not valued (Gappa, 2000). Some adjuncts report feeling that they are not welcome, they are ignored, they are unappreciated, and not acknowledged for their efforts. They describe the way some of their department colleagues make them feel by using words like “invisible,” “belittled,” “degraded,” and “lowest of the low” (Waltman et al., 2012, p. 427). Some adjuncts mentioned that photo boards in their institutions include pictures of everyone except the part-time lecturers, and they hear phrases like they are

"just a lecturer" (Bergom &Waltman, 2009; Waltman et al., 2012, p. 428), disregarding their contributions and the relationships they have formed with students on behalf of the university.

Some adjuncts report that the lack of respect is subtle. Gappa et al. (2007) discussed an interview they conducted in which the adjunct said that the part-timers mail slots were below the full-time faculty's spots. In another interview the part-timer was invited to a new teacher reception where only the full-time teachers were introduced (Gappa et al, 2007). In the study conducted by Waltman et al. (2012) professors are considered "knowledge workers" in which their work is thinking and their output is knowledge. Feeling respected and included is a key component of job satisfaction for knowledge workers, and if the part-time faculty do not feel respected or included it is a significant indicator of job dissatisfaction.

Adjuncts report feeling frustration and anger over their perceived second-class status and lack of recognition and appreciation for their service. They feel alienated and powerless. A major area of concern is not being consulted about academic matters that involve them, not being allowed to attend meetings, or if they do attend not being allowed to vote with the faculty (Gappa, 2000; Waltman et al., 2012). Adjuncts also mention being asked to leave the room for faculty discussions or voting (Bergom & Waltman, 2009).

Because adjuncts are not a homogenous group, they need flexible reward incentives and recognition for their work. Some want recognition and collaborative work environments; others do not have those needs (Gappa & Leslie, 1993). Awards and recognition of service and teaching excellence should be provided to all deserving faculty. Showing respect and recognition for part-timer's work through public or private means will show faculty they are valued (Baldwin & Chronister, 2001; Niskode-Dossett, 2008).

Community and collegiality.

Another important area that impacts job satisfaction ratings is a sense of being a part of a collegial community. Feeling included in the academic community is one of the main reasons part-time faculty are willing to accept low wages, no benefits, and poor working conditions. Adjunct faculty want to build friendships with colleagues and have the opportunity to explore ideas, work in a collaborative environment, and be welcomed in a collegiate community (Rice et al., 2000; Cox, 2004; Block, 2009). They desire to work within a community where mutual respect and caring are foundational values, and where they feel supported by their colleagues and the institution (Hord & Sommers, 2008; Brooks, 2010). All people need to feel safe and secure, but they also need to belong and have respect from others. Faculty need to feel accepted and important otherwise they feel indifference and lose self-esteem (Manning & Curtis, 2012, Maslow, 1987).

All faculty including tenured, full-time non-tenured, and part-time must be integrated into the academic community in order for the faculty body to function effectively. A new system that does not relegate some members to second-class status and provides all members with development and governance opportunities avails the faculty body with all resources and ideas represented by the faculty. Continuing to add more faculty on the periphery of the academy and promoting a two class system does not create a collaborative, collegial environment that will provide the best the best education for students or the best work environment for the faculty (Baldwin & Chronister, 2001).

A common theme in the literature is that if the institutional disregard of adjuncts is not addressed, the intellectual, collaborative faculty community in which ideas are exchanged and programs created will be hampered (Klausman, 2010). The ASHE report (2010) indicates that

part-timers are angry and frustrated about being excluded from collegial activities and governance. Hollenshead and others (2007) report that involvement is changing with 35% of part-timers in their study having the ability to participate in the senate and 66% able to participate in departmental affairs (but may not have voting rights).

There are some strategies identified in the literature that have proven effective at creating community among faculty. Orientation programs, seminars and retreats bring faculty together and help create a sense of community (Yee, 2007). Participant perceptions of personal competence and relatedness have a positive impact on knowledge sharing in virtual communities (Yoon & Rolland, 2012).

Eddy & Garza Mitchell (2012) discuss the concept of "thinking communities," which provide opportunities for collaborative work, relationship building and an ability to bounce ideas off of colleagues to refine and support idea generation. Thinking communities develop through regular communication and interaction. Members must be willing and able to commit to the time it takes to build trust and spend time together. Technology provides virtual space for synchronous and asynchronous gathering spaces. Thinking communities can combat the isolation felt by new faculty members and enrich the collegiate environment through cooperation and collaboration. Collaborative work helps faculty retain their passion for their field and increases productivity, the knowledge base, and expands thinking through a diversity of ideas and perspectives.

Faculty learning communities (FLC) or communities of practice (CoP) serve the same purpose. The goal of all FLCs or CoPs is to bring people together to form relationships of trust and mutual respect in which the members can learn and benefit from the knowledge and expertise of the whole group. Block (2009) writes that, "Community exists for the sake of

belonging and takes its identity from the gifts, generosity, and accountability of its citizens" (p. 30). Ensuring that all faculty are integral members of the academic community is mutually beneficial.

Learning communities allow faculty to exchange ideas, form collegial relationships, learn from each other, and build on the synergy that occurs when knowledge is created (Eddy & Garza Mitchell, 2012). Brooks (2010) explains that communities build deep, personal relationships that are necessary for collaborative work environments. Eib and Miller (2006) suggest that learning communities yield, "big pay-offs in terms of providing energizing environments in which faculty feel connected and committed to each other and the goals of the organization" (p. 4).

In a learning community, members matter to each other, and the relationships that are developed improve trust among members, increase feelings of support, and form cooperative work relationships (Brooks, 2010; Petrone & Ortquist-Ahrens, 2004). Learning communities that welcome part-time faculty benefit all faculty members.

Learning communities provide an environment in which ideas can be exchanged and faculty members can receive support and professional development from interacting with colleagues. One of the goals of this study is to identify the level of satisfaction with the support adjuncts feel at their institutions, and their sense of being valued for their contributions. Faculty development needs and interests will also be explored.

Faculty Development

The future higher education will likely increase the use of part-time faculty, which will increase their impact on student learning. Most faculty are educated in their discipline, but do not have training in how to teach. They have to rely on their experience as students to inform their teaching practices (Jones, 2008). It is imperative that institutions strengthen the teaching

effectiveness of all faculty, and it is critical that adjuncts not be omitted from faculty development opportunities. They are the front line faculty who teach the majority of undergraduate, core classes and the have a large impact on overall teaching quality (Benjamin, 2003a; Elman, 2003; Gappa et al., 2007; Lyons, 2007).

There is a strong call for increased attention to professional development for part-time faculty, but there needs to be a deliberate effort to design development opportunities for part-timers. Issues that must be considered when designing development programs are adjunct diversity in experience and disciplines, other job obligations during the daytime hours, complex logistics of offering appropriate training when adjuncts can and will attend, turnover, decentralized hiring that makes it difficult to keep a current roster, and economic challenges (Kezar, 2012; Lyons, 2007; Yee, 2007). Unless institutions address the professional development needs of adjuncts there will be no improvements in the adjunct's ability to meet student's needs or be better prepared to teach their classes (Bedford & Miller, 2013; Umbach, 2007). In many cases, part-time faculty are not even eligible for development programs, grants, support for conferences, or awards and distinctions in their disciplines (Nutting, 2003). Currently if an adjunct instructor's instruction is judged to be unsatisfactory, he/she is easily replaced. The teaching contract simply is not renewed. Leslie and Gappa (2002) posit that institutions treat adjuncts like replaceable parts and that all constituents would be better served if institutions invest in their capabilities. Part-timers are very focused on teaching effectiveness because they realize that their job depends on their teaching skills (Schuster, 2003).

Mentorship programs can positively impact the learning environment for students and can be a place where adjuncts receive guidance on how to improve their practice, socialize with full-time faculty, and build academic community connections (Kezar, 2012; Niskide-Dossett,

2008). Hunti, Rhodes, Allison and Lauterbach (2007) discuss that part-time instructors are not often involved in mentoring programs, so they do not have the benefit of receiving recognition for their efforts or gaining direction from experienced educators. New adjunct faculty have many things to learn and challenges to overcome including teaching at remote times and feelings of isolation. A mentorship program can provide resource to them (Zutter, 2007). MacEwam College in Alberta, Canada, instituted a mentorship program that provides customized faculty development. Some beneficial results of their program are a sense connection, collegiality, and team building among faculty. Researchers report that the program also provides a vehicle to create deeper learning for students. Ninety-five percent of the adjunct mentees say the program is extremely worthwhile and they benefit from improved instructional skills (Zutter, 2007).

Access to professional development opportunities contributes to productivity, improved morale, creativity, and shows that faculty are valued by the institution. Part-time faculty who are not included or compensated for their time sense that they are not valuable contributing professionals and are not worthy of resources. It confirms to them that they hold second-class status (Baldwin & Chronister, 2001; Bergom & Waltman, 2009; Gappa et al., 2007). Part-time faculty can be as effective as full-time tenured faculty in achieving established learning objectives if the part-timers receive faculty development support (Gappa & Leslie, 1993; Reichard, 2003). The areas that consistently surface in the literature as being priorities for professional development are teaching effectiveness training, mentorship, community building and recognition. Leaders are recognizing that comprehensive, strategic faculty development efforts positively impacts student learning and retention, and addresses expectations of accrediting bodies and other stakeholders (Lyons, 2007).

Flexible options for part-time faculty development such as online and face-to-face resources, full-day retreats, and late afternoon or early evening sessions with a light meal, a stipend and a certificate of completion are recommended (Lyons, 2007). The authors in Lyons' compendium suggest brown-bag options, orientation sessions, and cross-disciplinary mentoring programs. They also recommend programs in which adjuncts who have completed training regimens be recognized through pay increases, rank-advancement, and utilization of their expertise in future training. Valencia Community College created an online faculty development program that includes collaborative work projects. One hundred percent of the participants report that they made changes to their syllabi, incorporated active or collaborative learning strategies into their courses, and included more interactive development discussions in class as a result of the program. When part-timers complete the program they receive a pay increase and status change. Adjuncts at VCC report that they feel more connected to the academic community (Peterson, 2007).

University of Central Florida has a three-level approach to faculty development. They have ongoing one-hour seminars in the late afternoon and evening so all faculty can attend, daylong face-to-face retreats, and online training courses. At UCF they have found that although the adjunct faculty state that they have different development needs than their full-time colleagues, their needs are similar to full-time faculty so customization may not be necessary (Yee, 2007).

College of the Canyons in California has developed a program for adjuncts that focuses on a variety of challenges. They address the lack of: connection and commitment to the institution, interaction between part-time and full-time faculty, professional development opportunities, and the lack of incentives to pursue professional development. When adjuncts

complete the program they gain associate status and receive a pay raise (Richardson, 2007). Bergom and Waltman (2009) suggest that part-time employees want to focus on teaching skills, professional growth, and respectful community. The authors recommend that institutions assist adjuncts by providing funding to present at conferences, offer eligibility for awards and grants, extend invitations and compensation for participating in meetings, and create opportunities to advise students and serve on thesis committees. Research indicates that one way to help part-timers feel valued is to provide customized professional development targeted to their needs (Hutti et al., 2007).

Conclusion

On the one hand, part-time faculty have real concerns about wages, benefits, job security, rank and advancement policies, faculty development opportunities, and the ability to be fully integrated into the academic community. On the other hand, a majority of adjunct faculty are working part-time by choice. Some are retired and want to give back and stay connected to the academic community. Others are specialists with full-time employment and enjoy being a part of academe as well as augmenting their income. Some are choosing part-time work in order to be available to care for children or family members, or to have the flexibility to pursue multiple professional opportunities. And there are also a fair percentage that would like to move into a full-time academic career.

This literature review reveals that the adjunct community is not a homogenous group with similar needs, concerns, or joys related to their academic employment. The typology created by Gappa and Leslie in 1993 is still in use today, and is a useful model to categorize the needs of adjunct faculty. Most satisfaction ratings look at the adjunct community as a homogenous group, which is not the case. Looking at satisfaction ratings based on typology is a

better way to determine if differences exist that can be attributed to motivation for engaging in part-time work. This study explores those questions to determine differences and similarities across adjunct categories.

Chapter 3

Research methodology

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to determine if job satisfaction levels differ based on adjunct typology or university affiliation, and ascertain professional development interests including scheduling preferences for adjunct faculty. Gappa and Leslie's (1993) typology was used as the model to identify the reasons that adjunct faculty choose part-time work. Because adjunct faculty make up the majority of instructors in higher educational institutions, the needs and interests of the adjunct community have a significant impact on the higher educational system.

Setting

Three private liberal arts universities participated in this study. They are all located in or near Portland, Oregon. They are all faith-based institutions.

Institution A is a Quaker university in a rural community outside of the Portland, Oregon metropolitan area. According to an e-mail correspondence with a university Human Resource representative on September 15, 2014, this university enrolls 2,115 undergraduate students, 269 degree-completion students, and 1,328 graduate students totaling 3,712 students. It caters to traditional residential students, adult degree-completion, and commuter/online students. It employs 220 full-time and 442 adjunct faculty.

Institution B is a Catholic, commuter/online university in a suburb of Portland, Oregon, and it caters to adult students. According to the university website on October 27, 2014, there are 746 undergraduate and 667 graduate students totaling 1,413 students. There are 54 full-time faculty and 426 adjunct faculty teaching at this university.

Institution C is a Church of God college in the city of Portland, Oregon. According to a conversation with a university assessment officer on August 25, 2014, the university enrolls 1,360 undergraduates and 220 graduate students, totaling 1,580 students. It caters to traditional residential students, adult degree-completion, and commuter/online students. It employs 32 full-time and 100 adjunct faculty.

All three universities employ adjunct faculty to teach undergraduate and graduate courses, teaching in face-to-face, hybrid, and online environments.

Participants and Sampling Strategy

This study used a sample survey research design setting because it encompassed a portion of the total adjunct population employed in the three universities (Miller, 1991). This choice was made because sample surveys can be used to assess "preferences, attitudes, practices, concerns, or interests of a group of people" rather than surveying the whole population (Gay, Mills, & Airasian, 2012). Seymore Sudman (1976) recommends that there be a minimum of 100 participants in the sample. Paul Spector (1992) suggests that when using a summated rating scale, the sample size should be about 100 to 200 respondents. The results from the pilot test were used to calculate the sample size needed to be 98% confident that the sample results would not differ from the total population results by more than five percent. The following formula, $n = 0.25((z\ \alpha/2)/E)^2$ (PhStat4. Retrieved from http://wps.aw.com/phstat/), was used to determine the confidence rating. In order to obtain a 98% confidence rating, a sample size of 543 was needed. The actual sample size was 763.

The participants in this sample survey were adjunct faculty who were employed less than full-time as non-tenure-track instructors. Adjunct faculty are instructors who are hired on a semester-by-semester basis with no long-term employment contract or benefits packages. All

adjuncts who taught at least one class in 2014 and did not have an ongoing teaching or administrative employment contract with the institution were identified and asked to participate. Responses from faculty who had full-time or part-time teaching or administrative contracts at the participating institution and taught as adjuncts at the same university were not included in this study due to the assumption of institutional commitment level differences, community involvement opportunity differences, and resource and facilities availability differences. The results from the faculty who hold employment contracts were not combined with the adjuncts who did not have employment contracts at the institutions. Both online and campus-based faculty were included.

This sample was limited to those eligible adjuncts teaching at the selected institutions who were available and willing to participate. Because the sample represented a portion of the adjunct population, and criteria for the sample were identified, a purposive sample was used (Gay et al., 2012; Miller, 1991). A purposive sample uses non-probability sampling, so the findings are not generalizable to the whole adjunct population (Gay et al., 2012). However, the results will inform the participating universities of some of the needs of their adjunct population, and may provide useful information to institutions that are similar to the sample universities.

The universities provided the list of current adjunct faculty who met the study's criteria along with their academic e-mails. Although using the academic e-mails may have had an impact on the response rate, universities generally contact part-time faculty through academic e-mail when communicating university business. Some adjuncts do not look at their university e-mails in a term/semester in which they are not teaching. Those adjuncts who taught in 2014, but were not teaching during the winter 2015 term/semester may not have been aware of the survey which impacted the response rate. Even so, the response rate was 33%.

Research Design, Data Collection, and Analytical Procedures

Data Collection Instrument

The selected instrument for this study was an online survey utilizing Survey Monkey (see Appendix A). The reason for this selection was that the sample size was large and a survey was cost-effective, it enabled the inclusion of faculty who are in the local area and abroad, and it allowed for participants to consider their answers in a private setting (Miller, 1991). The survey was an appropriate instrument to ask the same set of questions to a large sample in order to obtain their opinions and attitudes, and to compare relationships between more than two variables (Peer, Hakemulder, & Zyngier, 2012; Miller, 1991). A weakness of this choice is that surveys have a lower response rate than personal interviews, and the sample was limited to those who chose to complete the survey (Miller, 1991).

The data collection instrument had five parts. The first two sections gathered general information. The first portion was an informed consent document that had to be acknowledged and accepted by the participant in order to continue with the survey. If the participant did not provide informed consent, Survey Monkey routed him/her to the final "thank you" page. The second section collected demographic data and asked the participants to select the adjunct typology with which they most closely identified. This format was consistent with Peer et al.'s (2012) recommendation that instruments start with general questions and move to more complex questions.

The third section of the instrument was a survey developed by Hoyt, Howell, and Eggett (2007) and revised in 2012 (Hoyt, 2012) to examine job satisfaction of part-time faculty. The authors conducted a research study with the intent of developing a survey that was valid and reliable for assessing job satisfaction levels specific to the adjunct faculty community (Eggett,

2007). The original instrument (Hoyt et al., 2007) and the revised instrument (Hoyt, 2012) used Cronbach's alpha tests to validate internal consistency for the subscales. Some items were dropped from the subscales in order to maintain Spector's (1992) recommended 0.70 Cronbach's alpha value. One subscale, work preference, produced an alpha value of 0.65 but was retained because it was very close to the 0.70 alpha value guideline. A factor analysis was conducted on the survey subscales and all except five questions had factor loadings in the good to excellent range (0.55 or higher), four questions fell in the fair range (0.45 - 0.54) and one question fell slightly below the poor range (below 0.45) according to image analysis. Hoyt (2012) reported that the overall findings showed the instrument to possess internal consistency and validity. A regression analysis was conducted to determine if the job satisfaction subscales were significant predictors of satisfaction levels. Extreme outliers were eliminated and excluded from the factor analysis. The regression analysis supported the use of the subscale questions as predictors of job satisfaction.

Hoyt et al. (2008) suggest that there are limited peer-reviewed studies that focus on job satisfaction of adjunct faculty, and many of those studies utilize single questions for each job satisfaction construct. According to Velicer and Fava (1998), a minimum of three variables per factor is necessary to obtain valid and reliable results. The revised instrument that was utilized in section three of this study utilized three questions per subscale (Hoyt, 2012). Surveys that are designed for full-time faculty are worded in ways that do not fit adjunct's experiences, and many questions such as tenure, grants and advising responsibilities are not applicable to adjunct faculty (Hoyt, et al., 2008).

The job satisfaction section of the survey utilized Herzberg's Two-Factor Theory, which divides job satisfaction into hygiene factors, "policy and administration, supervision,

interpersonal relationships, working conditions, salary, status, and security" (Herzberg, 1968, p. 57), and motivator factors, "achievement, recognition for achievement, the work itself, responsibility, and growth or advancement" (Herzberg, 1968, p. 57). Hoyt et al. (2008) utilized Herzberg's factors to develop some of the questions, they developed some questions themselves, and they also modified questions from existing instruments to design their survey (Eggett, 2007).

The survey included a 6-point Likert-type summated rating scale, and included several negatively worded questions to address acquiescence tendencies (Eggett, 2007). The negatively worded questions were reverse scored to ensure that the mean score was consistent with the other scoring (Peer et al., 2012). The weakness of using a summated scale as an interval measurement is that the intervals between the descriptive scale values may differ in intensity, so they may not be equally distant from each other (Jamieson, 2004). Even though the Likert scale is an ordinal scale, "in practice it is treated as an interval scale" (Peer et al., 2012, p. 114). A summated scale is ordinal in nature, however in practice it "has become common practice to assume that Likert-type categories constitute interval-level measurement" (Jamieson, 2004). The summated scale for this study was considered continuous, and the results were analyzed as interval data based on its common use in educational settings. According to Arlene Fink (2013), "if the surveyor decides to regard the scale as continuous, then means and standard deviations are appropriate statistics" (p. 45).

The Hoyt et al. (2007) survey was pilot tested with part-time faculty in July of 2007 and administered in August of 2007 to part-time faculty at Brigham Young University. Hoyt (2012) revised the instrument by adding two subscales—loyalty and personal growth, more narrowly defining the recognition subscale, changing some of the questions, and balancing the instrument by including three questions per subscale. The instrument that was used in this study is the

revised instrument that was designed and tested using Cronbach's alpha, factor analysis, and regression analysis. The instrument included three questions for each of the categories listed in the following table.

Table 1

Job satisfaction categories

Category	Cronbach's alpha value
Overall job satisfaction	0.78
Loyalty	0.74
Recognition	0.82
Work preferences	0.65
Autonomy	0.73
Classroom facilities	0.80
Faculty support	0.77
Honorarium	0.89
Quality of students	0.79
Personal growth	0.72
Teaching schedule	0.82

Utilizing three questions for each subscale meets the requirement of at least three variables per factor (Velicer & Fava, 1998).

The forth and fifth sections of the survey included questions on professional development interests and scheduling preferences to determine the best time to offer professional development opportunities for part-time faculty. The survey instrument selected for these sections was

designed to assess the faculty development needs of adjunct faculty at Clark Community College in Las Vegas, Nevada (Pedras, 1982). The survey was selected for this study because it was designed specifically for adjunct faculty, and the designers addressed content validity by conducting an extensive review of existing faculty development surveys to ensure that the questions represented the major faculty development interests of adjunct faculty (Borg & Gall, 1989). Another benefit of this instrument was that it contained a Likert-type scale, which allowed the participants to give more precise, summated responses to the questions providing an index of interests and scheduling preferences rather than simple pro or con responses (Alreck, & Settle, 1995; Light, Singer, & Willett, 1990). Pedras (1982) based the design of the instrument on a thorough literature review and compilation of questions and categories that were consistently used in other surveys. An advisory committee consisting of administrators, full-time faculty, and part-time faculty reviewed the instrument. After making suggested modifications the instrument was pilot tested by a representative sample population. The final copy incorporated all recommended changes from the pilot test participants (Pedras, 1982).

Research Design

This study's sample population and application were similar to the samples of both selected instruments included in sections three, four, and five of this survey, which means that measurement quality was maintained (Light, Singer, & Willett, 1990). Even though a pilot test was not required to verify the construct validity of this instrument, the five-part survey was pilot tested with a sample of five adjunct faculty members, four adjunct faculty/administrators, and one editor in order to verify the construct validity of this instrument to the selected sample in this study (Borg & Gall, 1989; Light, Singer, & Willett, 1990). The pilot test also examined if the survey was easy to follow, if it ran smoothly in the online format, and if the questions were

clearly worded (Fink, 2003). The pilot group took the online, Survey Monkey survey and provided feedback about ease of use, completion time, and clarity. The pilot members also provided feedback on suggested modifications, which were incorporated into the final instrument.

According to Miller (1991) a known sponsor who informs participants that he/she supports the research increases the likelihood of participation. Prior to distributing the survey, the institutional Provost or Dean contacted his/her adjunct faculty to let them know that the survey was forthcoming. The communication included a brief description of the purpose of the survey and requested their participation. One week later the online survey was sent to all adjunct faculty at the participating institutions who had taught one or more courses in 2014 and were not otherwise employed by that institution. At the start of the survey, participants were asked to provide informed consent before they were able to complete the survey (see Appendix C). Participants had 16 days to complete the survey online. One week after the survey was distributed, a reminder memo was sent to participants who had not yet completed the survey to remind them of the pending deadline. This had the potential of increasing the return rate (Monroe & Adams, 2012). The day before the survey closed, a second reminder memo was sent to those who had not yet completed the survey.

Analytical Procedures

When the data collection process was complete, the data were analyzed using EXCEL and Megastat. The primary null hypothesis for this study was that there is no difference in job satisfaction ratings among adjunct types. For the secondary question, the null hypothesis was that there are no job satisfaction differences among universities. The independent variables were adjunct types and university affiliation. The dependent variable was job satisfaction ratings. The overall data were examined in aggregate, data for each adjunct typology were evaluated, and data

from each school were reviewed independently. Frequency distributions were completed on the demographic data to determine the variety and frequency of responses (Tanner, 2012). When examining the dependent variable, job satisfaction, distributions within groups and comparisons of more than two groups were analyzed to determine if responses were significantly different. Thus, multiple analysis of variance (ANOVA) tests were used to analyze the data sets (Peer et al., 2012). To evaluate professional development interests including scheduling preferences, measures of central tendency were utilized to determine the means and standard deviations of the rating scores.

Analysis of variance tests were conducted to examine if satisfaction ratings by subscale (overall job satisfaction, loyalty, recognition, work preferences, autonomy, classroom facilities, faculty support, honorarium, quality of students, personal growth, and teaching schedule) differed based on adjunct type. Separate ANOVAs were conducted to analyze if job satisfaction ratings by subscale differed by university affiliation. Because ANOVA tests reveal if there are differences between variables but the results do not identify where the differences occur, Tukey's HSD post hoc tests were conducted in each situation in which the ANOVA uncovered significant differences between variables in order to determine where the differences occurred (Tanner, 2012). Professional development interests and scheduling preferences data were examined by calculating the mean and standard deviation of the scores for each question and comparing the results for all questions to determine interest level.

Research Ethics

In the initial communication from the departments to the part-time faculty, an overview of the research and purpose statement were provided. The adjuncts were notified that participation was voluntary, and they would be asked to provide informed consent at the start of

the survey. The first section of the survey was a letter of informed consent (see Appendix C). Participants were required to read the letter and agree to participate. The informed consent letter provided privacy information, included the researcher's name and contact information, and listed the IRB contact information. If the participants did not provide their consent, the Survey Monkey program transferred them to the final "thank you" page, and they were not able to participate in the survey.

The results of this survey have been published in an aggregate form to ensure that no specific responses can be traced to an individual. General demographic data were collected such as gender, colleges(s) for which the adjunct teaches (Undergraduate-Arts and Sciences, Undergraduate-Professional, and Graduate), highest academic degree, and years teaching as an adjunct. Names, department affiliation and other specific identifying information was not requested. The results were reported as an aggregate whole, by university, or by adjunct typology. No individual responses were presented, and no individual comments were included in the report.

The survey data were retrieved electronically and stored in an electronic file. SurveyMonkey was used as the survey provider. Participants were instructed to access the survey through a unique web link provided on their invitation letter. No passwords were required. SurveyMonkey collects responses through secure, SSL/TLS encrypted connections, which protect communication through server authentication and data encryption. This ensures that the transit of data is only available to the intended researcher. SurveyMonkey utilizes third party security scans, a firewall, and security patches to mitigate vulnerabilities.

Although e-mail identifiers were used to collect the data, and the responses could be traced to an individual, the researcher is the only person with access to the data. All the data were

taken from the results analysis section of the SurveyMonkey. Those results are reported in aggregate form without email identifiers.

Data as stored on the survey will be deleted after seven years. The EXCEL data set, which does not contain individual e-mail addresses or any other identifiers, will not be destroyed.

Role of Researcher

The researcher held two roles in this study. The first role was that of a doctoral student. This research study was used to complete a dissertation. The second role was that of an adjunct faculty member. The researcher has been teaching as an adjunct instructor for over 20 years, and is currently teaching at one of the participating universities. She also serves on the Faculty Senate at one of the universities. These research data will be used to inform the participating universities of job satisfaction ratings and professional development opportunities for adjunct faculty in their universities. It will also provide some aggregate comparison data as an overview of the research study.

Potential Contributions of the Research

The adjunct community is viewed as a homogenous group. Professional development programs and efforts to improve satisfaction levels of the part-time community are not customized to the unique needs of the various types of adjuncts. This research categorizes satisfaction levels by typology, which is a new way to consider the needs and interests of part-time faculty. The research results may have a practical application as well. Because the study reveals that different types of adjuncts have unique needs, the results may inform university administrators and managing faculty of the need to customize working condition improvements. The findings may also supply information on which areas to focus time and energy to increase part-time faculty's satisfaction levels and address their professional development needs.

Chapter Four

Results

Introduction

Part-time faculty are teaching a majority of the undergraduate classes at many institutions. Because they have such a great impact on the quality of education, it is important to determine the distinct needs and satisfaction levels of adjunct faculty in order to provide appropriate teaching resources and development opportunities for them. Better development of and support for part-time faculty can enable higher educational institutions to offer the best possible educational experience for students, and maintain commitment to the institutional mission. This study added to the literature by determining if job satisfaction levels differed based on adjunct typology or university affiliation. The research also explored professional development interests including scheduling preferences of the adjunct community.

Statement of the Problem

The purpose of this study was three-fold. First, to determine if job satisfaction levels differed based on adjunct typology. Second, to ascertain professional development interests and scheduling preferences of adjunct faculty. Third, to explore if job satisfaction levels differed based on university affiliation. A survey was conducted with adjunct faculty at three liberal arts universities to discern job satisfaction levels and professional development interests. The study differentiated results based on adjunct type using Gappa and Leslie's (1993) adjunct typology. A secondary objective of this research was to discover if using the typology would provide data that could inform institutions of the distinct needs of their part-time population.

Primary Research Questions

1) What are overall adjunct faculty job satisfaction levels?

2) What are the unique job satisfaction ratings for each type of adjunct?

3) What are the professional development interests of adjunct faculty?

Secondary Question

4) What are the differences in faculty typology distinctions, job satisfaction levels, and professional development interests among participating institutions?

Sample Demographics

The sample for this study included 763 adjunct and part-time faculty at three higher education institutions. The response rate for this survey was 33%, 253 respondents. Twenty-five people started to take the survey but did not complete it. Some of those respondents sent messages stating that they were laboratory assistants or they observed student teachers, so they did not feel that the survey was appropriate for their situations.

One of the limiting criteria for participation in this study was that the adjunct could not have a contract for other work in the institution while teaching as an adjunct. Thirty-six respondents indicated that they did have a contract with the institution, so their responses were segregated bringing the total sample to 217. Only responses from participants who indicated that they had no contract were included in the results section.

Demographic Distribution

Participants were asked to provide demographic data in the survey. There was an even gender distribution, almost a 50/50 split between male and female participants. The age distribution was fairly even as well. The majority of participants hold a MA/MS or Masters degree + 40. Eighty-eight percent of the participants teach on-campus or in a hybrid/blended format, which means they can get to campus on occasion. The survey sample demographics are outlined in Table 2.

Table 2

Demographic Data

Demographic Category	*n*	%
Gender		
Female	109	50
Male	108	50
Age		
35 and under	41	19
36-45	50	23
46-55	44	20
56-65	50	23
66 and over	32	15
Institutional Affiliation		
A	113	52
B	60	28
C	44	20
Years taught as an adjunct in Higher Education		
0-3	77	35
4-7	54	25
8-11	38	18
12+	48	22

Demographic Category	*n*	%
Years taught at the participating institution		
0-3	105	48
4-7	58	27
8-11	29	13
12+	25	12
Highest degree received		
BA/BS	18	8
MA/MS	80	
Master degree +40	64	29
Ph.D./Ed./D.	41	19
Professional Degree/J.D.	14	6
Primary College in which participant teaches		
Undergraduate-Arts, Sciences, Humanities	94	43
Undergraduate-Professional	55	25
Graduate	68	31
Primary modality in which participant teaches		
On-campus only	120	55
Online only	26	12
Hybrid/Blended	71	33

Note. Undergraduate-Arts, Sciences, Humanities includes English, Communications, Science, Religion, and Arts. Undergraduate-Professional includes Business, Nursing, and Education.

Participants were asked to identify the typology with which they most closely identified. There are more specialists (44%) than any other type in this sample. Freelancers (24%) have the second highest percentage of participants. Forty-one participants added additional written comments in this section. Many individuals said they would like full-time work, but have been unable to find it. Others mentioned that they identified with two or more of the options, but selected the one that fit the closest. One participant did not select a typology, because he/she did not find one type that fit his/her circumstances. Table 3 outlines the typology distribution for the respondents.

Table 3

Adjunct Typology

Adjunct typology	*n*	%
Career-ender	35	16
Specialist or Expert	96	44
Aspiring academic	34	16
Freelancer	51	24
Total	216	

Table 4 shows the demographic data based on adjunct typology. The numbers listed in the table describe the percentages of participants within the individual typologies rather than comparisons among typologies. There are some distinct differences in the typologies that will be outlined in this narrative.

- There were more male (56%) than female (33%) specialists, and there were double the female (21%) compared to male (10%) aspiring academics. There was an even greater disparity between the female (33%) and the male (14%) freelancers.
- Over 53% of the specialists were in the 36 - 55 age range, while freelancers were fairly evenly distributed in the three categories under age 55. Slightly less than 53% of aspiring academics were under age 45, and there were 26% in the 56-65-age range.
- Seventy-seven percent of career-enders and 73% of aspiring academics have been teaching as an adjunct for more than 4 years. Forty-five percent of specialists have been teaching for three years or less.
- Seventy three percent of the aspiring academics have a MA/MS + 40 or Ph.D./Ed.D., and 82% of freelancers have a MA/MS or MA/MS + 40 degree.
- Seventy-eight percent of freelancers teach undergraduate courses compared to 63 - 67% for the other typologies.
- Twenty-four percent of aspiring academics teach online only compared to 9 - 11% for the other typologies.

Table 4

Demographic data by Typology

	Career-enders		Specialists		Aspiring academics		Freelancers	
Descriptor	*n*	(%)	*n*	(%)	*n*	(%)	*n*	(%)
Gender								
Female	14	(40)	36	(37)	23	(68)	36	(71)
Male	21	(60)	60	(63)	11	(32)	15	(29)

Descriptor		*n*	(%)	*n*	(%)	*n*	(%)	*n*	(%)
Age									
	35 and under	0	(0)	19	(20)	10	(29)	12	(24)
	36-45	0	(0)	28	(29)	8	(24)	14	(27)
	46-55	4	(11)	23	(24)	6	(18)	11	(22)
	56-65	11	(31)	21	(22)	9	(26)	9	(18)
	66+	20	(57)	5	(5)	1	(3)	5	(10)
Years teaching									
	0-3 years	8	(23)	43	(45)	9	(26)	17	(33)
	8+ years	21	(60)	34	(35)	14	(41)	17	(33)
Degree									
	BA/BS	2	(6)	13	(14)	0	(0)	3	(6)
	MA/MS	11	(31)	35	(36)	8	(24)	26	(51)
	Masters +40	13	(37)	21	(22)	14	(41)	16	(31)
	Doctorate	6	(17)	18	(19)	11	(32)	5	(10)
	Professional degree	3	(9)	9	(9)	1	(3)	1	(2)
Undergraduate or graduate									
	UG	22	(63)	64	(67)	22	(65)	40	(78)
	G	13	(37)	32	(33)	12	(35)	11	(22)
Teaching modality									
	On-campus only	16	(46)	58	(60)	17	(50)	28	(55)
	Online only	4	(11)	9	(9)	8	(24)	5	(10)
	Hybrid	15	(43)	29	(30)	9	(26)	18	(35)

Table 5 presents the breakdown of adjunct typologies by institution. The sample size and percentages in Table 5 represent the specific population at each university. There is a fairly consistent distribution among the three institutions. All three have strong specialist and freelancer adjunct populations. Institution A has the largest student population of the three universities and has the largest sample size. It also has the lowest percentage of aspiring academics. Twenty eight percent of the sample at Institution A have doctorate or professional degrees. Institution C had a slightly higher percentage of aspiring academics; fourteen percent of participants hold doctorate or professional degrees. Thirty percent of Institution B's adjunct participants hold a doctorate or professional degree, and it has the highest percentage of aspiring academics. These findings will be considered when reviewing the job satisfaction by institution ANOVA results in the following section.

Table 5

Adjunct Typology by Institution

	Institution A		Institution B		Institution C	
Adjunct typology	*n*	(%)	*n*	(%)	*n*	(%)
Career-ender	20	(18)	10	(17)	5	(11)
Specialist	52	(46)	25	(42)	19	(43)
Aspiring academic	15	(13)	12	(20)	7	(16)
Freelancer	26	(23)	12	(20)	13	(30)
Total	113		59		44	

Table 6 lists demographic information for the sample by institution. There are some interesting data that are noteworthy in this table. Three percent of Institution B's adjuncts are age 35 and under compared to 26% and 23% in the other two institutions. Institution B also has a larger percentage of adjunct faculty who have taught for eight or more years, and who teach online courses only. Institution C has a different ratio of undergraduate and graduate courses than the other two institutions. The data on Table 6 will be used to help interpret differences in job satisfaction ratings by institution.

Table 6

Demographic Data by Institution

		Institution A		Institution B		Institution C	
Descriptor		*n*	(%)	*n*	(%)	*n*	(%)
Gender							
	Female	57	(50)	33	(55)	19	(43)
	Male	56	(50)	27	(45)	25	(57)
Age							
	35 and under	29	(26)	2	(3)	10	(23)
	36-45	24	(21)	13	(22)	13	(30)
	46-55	25	(22)	13	(22)	6	(14)
	56-65	22	(19)	17	(28)	11	(25)
	66 +	13	(11)	15	(25)	4	(9)
Years teaching							
	0 – 3 years	53	(47)	10	(17)	14	(32)

Descriptor		*n*	(%)	*n*	(%)	*n*	(%)
	8+ years	37	(33)	36	(60)	13	(30)
Degree							
	MA/MS	44	(39)	17	(28)	19	(43)
	Masters +40	25	(22)	22	(37)	17	(39)
	Doctorate	22	(19)	14	(23)	5	(11)
Undergraduate or graduate							
	UG	74	(65)	34	(57)	41	(93)
	G	39	(35)	26	(43)	3	(7)
Teaching modality							
	On-campus only	75	(66)	15	(25)	30	(68)
	Online only	8	(7)	18	(30)	0	(0)
	Hybrid	30	(27)	27	(45)	14	(32)

Job Satisfaction

Typology Comparisons

The job satisfaction section of the survey was designed utilizing a six point Likert-type scale: (1) strongly disagree, (2) disagree, (3) somewhat disagree, (4) somewhat agree, (5) agree, and (6) strongly agree. Negatively worded questions were reverse scored and weighted averages were used to determine the mean. The lowest rating was for honorarium, which relates to compensation satisfaction. The recognition category received the next lowest rating, which indicates that adjuncts somewhat agree that they are satisfied with the level of recognition they

receive. Only the Work preferences category received ratings between agree and strongly agree. Table 7 depicts the category means and standard deviations for the total sample.

Table 7

Total Job satisfaction ratings by category

Category	*M*	*SD*
Overall job satisfaction	4.04	0.648
Recognition	3.56	0.663
Work preferences	5.16	0.443
Autonomy	4.31	0.504
Classroom facilities	4.33	0.839
Faculty support	4.57	0.331
Honorarium	3.02	0.501
Teaching schedule	4.79	0.196
Loyalty	4.95	0.324
Quality of students	4.41	0.214
Personal growth	4.76	0.298
Total *M*	4.35	

Table 8 shows the job satisfaction means and standard deviations by category for each participating institution. Institution B had the lowest satisfaction ratings on overall job satisfaction and honorarium. Institution C's participants had a higher percentage of MA/MS than

the other institutions, and had six more males than females. Institution C had a noticeably lower rating on autonomy.

Table 8

Job satisfaction category ratings by institution

	Institution A		Institution B		Institution C	
Category	*M*	(*SD*)	*M*	(*SD*)	*M*	(*SD*)
Overall job satisfaction	4.28	(0.366)	3.78	(0.377)	4.12	(0.421)
Recognition	4.12	(0.417)	3.95	(0.496)	3.98	(0.522)
Work preferences	5.15	(0.502)	5.13	(0.411)	5.02	(0.418)
Autonomy	4.55	(0.521)	4.54	(0.444)	3.67	(0.654)
Classroom facilities	4.35	(0.967)	4.62	(0.991)	4.09	(0.954)
Faculty support	4.69	(0.075)	4.72	(0.205)	4.17	(0.162)
Honorarium	3.20	(0.152)	2.75	(0.103)	3.58	(0.012)
Teaching schedule	4.73	(0.130)	5.00	(0.139)	4.93	(0.020)
Loyalty	5.04	(0.227)	4.93	(0.340)	4.83	(0.104)
Quality of students	4.50	(0.090)	4.61	(0.289)	4.24	(0.212)
Personal growth	4.71	(0.315)	4.73	(0.248)	4.68	(0.307)
Total *M*	4.46		4.43		4.30	

Table 9 outlines the mean scores of each job satisfaction category by adjunct typology. This table highlights the low satisfaction ratings that aspiring academics gave to overall job satisfaction and honorarium, and the slightly higher rating given to the amount of personal

growth they pursued in the last year. The freelancers rated work preferences and faculty support slightly lower than the other types.

Table 9

Job satisfaction category ratings by adjunct typology

	Career-enders		Specialists		Aspiring academics		Freelancers	
Category	*M*	*(SD)*	*M*	*(SD)*	*M*	*(SD)*	*M*	*(SD)*
Overall job satisfaction	4.61	(0.421)	4.48	(0.298)	3.33	(0.409)	3.75	(0.466)
Recognition	3.60	(0.550)	3.72	(1.043)	3.42	(0.736)	3.51	(0.640)
Work preferences	5.37	(0.283)	5.10	(0.515)	5.33	(0.476)	4.85	(0.501)
Autonomy	3.9	(0.341)	4.46	(0.580)	4.60	(0.476)	4.29	(0.560)
Classroom facilities	4.29	(0.898)	4.34	(1.026)	4.11	(1.069)	4.56	(0.847)
Faculty support	4.93	(0.248)	4.73	(0.066)	4.41	(0.246)	4.21	(0.121)
Honorarium	3.24	(0.290)	3.45	(0.140)	2.25	(0.125)	3.14	(0.053)
Teaching Schedule	4.83	(0.217)	4.97	(0.090)	4.57	(0.154)	4.80	(0.063)
Loyalty	5.21	(0.362)	5.04	(0.201)	4.70	(0.388)	4.86	(0.185)
Quality of students	4.32	(0.266)	4.64	(0.170)	4.33	(0.079)	4.33	(0.185)
Personal growth	4.68	(0.282)	4.56	(0.345)	5.03	(0.261)	4.78	(0.208)
Total *M*	4.45		4.50		4.19		4.28	

Multiple ANOVA calculations were conducted to determine if there were any significant differences in the mean scores of job satisfaction categories based on adjunct typology. Table 10

presents the results of one factor ANOVAs comparing the differences by adjunct typology for each job satisfaction category.

Table 10

Job satisfaction category by adjunct typology

Job satisfaction category	Type III sum of squares	*df*	Mean square	*F*	Sig.
Overall	3.317	3	1.105	6.80	**0.0136**
Recognition	0.147	3	0.049	0.08	0.967
Work performance	0.510	3	0.170	0.83	0.516
Autonomy	0.811	3	0.270	1.09	0.408
Room facilities	0.299	3	0.100	0.11	0.953
Faculty support	0.921	3	0.307	8.70	**0.007**
Honorarium	2.522	3	0.841	27.47	**0.0001**
Teaching schedule	0.256	3	0.085	4.12	**0.049**
Loyalty	0.439	3	0.146	1.64	0.256
Student quality	0.223	3	0.074	2.11	0.177
Personal growth	0.357	3	0.119	1.53	0.279

Note. Significant findings, $p < 0.05$, are in boldface.

There were four job satisfaction categories that produced significant differences among adjunct types: overall, faculty support, honorarium, and teaching schedule. The questions included in each category are listed below. The questions followed by an asterisk were reversed scored.

Overall:

Considering everything, I have an excellent job as an adjunct faculty member.

I am dissatisfied with aspects of my job as an adjunct faculty member.*

I am completely satisfied with my job teaching as an adjunct faculty member at the college/university.

Faculty Support:

Full-time faculty and department chairs on the main campus lack interest and care very little about my success as a teacher.*

Full-time faculty or department chairs on the main campus are always available and accessible to me when I need assistance.

I feel very comfortable requesting assistance from full-time academic faculty or department chairs on the main campus when I have questions.

Honorarium:

I feel that I am well compensated for my teaching.

I am dissatisfied with the pay I receive for teaching courses.*

I am paid fairly for the amount of work I do to teach courses.

Teaching Schedule:

The times scheduled for my class(es) have been convenient.

I am required to teach at times that are inconvenient for me.*

The times that I teach my classes work well with my other commitments.

Post Hoc Tukey HSD tests were conducted on the four significant categories to determine where the differences occurred. Tables 11 through 14 report on the findings of the *Post Hoc* Tukey HSD tests.

Table 11

Post hoc Tukey HSD test on overall job satisfaction by adjunct typology (df = 8)

		Aspiring academic *M* = 3.333	Freelancer *M* = 3.750	Specialist *M* = 4.480	Career-ender *M* = 4.613
Aspiring academic	*M* = 3.333				
Freelancer	*M* = 3.750	*p* = 1.27			
Specialist	*M* = 4.480	***p* = 3.48**	*p* = 2.22		
Career-ender	*M* = 4.613	***p* = 3.89**	*p* = 2.62		

Note. Critical values for experimentwise error rate: p < 0.05 = 3.20. Significant values in boldface.

Aspiring academics had significantly lower overall satisfaction ratings than career-enders and specialists.

Table 12

Post hoc Tukey HSD test on faculty support by adjunct typology (df = 8)

		Aspiring academic *M* = 4.210	Freelancer *M* = 4.413	Specialist *M* = 4.730	Career-ender *M* = 4.927
Aspiring academic	*M* = 4.210				
Freelancer	*M* = 4.413	*p* = 1.33			
Specialist	*M* = 4.730	***p* = 3.39**	*p* = 2.07		
Career-ender	*M* = 4.927	***p* = 4.67**	***p* = 3.35**	*p* = 1.28	

Note. Critical values for experimentwise error rate: p < 0.05 = 3.20. Significant values in boldface.

Aspiring academics and freelancers gave significantly lower faculty support ratings than career-enders. Aspiring academics also were significantly less satisfied with faculty support than specialists.

Table 13

Post Tukey HSD test on honorarium by adjunct typology (df = 8)

		Aspiring academic *M* = 2.250	Freelancer *M* = 3.140	Career-ender *M* = 3.240	Specialist *M* = 3.450
Aspiring academic	*M* = 2.250				
Freelancer	*M* = 3.140	***p* = 6.23**			
Career-ender	*M* = 3.240	***p* = 6.93**	*p* = 0.70		
Specialist	*M* = 3.450	***p* = 8.40**	*p* = 2.17	*p* = 1.47	

Note. Critical values for experimentwise error rate: p < 0.05 = 3.20. Significant values in boldface.

Aspiring academics were significantly less satisfied with compensation than all other adjunct typologies.

Table 14

Post hoc Tukey HSD test on teaching schedule by adjunct typology (df = 8)

		Aspiring academic *M* = 4.567	Freelancer *M* = 4.803	Career-ender *M* = 4.830	Specialist *M* = 4.973
Aspiring academic	*M* = 4.567				
Freelancer	*M* = 4.803	*p* = 2.01			
Career-ender	*M* = 4.830	*p* = 2.24	*p* = 0.23		
Specialist	*M* = 4.973	***p* = 3.46**	*p* = 1.45	*p* = 1.22	

Note. Critical values for experimentwise error rate: $p < 0.05 = 3.20$. Significant values in boldface.

Aspiring academics were significantly less satisfied with their teaching schedules than specialists.

Institution Comparisons

A series of ANOVA tests were conducted to determine if there were significant differences in job satisfaction subscale ratings among the three participating institutions. There was not a significant difference between the institution ratings when looking at all of the job satisfaction categories combined; the *p* value was 0.6095. When comparing individual job satisfaction categories, the findings were slightly different than the adjunct typology results. The overall subscale ($p = 0.785$) and teaching schedule ($p = 0.056$) showed no significant difference among universities. The two job satisfaction categories that did show significant differences among institutions were faculty support and honorarium. Table 15 reports the ANOVA results for the two significant categories.

Table 15

Significant job satisfaction category by institution

Job satisfaction category	Type III sum of squares	*df*	Mean square	*F*	Sig.
Faculty support	0.5816	2	0.291	11.81	**0.0083**
Honorarium	1.020	2	0.011	45.39	**0.0002**

Note. Significant findings, $p < 0.05$, are in boldface.

Tables 16 and 17 present the *Post Hoc* Tukey HSD test results for faculty support and honorarium by institution.

Table 16

Post hoc Tukey HSD for faculty support by institution

		Institution C	Institution A	Institution B
		M = 4.167	*M* = 4.687	*M* = 4.723
Institution C	*M* = 4.167			
Institution A	*M* = 4.687	***p* = 4.06**		
Institution B	*M* = 4.723	***p* = 4.34**	*p* = 0.29	

Note. Critical values for experimentwise error rate: p < 0.05 = 3.20. Significant values in boldface.

Institution C adjuncts were significantly less satisfied with the level of faculty support than the other two institutions. A factor that may have impacted the results is that a higher percent of Institution C's adjunct sample were freelancers compared to the other two institutions. Freelancers by definition hold a variety of part-time jobs or care for children or parents. They appreciate the flexibility of part-time work, but may not have a work-related network of support.

Table 17

Post hoc Tukey HSD test for honorarium by institution

		Institution B	Institution A	Institution C
		M = 2.753	*M* = 3.203	*M* = 3.577
Institution B	*M* = 2.753			
Institution A	*M* = 3.203	***p* = 5.20**		
Institution C	*M* = 3.577	***p* = 9.51**	***p* = 4.31**	

Note. Critical values for experimentwise error rate: $p < 0.05 = 3.20$. Significant values in boldface.

Institution B was significantly less satisfied with compensation than the other institutions, and Institution A was significantly less satisfied with compensation than Institution C. A higher percentage of Institution B's sample were aspiring academics compared to the other schools. Thirty percent of Institution B's adjunct sample held doctorate or professional degrees compared to 28% of Institution A and 14% of Institution C. Their desire for full-time academic work and higher level of education may impact their compensation expectations.

Professional Development Interests

The Professional Development Interest data were analyzed by calculating the mean and standard deviations of the ratings by question and comparing the means of all questions to determine interest. The professional development interests across adjunct categories were fairly consistent.

Table 18 lists the overall means and standard deviations for the different professional development topics. The final column indicates which adjunct category was slightly different than the other types on those topics for which the standard deviation was greater than 0.80. The adjunct typologies are noted with abbreviations: (CE) career-enders, (S) specialists, (AA) aspiring academic, and (F) freelancer. The rating scale for this section of the survey was (1) no need, (2) low need, (3) moderate need, and (4) high need.

Thirty participants commented after this section. The participants reiterated that adjuncts have very different interests and needs, and said a "cookie-cutter" approach is not effective. Many indicated that they have much experience and would welcome the opportunity to share their knowledge with colleagues. They did mention that they appreciate learning new best

practices in faculty gatherings, and they feel that ongoing, compensated training should be a high priority.

It is interesting to note that the highest rated choice was overall level of interest in faculty development, and yet that rating is still between the low and moderate interest rating. The topics that were the most highly rated were accommodating different learning styles, reinforcing student learning, selecting, developing, and using technology in courses, diagnosis of learning/teaching problems, and increasing student engagement. The lowest ratings were realized on the more technical side of course design: writing test items, developing course outlines, and creating grading systems.

Table 18

Professional development interests

Professional development topic	*M*	*SD*	Adjunct category
Course and curriculum development	2.51	0.76	
Developing course outlines	2.33	0.81	Lower for CE
Application of learning principles to instruction	2.43	0.80	Higher for AA
Reinforcing student learning	2.59	0.81	Higher for AA
Diagnosis of learning/teaching problems	2.57	0.82	Higher for AA and F
Use of community resources as teaching tools	2.51	0.79	
Structuring interdisciplinary learning experiences for students	2.42	0.83	Higher for AA
Increasing student engagement	2.56	0.82	Lower for AA
Accommodating different learning styles	2.64	0.78	
Writing instructional objectives	2.27	0.79	
Writing test items	1.89	0.80	Lower for F

Professional development topic	*M*	*SD*	Adjunct category
Creating grading systems that are compatible with instructional objectives	2.33	0.83	Lower for AA
Techniques for evaluating instructional strategies	2.44	0.78	
Developing programs that accommodate disadvantaged or handicapped students	2.46	0.78	
Selecting, developing, and using technology in courses	2.57	0.86	Higher for CE and F
Utilizing group process skills in class discussions	2.45	0.81	Higher for F
Overall level of interest in faculty development in-service training for adjunct faculty	2.68	0.78	

Faculty Development Scheduling

The faculty development scheduling section asked participants to share how and when they would like training to be offered. There was very little variation in the responses across adjunct category as seen by the standard deviations.

There were three possible ratings for the scheduling preferences section: (1) not desirable, (2) somewhat desirable, and (3) very desirable. There were multiple opportunities for comments in the faculty development scheduling sections. In each section many comments related to the need to be compensated for meetings. There was interest in attending meetings that focus on student achievement, best practices, and focused needs. The desire to connect with colleagues and receive support was a recurring comment. There were also comments about the need for a variety of schedules to accommodate the work schedules of adjuncts.

The ratings show that there is moderate interest overall in participating in faculty development opportunities. The majority of adjunct faculty in this sample either teach on campus or teach with a hybrid/blended model. Eighty eight percent of participants are able to come to campus, and that is the preferred method of training. However, all of the times listed for

professional development received ratings between not desirable and somewhat desirable. For this sample, the most desirable way to learn new skills is with one to two-hour workshops or self-paced instructional material, although the differences noted in the descriptive statistics may not be significant.

The following tables relate to various aspects of faculty development scheduling, location, modality, and times.

Table 19

Faculty development scheduling

Development scheduling preferences	*M*	*SD*
New adjunct faculty orientation	2.19	0.72
Periodic college-wide adjunct faculty meetings	2.00	0.78
Periodic adjunct faculty division/department meetings	2.2	0.71
Attendance at professional education or trade association conferences	2.21	0.77

Table 20

Preferred location for professional development

Development scheduling preferences	*M*	*SD*
On campus	2.37	0.70
Online—asynchronous	1.98	0.73

Online—synchronous	1.76	0.72

Table 21

Best times for faculty development workshop activities

Best times for faculty development	*M*	*SD*
Summers	1.74	0.71
Breaks during the academic year	1.61	0.66
Weekends during the academic year	1.65	0.68
Weekdays	1.85	0.76
Week evenings	1.65	0.66

Table 22

Most feasible way to learn new skills

Most feasible way to learn skills	*M*	*SD*
One to two-hour workshops	2.3	0.65
University coursework	1.56	0.69
Self-paced instructional material	2.09	0.71
Online training	2.01	0.71

The final section of the survey asked participants about voluntary or mandatory training with or without compensation. Table 23 outlines the responses.

Table 23

Voluntary or mandatory faculty development

Voluntary or mandatory development	*M*	*SD*
Interest in voluntary development without compensation	1.64	0.62
Interest in mandatory development with compensation	2.14	0.67
Interest in voluntary development with compensation	2.57	0.60

Although these tables are descriptive statistics without evidence that the number differences are significant, these results suggest that if institutions would like to provide professional development opportunities for the largest percent of the faculty body, compensation is an important incentive.

Chapter 5

Discussion and Conclusions

Discussion

In this chapter, the research findings, conclusions, and potential future research will be discussed. The chapter will first summarize the findings as they relate to the following research questions:

1) What are overall adjunct faculty job satisfaction levels?

2) What are the unique job satisfaction ratings for each type of adjunct?

3) What are the professional development interests of adjunct faculty?

Secondary question:

4) What are the differences in faculty typology distinctions, job satisfaction levels, and professional development interests among participating institutions?

The implications of the research will then be explored, followed by a comparison of research findings to prior research. The limitations of the study will be discussed, and concluding comments will be addressed.

Summary of Findings

Question number one: What are overall adjunct faculty job satisfaction levels?

The first research question was explored using descriptive statistics. Taking a broad look at overall job satisfaction for adjunct faculty provided a grand mean of 4.35, which indicates that overall, the sample "somewhat agrees" that they are satisfied across all categories. However, this rating is too broad to use as a measure of satisfaction. As noted on Table 7, the mean of each job satisfaction category is very different. It is a much better judge of satisfaction to take

each category independently and identify where adjuncts are more satisfied and where opportunities exist to improve satisfaction levels.

Examining the two lowest overall scores reveals that compensation (honorarium *M* 3.02, *SD* 0.501) is a major concern of adjunct faculty. A mean rating of 3.02 indicates that adjuncts "somewhat disagree" that they are satisfied in this category. Dealing with compensation issues for the large adjunct community will take a financial commitment on the part of higher education institutions, but it is the category of least satisfaction. The second lowest rating was in the area of recognition (*M* 3.56, *SD* 0.663). Again adjuncts "somewhat disagree" that they are satisfied with the recognition they receive from the institutions. This is an area where increased attention from administration and full-time faculty may improve satisfaction ratings without a large financial impact. There are four categories that produced ratings that are below the mid-point of "somewhat agree": overall, autonomy, classroom facilities, and quality of students. These are areas that institutions may want to prioritize when considering job satisfaction improvement strategies.

On the other hand, the work preferences category received the highest rating (*M* 5.16, *SD* 0.443). This category relates to the adjunct faculty's love of teaching. They would rather be teaching than doing other jobs. Thus, although adjuncts have areas of dissatisfaction, they desire to teach in higher education. Other categories that produced mean scores that are 4.50 and above (ratings that are in the "somewhat agree" range, but are closer to "agree" than "disagree") are faculty support, teaching schedule, loyalty, and personal growth. (For a listing of the questions included in each job satisfaction category see Appendix B.)

The results in Table 7 provide the mean satisfaction levels of the adjunct community. Although there are quite a few categories in which adjuncts "somewhat agreed" that they are

satisfied, there is only one category (work preferences, M 5.16, SD 0.443) that received a rating of "agree". There is room for improvement in creating a satisfied workforce.

Question number two: What are the unique job satisfaction ratings for each type of adjunct?

The findings relating to the second question provide rich insight into differences within the adjunct community. Each job satisfaction category was analyzed independently based on adjunct typology. Seven of the 11 job satisfaction categories showed differences among the adjunct types, but those differences are not significant at a $p < 0.05$ level. Four of the eleven categories showed significant differences among adjunct types: overall, faculty support, honorarium, and teaching schedule.

In order to discuss the differences, it is important to keep the definitions of each typology in mind.

Career-ender—You are retired or moving toward retirement.

Specialist, expert, or professional—You are employed full-time elsewhere. You were hired because of your expertise, and you do not rely exclusively on the teaching income. You teach because you enjoy being a part of the academic community.

Aspiring academic—You would like a full-time faculty position, but currently teach at multiple institutions to create full-time work.

Freelancer—You have other part-time jobs or care for your home/children/parents. You supplement your income with teaching and appreciate the flexibility of part-time work. There are some distinct differences among the adjunct types.

The *Post Hoc* Tukey HSD test showed that aspiring academics are significantly less satisfied with their overall job than career-enders and specialists. Aspiring academics and

freelancers indicate that overall they "somewhat disagree" that they are satisfied. The specialists and career-enders report that they "somewhat agree" that they are satisfied overall. This category asked very general questions about their overall satisfaction with the job and did not ask specifically why they felt that way.

The other significant measures may give us some additional insight into reasons for satisfaction or dissatisfaction. Aspiring academics are significantly less satisfied than specialists and career-enders on all categories that showed significant differences—faculty support, honorarium, and teaching schedule. Freelancers are significantly less satisfied than career-enders in the area of faculty support. The only category in which aspiring academics and freelancers differ significantly is in the area of honorarium.

The demographic data on Table 4 and the job satisfaction ratings on Table 9 may highlight some possible reasons for the differences among adjunct types. Career-enders are older and 60% of them have been teaching for eight or more years, so teaching as an adjunct has been a long-term choice. Eighty-nine percent of their courses meet on campus for at least a portion of the classes, so they have contact with support services and have more opportunities to see full-time or other adjunct faculty and administrators. Career-enders rate their enjoyment of teaching (work preferences) and faculty support higher than any other typology. Because they have been teaching for a long time, they may have scheduling priority and can select the days and times before other faculty get to choose. They rate satisfaction with their institution higher than the other typologies (loyalty). Career-enders would like more freedom in designing their classes (autonomy), and rate satisfaction with autonomy lower than any other adjunct type.

Seventy-three percent of specialists are under 55 years old, one third have been teaching over eight years, and they teach 91% of their courses with an on-campus component. Nineteen

percent of specialists have their doctorates and 67% teach undergraduate courses. They are the most satisfied with their teaching schedules, they feel well supported, and they enjoy teaching (work preferences). Specialists are not dependent on their compensation, may be less concerned about teaching job security, and they are satisfied with their institutions (loyalty).

Freelancers' job satisfaction ratings ranged in the middle of the other adjunct types with the exception of classroom facilities for which they are the most satisfied, and faculty support, which was the lowest satisfaction rating. More Freelancers have an MA/MS than any other type, and only 10% have doctorates. Seventy-three percent are under 55 years old, and 51% have been teaching over eight years. They teach a higher percentage of undergraduate courses (78%) compared to the other types possibly due, in part, to their education levels. Ninety percent of their courses have an on-campus course component. Freelancers may have a lot of responsibilities in their lives outside of teaching, and may benefit from additional support and collegiality. They may feel isolated and stressed because they often have family and multiple career responsibilities.

Aspiring academics seem to be significantly less satisfied than the other adjunct types, however that is not true in all categories. They have the second highest rating of satisfaction of teaching (work preferences). They are the most satisfied of all adjunct types with their level of autonomy, and their commitment to growth as teachers (personal growth). Aspiring academics in this sample are primarily females (68%) who are under 55 (71%), and have the most education of all types (Masters + 40—41%; Doctorate—32%). This typology has the highest percentage of online-only teachers (24%). Aspiring academics are more highly educated, have the greatest variety of teaching modalities, enjoy teaching, and take personal responsibility for their own professional development. They also are the least satisfied with the pay, the level of recognition

for their work, and their teaching schedule. Those issues may have an impact on their loyalty although satisfaction with their institution is one of their highest ratings.

The results of this study show that each adjunct type is quite different in their needs, perceptions of satisfaction, and areas of satisfaction or dissatisfaction. Administrators and department chairs who see the adjunct faculty as a homogenous group may focus on compensation equity because that is what they hear about most often. Looking at the adjunct group as a whole may cause administrators to feel that the financial outlay and job satisfaction challenges are too overwhelming to address. This can lead to postponement of action rather than incremental change. Providing a pay raise to all adjuncts will address one area of dissatisfaction that is consistent across all typologies; however, that is just one area that should be considered. Making decisions unilaterally for the whole adjunct community rather than getting to know the characteristics of all typologies and the distinct needs of each adjunct faculty member will not use the institution's resources wisely nor provide the greatest benefit to the adjuncts or the institution. Taking the opportunity to talk with the adjuncts individually and collectively by typology to determine areas of frustration and dissatisfaction or satisfaction will provide direction for administrative resource allocation.

Question number three: What are the professional development interests of adjunct faculty?

Faculty development interests and scheduling preferences results provided information about which professional development topics are of interest to adjuncts, and which modalities and times are best for training. The question that received the highest mean rating is the level of interest in faculty development in-service training. Adjuncts are interested in training, but they would like training that is targeted to their needs. The topics that received the highest ratings

are: accommodating different learning styles, reinforcing student learning, selecting, developing, and using technology in courses, diagnosis of learning/teaching, increasing student engagement, use of community resources as teaching tools, and course and curriculum development. The topics of least interest are writing instructional objectives, and writing test items.

The scheduling preferences section results provided information about the best times and modalities to offer training. Adjuncts rated orientation, periodic division/department meetings, and conference attendance about the same in terms of preference. They prefer on campus meetings and would rather participate in asynchronous rather than synchronous online meetings. None of the times listed for workshops are highly desirable. The most desirable option, weekdays, is only desirable for those who do not have other work commitments during the days. Weekdays may exclude many specialists, freelancers, and aspiring academics due to their conflicting work schedules. Adjuncts rated two-hour workshops and self-paced instructional material slightly higher than university coursework, but the findings were not based on statistical significance. Online training is also an option, but not as desirable for this sample. In the narrative comment section, participants suggest that course content should determine the best delivery modality, and they acknowledge that online instruction may be the only option for distance instructors.

There is a noticeable difference between the voluntary versus mandatory professional development options. Adjuncts are more interested in voluntary development with compensation than mandatory development with compensation. Not surprisingly, voluntary professional development without compensation received the lowest desirability rating. There is still interest in non-compensated training, but attendance may be improved if adjuncts are compensated. Administrators, department chairs, professional development educators, and teaching and

learning center representatives need to consider if on-going training for the front-line faculty is an important goal for the institution. If it is, compensation may increase the desirability of attending training.

Question number four: What are the differences in faculty typology distinctions, job satisfaction levels, and professional development interests between participating universities?

It is interesting to note that there are quite a few differences in the adjunct population among institutions even though the institutions are all using adjuncts from the Portland metropolitan area. It may be that the institutions recruit certain types of adjuncts, or that certain types of adjuncts are drawn to different institutions. Based on the demographic data presented in Table 6, institutions do hire differently and use adjuncts for different types of classes.

In order to interpret the findings, the results of the ANOVA tests and the demographic data will be used. The two categories that showed significant differences among institutions are faculty support and honorarium. Adjunct faculty at Institution C feel significantly less satisfied with their level of faculty support than adjuncts at Institution A or B. There are no clear differences in adjunct demographics among the institutions that explain the difference in feelings of support. Adjuncts at Institution C teach a portion of all classes on campus, 93% of their course loads are undergraduate courses compared to 65% and 57% for the other institutions, they have the smallest percent of adjuncts with doctorates, and 23% are under 35. The most noteworthy difference among institutions is that there is a higher percentage of freelancers at Institution C than any other institution, and they have a high percentage of specialists as well. Freelancers and specialists are busy with careers outside of the institution and may benefit from additional support while teaching.

The other category with a significant difference among institutions was honorarium. Institution B was significantly less satisfied with compensation than Institutions A and C. There are some clear demographic distinctions that may contribute to the lower satisfaction level. Adjuncts at Institution B are older; 75% are under the age of 55, but only 3% under 35. Sixty percent have been teaching longer than eight years, and only 17% have been teaching less than three years. There is a higher percentage of adjuncts with Masters +40 or doctorates (60%) than the other institutions. Institution B also has the highest number of adjuncts teaching online (30% compared to 7% or 0%), and the highest percentage teaching graduate courses (43% compared to 35% and 7%). Online teaching is very time intensive and requires a great deal of work on a daily basis. Graduate teaching also requires additional time and attention. Adjunct faculty members at Institution B have more experience, have more education, are older, and are teaching more challenging, time intensive classes than the other institutions. This may contribute to the disparity in the compensation satisfaction level.

Implications of Research

The research findings support the hypotheses that there are significant differences in satisfaction levels among adjunct types and universities. The findings suggest that it will benefit both the institutions and the adjunct faculty if full-time faculty and administration focus on individual needs of adjuncts and explore typology distinctions when instituting programs to support the adjunct community. Viewing adjunct faculty as a homogenous group may lead decision-makers to assume that all adjuncts have the same needs, and to create programs that are less effective because they only address certain needs of a percentage of the adjunct population. Adjuncts have different needs and compensation considerations, while important to adjunct faculty, are not the only issues that impact satisfaction levels. Tracking with the research on job

satisfaction, the adjunct faculty will view giving all adjuncts a raise positively, but it will not create a fully satisfied workforce. Rather than viewing the needs of the adjunct population as too large or too expensive to resolve, administrators can use the typology to identify specific adjunct populations, gain insight into their needs, and address various categories that can impact satisfaction levels in smaller increments. Being able to identify adjunct types in an institution as well as their distinct needs and interests may provide information allowing administrators and faculty leaders to customize interventions that will improve working conditions for adjuncts and increase their satisfaction with the job and the institution. This, in turn, may aid in retention, increased satisfaction levels, and improved teaching effectiveness.

Another result of this research is that it highlights the quality of the adjunct workforce. The adjuncts that participated in this study are highly educated, dedicated, long-term instructors who enjoy teaching. Some would like full-time work and have a strong track record of quality service to students. As institutions consider ways to improve the quality of education offered to students, restructuring to include more full-time or permanent part-time positions that provide more stable employment for this high quality adjunct community will benefit the institutions, the students and the adjuncts. Institutions will be wise to look to the adjunct community when making hiring decisions.

Comparison of Research Findings to Prior Research

The literature posits that adjunct faculty primarily teach lower-division, undergraduate courses (Cross & Goldenberg, 2002, 2003; Green, 2007; Liu & Zhang, 2007; Townsend, 2003). Although that was true for Institution C in this sample, the adjuncts in the other two institutions teach between one-third and two-fifths of their course loads in graduate studies. Adjuncts in Institutions A and B are teaching at all levels.

Reports that adjuncts receive lower compensation, no benefits, no tenure or promotion opportunities, and no job security (ASHE Higher Education Report, 2010; Gappa & Leslie, 1993; Green, 2007; Waltman et al., 2012) are still true today. Some institutions continue to invite adjuncts to participate in collaborative program work or committees, but do not offer to pay for their time (Klausman, 2010). This study revealed that adjuncts appreciate the opportunity to participate in faculty development, but are more willing to attend when compensated. If institutions would like to ensure that their front-line instructors continue to improve their teaching skills, compensation for professional development should be considered.

The desire for faculty support, relatedness, and belonging to a faculty community (Cox, 2004; Deci & Ryan, 2000; Gappa et al., 2007; Hudd et al., 2009; Maslow, 1987; McLaughlin, 2005) are supported in this research. Faculty support is an area that produced significant differences among adjunct types and among institutions. Aspiring academics and freelancers are both less satisfied with faculty support than career-enders and specialists. This finding speaks to the importance of knowing the adjunct types represented by the institution and customizing the support offered to adjuncts based on their specific needs and desires. The institution that has the highest percentage of freelancers also has the lowest satisfaction ratings in the area of faculty support. Knowing adjunct types and addressing specific needs based on typology may increase adjunct satisfaction levels.

Although there is a perception that adjuncts teach at many institutions and want full time academic work (Antony & Valadex, 2002; Leslie & Gappa, 2002), this is true of only a percentage of the adjunct population. In this study16% of the sample are aspiring academics, which supports the Gappa et al. (2007) finding that aspiring academics comprise 16% of the adjunct population. Kezar (2012) indicated that researchers are wondering if the aspiring

academic typology is growing due to a reduction in tenure-track jobs. This study did not show that the typology is growing in percentage.

Studies show that many adjuncts have full or part-time jobs and use the teaching compensation to supplement their incomes (Benjamin, 1998; Conley et al., 2002; Leslie & Gappa, 2002). This study supported those findings. Sixty-eight percent of the sample identified with the specialist or freelancer typology. Leslie & Gappa (2002) and Lui & Zhang (2007) found that many adjuncts stay in their current teaching assignments for more than 5 years. The average adjunct has five or six year of teaching experience and 30% have ten years or more (Conley et al., 2002; Hoyt, 2012; Leslie and Gappa, 2002). The sample in this study reinforces those findings. Twenty-five percent of the sample have been teaching for four to seven years, 18% have been teaching for eight to eleven years, and 22% have been teaching 12 years or more. Twenty-seven percent of respondents have been with their current institution for four to seven years, and 25% have taught at their current institution for eight years or more.

Researchers suggest that adjunct faculty are more likely to have master's degrees than full-time faculty, but 19.6% to 25% hold doctorate degrees (Antony & Valadex, 2002; Conley et al., 2002; Eagan & Jaeger, 2009). Fifty-four percent of this sample have a masters + 40, doctorate, or professional degree. This finding counters Benjamin's (2003a) assertion that adjunct instructors are less qualified to teach, and supports Leslie & Gappa's (2002) statement that the preconception that adjunct faculty are under-qualified and not attentive to their teaching or students is invalid. According to the responses on this survey, adjunct faculty have enhanced their teaching ability by learning several teaching methods this past year, and put in extra time and effort to become better teachers on their own time.

Trower (2010) found that adjuncts desire faculty development opportunities. Gappa et al. (2007), Kausman (2010), and Lyons (2007) emphasized the need for scheduling and delivery flexibility. Thedwall (2008) reported that adjuncts are generally not compensated for professional development. This study indicates that adjunct faculty see a low-to-moderate need for faculty development. Respondents request targeted faculty development training, and mention the need for flexibility in scheduling due to the variety of work schedules and conflicting demands on their time. They also request compensation for their time, reinforcing Benjamin's (2003c) assertion that asking adjuncts to attend faculty development sessions without compensation will not be an effective method of improving teaching skills or building community. Adjuncts in this study take responsibility for their professional growth, which supports Leslie & Gappa's (2002) findings. Administrators need to consider how to offer flexible development opportunities in order to improve the adjuncts ability to meet student needs and prepare for classes (Bedford & Miller, 2013; Umback, 2007).

Autonomy in course scheduling, course content, prerequisites and assessments is important to adjuncts (Klausman, 2010; Lefebvre, 2008; Thedwall, 2008). This study showed that freedom to develop and modify course content, select materials and texts, as well as select a teaching schedule are important to adjuncts. Career-enders are less satisfied with the level of autonomy than the other adjunct types, and aspiring academics are less satisfied with their level of flexibility with teaching schedules. This reinforces that the needs of the four types are different.

Studies show that adjunct faculty enjoy teaching and want to be a part of the academic community (Leslie & Gappa, 2002; Schneirov, 2003; Schuster & Finkelstein, 2006). In this study, all types of adjunct faculty rated their enjoyment of teaching to be the most satisfying

aspect of their jobs. Adjunct faculty like to teach. They look forward to teaching and prefer teaching to doing other types of work. They are committed to their profession. These findings support Antony & Valadez's (2002) assertion that even though adjuncts are dissatisfied with aspects of their jobs, they are committed to their academic work, and if they were making a career choice again, they would choose teaching.

Lack of recognition and appreciation are sources of dissatisfaction for adjuncts (Green, 2007; Hoyt, 2012, Waltman et al., 2012). Adjunct faculty in this research are "somewhat dissatisfied" with the level of recognition they receive. Recognizing the efforts of adjunct faculty costs little, does not take a formal program, and will improve satisfaction levels. Showing appreciation for good work is a standard management practice, but higher education full-time faculty and administrators may not be taking the opportunity to provide this much needed feedback.

This study supports much of the research on the adjunct community. It adds to the literature by using the typology structure as an overlay to help interpret job satisfaction.

Limitations of Research

The purpose of this study was to determine if there were differences in job satisfaction ratings based on adjunct typology. Knowing and understanding the distinct characteristics and needs of the four typologies may provide a useful lens with which to identify the needs of four different adjunct groups. Conducting a survey and analyzing quantitative data about the typologies provided a strong base from which to separate the needs, however without qualitative data to explain the results, most interpretation comes from analyzing demographic data. It would have been useful to talk with the participants to ask for their reasons for responding as they did.

It would also have been beneficial to get specific feedback on why adjuncts feel satisfied or dissatisfied about each category.

The sample was comprised of adjunct faculty from three faith-based, non-profit, private institutions. It would have been beneficial to include adjunct faculty from public and for-profit institutions, and community colleges in order to get a broader range of experiences. Being able to randomly select participants from a larger base of institutions would have allowed for generalizability of results to a broader range of institutions.

The limitation of contacting adjunct faculty through the institutional e-mail system may have impacted the size of the sample. Only those teaching or wanting to stay in contact with the institution during the winter term may have been checking their institutional e-mails. Some adjuncts who would have been willing to participate were unaware of the survey.

Using a survey limited the number of questions asked and it limited the focus of the responses to the content requested on the survey. There were opportunities for participants to make comments, but those comments were not quantified in the findings. Participants were not able to share fully about their needs and interests.

This study was designed with the intent of conducting multiple one-way ANOVAs on the data set. After the data collection was complete and the analysis was conducted, it was determined that both independent variables (adjunct typology and institutional affiliation) produced significant findings. Because two independent variables were used in this study and significant findings were realized by both independent variables, a two-way ANOVA would have been a more appropriate test to analyze the data. The two-way ANOVA would have identified significant differences in both factors and included the interaction effect of the two variables. The one-way ANOVAs do not take the interaction effect into consideration.

Suggestions for Future Study

Although the findings from this study provide a strong foundation regarding the needs of adjunct types, there is a benefit to obtaining a narrative perspective on adjunct job satisfaction and faculty development needs. A qualitative study could ask respondents about their areas of satisfaction without being limited to the survey questions. This would also have the added benefit of updating or reinforcing the findings of Gappa & Leslie's extensive qualitative study conducted in 1993.

A missing piece of this research is determining next steps. The results provide descriptions of the adjunct types and areas of satisfaction and dissatisfaction; however, there are limited suggestions from the adjuncts on what to do to address their needs. A qualitative study in which adjuncts can express solutions would provide a good resource to administrators who would like to improve working conditions for adjunct faculty.

One aspect of job satisfaction that was highlighted in the literature review was that of respect. Respect for the individual adjunct instructor is a theme that is expressed in categories such as recognition, autonomy, faculty support, honorarium, loyalty, personal growth, and teaching schedule. Exploring in more detail how adjunct faculty are impacted by their feelings of being respected and valued, or how feelings of disrespect affect their individual and collective self-esteem or teaching effectiveness would be interesting and helpful.

Conclusion

This study adds to the literature by applying Gappa and Leslie's (1993) adjunct typology to the question of job satisfaction. The typology framework provides a way to separate the adjunct community into distinct groupings. Using the framework and separating overall job satisfaction into distinct categories produces some significant findings that may provide full-time

faculty and administrators with tools to more effectively address the needs of their adjunct faculty.

It is important to note that compensation for adjuncts is a concern across all typologies. It is universally acknowledged that adjunct faculty do not receive equitable remuneration for their work. Compensation equity should not be ignored because it is a large financial burden, or because adjuncts have little collective institutional power. However, this study reveals that there are many other areas that impact job satisfaction, and, if addressed, may provide working condition improvements. Providing recognition to adjuncts for their work, giving them autonomy to select materials and course content, providing adequate classroom resources, and providing additional faculty support are a few ways to positively impact satisfaction levels.

A major theme from this research is that the best way to improve satisfaction and provide impactful development opportunities for adjuncts is to get to know the adjuncts individually and collectively, and to ask for feedback. The typologies are a tool to enhance understanding on a meta-level, but individual departments must take the time to talk with individual adjunct faculty members and invite them to be a part of the collegiate community. The missing narratives in this study can be obtained on a case-by-case basis through discussions between full-time and adjunct faculty. Creating an atmosphere of collaboration, respect, exploration, and support will open lines of communication and allow for a discussion of how to meet the needs of the adjunct faculty, the institution, and most importantly, provide the best learning experience for the students.

References

Altbach, P. G. (2011). Harsh realities: The professoriate in the twenty-first century. In P.G. Altbach, P. J. Gumport & R. O. Berdahl (Eds.), *American higher education in the twenty-first century: Social, political, and economic changes*, 227-253. Baltimore, ME: The John Hopkins University Press.

Alreck, P. L., & Settle, R. B. (1995). *The survey research handbook: Guidelines and strategies for conducting a survey*. McGraw-Hill.

American Association of University Professors. (2004). *Statement from the conference on the growing use of part-time and adjunct faculty*. Sept. 26-28, 1997.11. July 2004 http://www.aaup.org/issues/parttime/ptconf.htm.19August2005.

American Association of University Professors. (2009). *On the brink: The annual report on the economic status of the profession, 2008-09*. Retrieved June 16, 2014, from aaup.org/reports-publications/2008-09salarysurvey.

American Federation of Teachers (AFT). (2009). *The American academic: The state of higher education workforce 1997-2007*. Washington, D.C.: American Federation of Teachers. Retrieved May 8, 2014, from www.aft.org/pdfs/highered/aa_highedworkforce0209.pdf

Ancar, L. N., Freeman, S. A., & Field, D. W. (2007). Professional connections through the technology learning community. *Journal of Technology Studies, 33*(2), 73-78.

Antony, J., & Valadex, J. (2002). Exploring the satisfaction of part-time college faculty in the United States. *The Review of Higher Education, 26*(1), 41-56.

ASHE Higher Education Report. (2010). *36*(5), 1-17. Wiley. doi: 10.1002/aehe.3605

Baldwin, R., & Chronister, J. (2001). *Teaching without Tenure: Policies and practices for a new era*. Baltimore: The John Hopkins University Press.

Baldwin, R., & Wawrzynski, M. (2011). Contingent faculty as teachers: What we know; what we need to know. *American Behavioral Scientist, 55*(11), 1485-1509.

Bedford, L., & Miller, H. (2013). All adjuncts are not created equal: An exploratory study of teaching and professional needs of online adjuncts. *Online Journal of Distance Learning Administration, 16*(1), 1-16.

Beem, K. (2002). The adjunct experience. *School Administrator, 59*(10), 6-12.

Benjamin, E. (2003a). Editor's Notes. In E. Benjamin (Ed.), *New Directions for Higher Education, 123*, 1-15. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Benjamin, E. (2003b). *Exploring the role of contingent instructional staff in undergraduate learning*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Benjamin, E. (2002). How over-reliance on contingent appointments diminishes faculty involvement in student learning. *Peer Review, 5*(1), 4-10.

Benjamin, E. (2003c). Reappraisal and implications for policy and research. In E. Benjamin (Ed.), *New Directions for Higher Education, 123*, 79-114. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Benjamin, E. (1998). Variations in the characteristics of part-time faculty by general fields of instruction and research. *New Directions for Higher Education, 104*.

Bergmann, D. (2011). *A Study of Adjunct Faculty* (Doctoral Dissertation). Available from ProQuest Information and Learning.

Bergom, I. & Waltman, J. (2009). Satisfaction and discontent: Voices of non-tenure-track faculty. *On Campus with Women, 37*(3). Academic OneFile. Web. 17 June 2014.

Block, P. (2009). *Community: The Structure of Belonging*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.

Borg, W. R., & Gall, M. D. (1989). *Educational research: An introduction*. New York: Longman, Inc.

Braxton, J. M., Bray, N. J., & Berger, J. B. (2000). Faculty teaching skills and their influence on the college student departure. *Journal of College Student Development, 41*(2).

Brooks, C. F. (2010). Toward 'hybridized' faculty development for the twenty-first century: Blending online communities of practice and face-to-face meetings in instructional and professional support programmes. *Innovations in Education & Teaching International, 47*(3), 261-270. doi: 10.1080/14703297.2010.498177

Christensen, C. (2008). The employment of part-time faculty at community colleges. *New Directions for Higher Education, 143*, 29-36. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Conley, V., Leslie, D., & Zimbler, L. (2002). Part-time instructional faculty and staff: Who they are, what they do, and what they think. *Education Statistics Quarterly, 4*(2)*,* 97-103.

Cox, M. D. (2004). Introduction to faculty learning communities. *New Directions for Teaching & Learning*, *97*, 5-23.

Cross, J. G., & Goldenberg, E. N. (2003). How does university decision making shape the faculty? In E. Benjamin (Ed.), *New Directions for Higher Education, 123*, 49-60. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Cross, J. & Goldenberg, E. (2009). *Off-track profs: Nontenured teachers in higher education*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Cross, J. & Goldenberg, E. (2002). Why hire non-tenure-track faculty? *Peer Review, 5*(1).

Deci, & Ryan (2000). The “what” and “why” of goal pursuits: Human needs and the self-determination of behavior. *Psychological Inquiry, 11*, 227-268.

Discenna, T. (2007). On the limits of performed compliance: Jill Carroll and the rhetoric of entrepreneurial adjuncts. *Communications Quarterly, 55*(4), 467-483.

Dunn, S. (2013a). Adjuncts' advocates call for fair treatment on work-hour calculations. *The Chronicle of Higher Education, 59*(34), A6.

Dunn, S. (2013b). Colleges are slashing adjuncts' hours to skirt new rules on health-insurance eligibility. *The Chronicle of Higher Education, 59*(33), A6.

Eagan, M. K. (2007). A national picture of part-time community college faculty: Trends and demographics in employment characteristics. *New Directions for Community Colleges, 140*, 5–14.

Eagan, M. K., & Jaeger, A. (2009). Effects of exposure to part-time faculty on community college transfer. *Research in Higher Education, 50*, 168-188.

Eddy, P., & Garza Mitchell, R. (2012). Faculty as learners: Developing thinking communities. *Innovative Higher Education, 37*(4), 283-296.

Eggett, D. (2007). Dimensions of part-time faculty job satisfaction: Development and factor analysis of a survey instrument. *Journal of Adult Education, 36*(2), 23-34.

Elman, S. E. (2003). A regional accreditation perspective on contingent faculty appointments. In E. Benjamin (Ed.), *New Directions for Higher Education, 123*, 71-78. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Experiences of non-tenure track faculty. (2010). *ASHE Higher Education Report, 36*(4), 48-75.

Fagan-Wilen, R., Springer, D., Ambrosino, B., & White, B. (2006). The support of adjunct faculty: An academic imperative. *Social Work Education, 25*(1), 39-51.

Feldman, D., Turnley, W. (2004). Contingent employment in academic careers: Relative deprivation among adjunct faculty. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 64*, 284-307.

Fink, A. (2013). *How to conduct surveys: A step-by-step guide*. Sage Publications, Inc.

Fink, A. (2003). *The survey handbook*. Sage Publications, Inc.

Gappa, J. (2000). The new faculty majority: Somewhat satisfied but not eligible for tenure. *New Directions for Institutional Research, 105*, 77-86.

Gappa, J. (2008). Today's majority: Faculty outside the tenure system. *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning 40*(4), 50–54.

Gappa, J. M., Austin, A. E., & Trice, A. G. (2007). *Rethinking faculty work: Higher education's strategic imperative*. John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Gappa. J., & Leslie, D. (1993). *The invisible faculty: Improving the status of part-timers in higher education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Gay, L. R., Mills, G. E., & Airasian, P. (2012). *Educational research: Competencies for analysis and applications*. Pearson.

Green, D. (2007). Adjunct faculty and the continuing quest for quality. *New Directions for Community Colleges, 140*, 29-39.

Hollenshead and others. (2007). Making the best of both worlds: Findings from a national institution-level survey on non-tenure-track faculty. Ann Arbor, MI: Center for the Education of Women.

Hord, S. M., & Sommers, W. A. (2008). *Leading professional learning communities: Voices from research and practice*. Thousand Oaks: Corwin Press & National Association of Secondary School Principals.

Hoyt, J. E. (2012). Predicting the satisfaction and loyalty of adjunct faculty. *The Journal of Continuing Higher Education, 60*(3), pp. 132-142.
doi: 10.1080/07377363.2013.722417

Hoyt, J. E., Howell, S. L., & Eggett, D. (2007). Dimensions of part-time faculty job satisfaction:

Development and factor analysis of a survey instrument. *Journal of Adult Education, 36*(2), pp. 23-34, Insert.

Hoyt, J., Howell, S., Glines, L., Johnson, C., Spackman, J., Thompson, C., & Rudd, C. (2008). Assessing part-time faculty job satisfaction in continuing higher education: Implication for the profession. *The Journal of Continuing Higher Education, 56*(1), 27-38.

Hudd, S., Apgar, C., Bronson, E. & Lee, R. (2009). Creating a campus culture of integrity: Comparing the perspectives of full- and part-time faculty. *Journal of Higher Education, 80*(2), 146-177.

Hutti, M. H., Rhodes, G. S., Allison, J., & Lauterbach, E. (2007). The part-time faculty institute: Strategically designed and continually assessed. In R. Lyons (Ed.), *Best practices for supporting adjunct faculty*, 31-48. Bolton, Mass.: Anker Publishing Company, Inc.

Jacobson, K. (2013). Building a roadmap to adjunct faculty success. *Techniques, 88*(4), 10-12.

Jacoby, D. (2006). Effects of part-time faculty employment on community college graduation rates. *Journal of Higher Education, 77*(6), 1081-1103.

Jamieson, S. (2004). Likert scales: How to (ab)use them. *Medical Education, 38*, 1212-1218.

Jones, A. (2008). Preparing new faculty members for their teaching role. In N. Chism (Ed.), *New Directions for Higher Education, 143*, 93-100. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Kezar, A. (2012). Needed policies, practices, and values: Creating a culture to support professionalize non-tenure track faculty. In A. Kezar (Ed.), *Embracing non-tenure track faculty: Changing campuses for the new faculty majority*, 2-27. New York: Routledge.

Kezar, A. (2012). Preface. In A. Kezar (Ed.), *Embracing non-tenure track faculty: Changing campuses for the new faculty majority*, x-xxiv. New York: Routledge.

Kezar, A., & Maxey, D. (2012). Missing from the institutional data picture: Non-tenure track faculty. *New Directions for Institutional Research, 155*, 47-65.

Kezar, A., & Sam, C. (2012). Strategies for implementing and institutionalizing new policies and practices: Understanding the change process. In A. Kezar (Ed.), *Embracing non-tenure track faculty: Changing campuses for the new faculty majority*, 28-53. New York: Routledge.

Kirk, F. & Spector, C. (2009). A comparison of the achievement of students taught by full-time versus adjunct faculty in business courses. *Academy of Educational Leadership Journal, 13*(2), 73-81.

Klausman, J. (2010). Not just a matter of fairness: Adjunct faculty and writing programs in two-year colleges. *Teaching English in the two-year college, 37*(4), 363-371.

Lefebvre, L. (2008). Demographics, employment motivations, and roles of part-time faculty at virtual universities. In N. Chism (Ed.), *New Directions for Higher Education, 143*, 37-44. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Leslie, D., & Gappa, J. (2002). Part-time faculty: Competent and committed. *New Directions for Community Colleges, 2002*(118), 59-67.

Levin, J. S., Kater, S., & Wagoner, R. L. (2006). *Community college faculty: At work in the new economy*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Light, R. J., Singer, J. D., Willett, J. B. (1990). *By Design: Planning research on higher education*. Harvard University Press.

Litwin, M. S. (1995). *How to measure survey reliability and validity*. Thousand Oaks: Sage

Publications.

Liu, X., & Zhang, L. (2007). What determines employment of part-time faculty in higher education institutions? *Cornell University Higher Education Research Institute, Working Paper #105*. June 18, 2007. Retrieved May 12, 2014, from www.ilr.cornell.edu/cheri/workingPapers/upload/cheri_wp105.pdf.

Lyons, R. E. (2007). Deepening our understanding of adjunct faculty. In R. Lyons (Ed.), *Best practices for supporting adjunct faculty*, 1-12. Bolton, Mass.: Anker Publishing Company, Inc.

Manning, G. & Curtis, K. (2012). *The Art of Leadership*. New York, New York: McGraw-Hill.

Maslow, A. (1970). *Motivation and Personality*. New York: HarperCollins.

Maynard, D., & Joseph, T. (2008). Are all part-time faculty underemployed? The influence of faculty status preference on satisfaction and commitment. *Higher Education, 55*(2), 139-154.

McLaughlin, F. (2005). Adjunct faculty at the community college: Second-class professoriate? *Teaching English in the Two-Year College, 33*(2), 185-193.

Meixner, C., Kruck, S. E., & Madden, L. T. (2010). Inclusion of part-time faculty for the benefit of faculty and students. *College Teaching, 58*(4), 141-147. doi:10.1080/87567555.2010.484032

Miller, D. C. (1991). *Handbook of research design and social measurement*. Sage Publications.

Milyavskaya, M. & Koestner, R. (2011). Psychological needs, motivation , and well-being: A test of self-determination theory across multiple domains. *Personality and Individual Differences, 50*, 387-391.

Monroe, M. & Adams, D. (2012). Increasing response rates to web-based surveys. *Journal of*

Extension, *50*(6), Article 6TOT7.

Narayan, D., Chambers, R., Shah, M., & Petesch, P. (2000). Voices of the poor: Crying out for change. New York: Oxford University Press.

Niskode-Dossett, A. S. (2008). Summary and recommendations. In N. Chism (Ed.), *New Directions for Higher Education, 143*, 109-114. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Nutting, M. M. (2003). Part-time faculty: Why should we care? In E. Benjamin (Ed.), *New Directions for Higher Education, 123*, 33-40. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Pannapacker, W. (2013). Just look at the data, if you can find any. *The Chronicle of Higher Education, 59*(40), A31-A32.

Patall, E., Cooper, H., & Robinson, J. (2008). The effects of choice on intrinsic motivation and related outcomes: A meta-analysis of research findings. *Psychological Bulletin*, *134*(2), 270-300.

Pedras, M. J. (1982). *The conceptualization and development of a staff development model for community college part-time faculty.* Paper presented at the American Vocational Education Conference, Anaheim, CA.

Peer, W., Hakemulder, F., & Zyngier, S. (2012). *Scientific methods for the humanities*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Co.

Peterson, D. (2007). A proven program for supporting adjunct faculty online. In R. Lyons (Ed.), *Best practices for supporting adjunct faculty*, 49-67. Bolton, Mass.: Anker Publishing Company, Inc.

Petrone, M. C. & Ortquist-Ahrens, L. (2004). Facilitating faculty learning communities: A compact guide to creating change and inspiring community. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning, 2004*(97), 63-69.

PhStat4. Retrieved from http://wps.aw.com/phstat/.

Rajagopal, I. (1996). Hidden careerists in Canadian universities. *Higher Education, 32*(3), 247-266.

Reichard, G. W. (2003). The choices before us: An administrator's perspective on faculty staffing and student learning in general education courses. In E. Benjamin (Ed.), *New Directions for Higher Education, 123*, 61-70. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Remmik, M., Karm, M., Haamer, A., & Lepp, L. (2011). Early-career academics' learning in academic communities. *International Journal for Academic Development, 16*(3), 187-199. doi: 10.1080/1360144X.2011.596702

Richardson, R. (2007). The associate program: A foundation for professional growth in adjunct faculty. In R. Lyons (Ed.), *Best practices for supporting adjunct faculty*, 132-142. Bolton, Mass.: Anker Publishing Company, Inc.

Rice, R. E., Sorcinelli, M. D., Austin, A. E., (2000). Heeding new voices: Academic careers for a new generation. *New Pathways: Faculty Careers and Employment for the 21st Century*, Working paper series, inquiry #7. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education.

Roffey, S. (2013). Inclusive and exclusive belonging-the impact on individual and community well-being. *Educational & Child Psychology, 30*(1), 38-49.

Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2000). Self-determination theory and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation, social development, and well-being. *The American Psychologist, 55*(1), 68-78.

Schneirov, R. (2003). Contingent faculty: A new social movement takes shape. *WorkingUSA, 6*, 38-48.

Schuster, J. H. (2003). The faculty makeover: What does it mean for students? In E. Benjamin (Ed.), *New Directions for Higher Education, 123*, 15-22. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Schuster, J., & Finkelstein, M. (2006). *American faculty: The restructuring of academic work and careers*. Baltimore, MD: John Hopkins University Press.

Spector, P. E. (1992). *Summated rating scale construction: An introduction*. Sage University Paper Series on Quantitative Applications in the Social Sciences, 07-082. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Sudman, S. (1976). *Applied Sampling*. New York: Academic Press.

Tanner, D. (2012). Using statistics to make educational decisions. Sage Publications, Inc.

Thedwall, K. (2008). Nontenure-track faculty: Rising numbers, lost opportunities. In N. Chism (Ed.), *New Directions for Higher Education, 143*, 11-20. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Thompson, K. (2003). Contingent faculty and student learning: Welcome to strativersity. In E. Benjamin (Ed.), *New Directions for Higher Education, 123*, 41-48. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Townsend, R. B. (2003). Changing relationships, changing values in the American classroom. In E. Benjamin (Ed.), *New Directions for Higher Education, 123*, 23-32. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Trower, C. A. (2010). A new generation of faculty: Similar core values in a different world. *Peer Review, 12*(3), 27-30.

Tuckman, H. (1978). Who is part-time in academe? *AAUP Bulletin, 64*.

Umbach, P. (2007). How effective are they? Exploring the impact of contingent faculty on undergraduate education. *Review of Higher Education, 30*(2), 91-123.

U.S. Department of Education. Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Educational Statistics. (2013). *Digest of Educational Statistics 2011-2012*. Retrieved June 23, 2014 from http://nces.ed.gov.

Vaughan, N. (2004). Technology in support of faculty learning communities. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning,* (97), 101-109.

Velicer, W. F., & Fava, J. L. (1998). Affects of variable and subject sampling on factor pattern recovery. *Psychological Methods*, *3*(2), 231-251. doi:10.1037/1082-989X.3.2.231

Waltman, J., Bergom, I., Hollenshead, C., Miller, J., & August, L. (2012). Factors contributing to job satisfaction and dissatisfaction among non-tenure-track faculty. *Journal of Higher Education, 83*(3), 411-434.

West, E. (2010). Managing adjunct professors: Strategies for improved performance. *Academy of Educational Leadership Journal, 14*(4), 21-37.

Wilson, R. (2013a). Faculty culture is fractured. *The Chronicle of Higher Education, 59*(40), A24-A27.

Wilson, R. (2013b). For full-time instructors, work off the tenure track has become its own career. *The Chronicle of Higher Education, 59*(31), A26-A27.

Yee, K. (2007). Ensuring an effective start for adjunct faculty: Orientation with multiple options. In R. Lyons (Ed.), *Best practices for supporting adjunct faculty,* 13-30. Anker Publishing Company, Inc.

Yoon, C., & Rolland, E. (2012). Knowledge-sharing in virtual communities: Familiarity, anonymity and self-determination theory. *Behavior & Information Technology, 31*(11), 1133-1143.

Zutter, C. (2007). Mentoring adjunct instructors: Fostering bonds that strengthen teaching and learning. In R. Lyons (Ed.), *Best practices for supporting adjunct faculty*, 68-80. Anker Publishing Company, Inc.

Appendix A

ADJUNCT FACULTY SURVEY

General Demographics and Information

This survey relates to your work as an adjunct or part-time instructor. Please limit your responses to your adjunct faculty role.

What is your gender?

Female	Male

What is your age?

35 and under 36 - 45 46 - 55 56 - 65 66 +

How many years have you taught as an Adjunct professional educator at any institution of higher education?

0-3	4 - 7	8 -11	11+

How many years have you taught as an Adjunct professional educator at this university?

0-3	4 - 7	8 - 11	11+

What is the highest degree you have received?

BA/BS	MA/MS	Master's +40	Ph.D./Ed.D.	Professional Degree/ J.D.

Select the college in which you primarily teach

Graduate	Undergraduate-Arts, Sciences, & Humanities (English, Communications, Science, Religion, Arts)	Undergraduate-Professional (Business, Nursing, Education, Law)

In which modality do you primarily teach?

On-campus only	Online only	Online and on-campus including Hybrid/Blended

Do you work full or part-time at this university in addition to teaching as an adjunct?

Yes	No

Typology Questions

Which typology best describes your reason for choosing part-time faculty work?

Career-ender You are retired or moving toward retirement.	**Specialist, expert, or professional** You are employed full-time elsewhere. You were hired because of your expertise, and you do not rely exclusively on the teaching income. You teach because you enjoy being a part of the academic community.	**Aspiring academic** You would like a full-time faculty position, but currently teach at multiple institutions to create full-time work	**Freelancer** You have other part-time jobs or care for your home/children/parents. You supplement your income with teaching and appreciate the flexibility of part-time work.	**Other** Please describe

Job Satisfaction

Directions: Read each item and rate it using the following scale: 1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Somewhat Disagree, 4 = Somewhat Agree, 5=Agree, 6=Strongly Agree.

		1	2	3	4	5	6
1	I really enjoy teaching courses.						
2	I have a lot of freedom to develop and modify course content to meet the needs of my students.						
3	The classroom space where I teach classes is excellent.						
4	Full-time faculty and department chairs on the main campus lack interest and care very little about my success as a teacher.*						
5	Considering everything, I have an excellent job as an adjunct faculty member.						
6	Students lack motivation or the academic skills to succeed in my courses.*						
7	The times scheduled for my class(es) have been convenient.						

8	I am often thanked for teaching here.						
9	I am dissatisfied with aspects of my job as an adjunct faculty member.*						
10	I would highly recommend teaching at the university to other qualified people.						
11	I have enhanced my teaching ability by learning several new teaching methods or techniques during this past year.						
12	I am completely satisfied with the quality and caliber of students in my classes.						
13	I would prefer to teach somewhere else instead of at the university.*						
14	I am putting in extra time and effort to become a better teacher.						
15	I feel that I am well compensated for my teaching.						
16	I am required to teach at times that are inconvenient for me.*						
17	I am completely satisfied with my job teaching as an adjunct faculty member at the university.						
18	Adjunct faculty are recognized for their teaching contribution at the university.						
19	Students here are highly engaged and very interested in their academic work.						
20	I rarely receive any appreciation for teaching part time at the university.*						
21	I have a satisfactory level of autonomy to select material or texts for my courses.						
22	The classroom(s) where I teach have multimedia equipment that adequately meets pedagogical needs.						
23	Full-time faculty or department chairs on the main campus are always available and accessible to me when I need assistance.						
24	I am dissatisfied with the pay I receive for teaching courses.*						
25	My teaching skills and abilities have substantially improved this past year.						
26	I am very proud to tell others that I teach at the university.						
27	I would like more freedom to determine the content, materials, or texts for my courses.*						
28	I almost always look forward to teaching courses.						

29	The classroom space where I meet with students could be improved.*						
30	I feel very comfortable requesting assistance from full-time academic faculty or department chairs on the main campus when I have questions.						
31	I am paid fairly for the amount of work I do to teach courses.						
32	I would prefer to do work other than teaching.*						
33	The times that I teach my classes work well with my other commitments.						

Professional Development

Part 1

Directions: A number of skills and knowledge items are listed below. Please select the number which best indicates your perceived interest for inclusion in part-time faculty training. The numbers indicate the following value opinions:

No Need	**Low Need**	**Moderate Need**	**High Need**
1	**2**	**3**	**4**

Instructional development and delivery.

	1	2	3	4
Course and curriculum development				
Developing course outlines				
Application of learning principles to instruction				
Reinforcing student learning				
Diagnosis of learning/teaching problems				
Use of community resources as teaching tools				
Structuring interdisciplinary learning experiences for students				
Increasing student engagement				

Accommodating different learning styles

Writing instructional objectives

Writing test items

Creating grading systems that are compatible with instructional objectives

Techniques for evaluating instructional strategies

Developing programs that accommodate disadvantaged or handicapped students

Selecting, developing and using technology in courses

Utilizing group process skills in class discussions

Overall level of interest in faculty development in-service training for adjunct faculty

Part 2

Directions: For each of the activities listed please select the number corresponding to the perceived desirability level. The numbers indicate the following valued opinions:

Not Desirable	**Somewhat Desirable**	**Very Desirable**
1	**2**	**3**

1 2 3

New adjunct faculty orientation meetings

Periodic college-wide adjunct faculty meetings

Periodic adjunct faculty division/department meetings

Attendance at professional education or trade association conferences

Possible locations for staff development workshops:

On campus

Online—asynchronous
Online—synchronous
Other – please explain

For greatest participation in staff development workshop activities:

Summers
Breaks during the academic year
Weekends during the academic year
Weekdays
Week evenings
Other- (please explain)

The most feasible way to learn skills and knowledge:

On to two-hour workshops
University coursework
Self-paced instructional materials
Online training
Other – (please explain)

What is your level of interest in voluntary faculty development activities without compensation?

What is your level of interest in mandatory faculty development activities with compensation?

What is your level of interest in voluntary faculty development activities with compensation?

Comments:

Thank you for your participation. Your service to this University is appreciated and valued.

Appendix B

Faculty Survey Categories

Coding:

O verall job satisfaction (alpha = .74)
R ecognition (alpha = .82)
W ork preference (alpha = .65)
A utonomy (alpha = .73)
C lassroom facilities (alpha = .80)
F aculty support (alpha = .77)
H onorarium (alpha = .89)
T eaching schedule (alpha = .82)
L oyalty (alpha = .78)
Q uality of Students (alpha = .79)
P ersonal Growth (alpha = .65)

Question Number	Code	
		Overall Job Satisfaction (alpha = .74)
17	O	I am completely satisfied with my job teaching courses as a part-time faculty.
5	O	Considering everything, I have an excellent job as a part-time faculty teaching courses.
9	O	I am dissatisfied with aspects of my job as a part-time faculty.
		Recognition (alpha = .82)
8	R	I am often thanked for teaching here.
20	R	I rarely receive any appreciation for teaching part-time at the university.*
18	R	Adjunct faculty are recognized for their teaching contribution at the university.
		Work Preferences (alpha = .65)
1	W	I really enjoy teaching courses.
28	W	I almost always look forward to teaching classes.
32	W	I would prefer to do work other than teaching. *
		Autonomy (alpha = .73)
2	A	I have a lot of freedom to develop and modify course content to meet he needs of my students.
21	A	I have a satisfactory level of autonomy to select material and texts for my courses.
27	A	I would like more freedom to determine the content, materials, and texts for my courses.
		Classroom Facilities (alpha = .80)
3	C	The classroom space where I teach classes is excellent.

22	C	The classroom(s) where I teach have multimedia equipment that adequately meets pedagogical needs.
29	C	The classroom space where I meet with my students could be improved.*
		Faculty Support (alpha = .77)
23	F	Full-time faculty or department chairs on the main campus are always available and accessible to me when I need assistance.
4	F	Full-time faculty and department chairs on the main campus lack interest and care very little about my success as a teacher.*
30	F	I feel very comfortable requesting assistance from full-time academic faculty or department chairs on the main campus when I have questions.
		Honorarium (alpha = .89)
15	H	I feel that I am well compensated for my teaching.
31	H	I am paid fairly for the amount of work I do to teach courses.
24	H	I am dissatisfied with the pay I receive for teaching courses.
		Teaching Schedule (alpha = .82)
7	T	The times scheduled for my class(es) have been convenient.
33	T	The times that I teach my classes work well with my other commitments.
16	T	I am required to teach at times that are inconvenient for me.*
		Loyalty (alpha = .74)
10	L	I would highly recommend teaching at the university to other qualified people.
13	L	I would prefer to teach somewhere else instead of at the university.*
26	L	I am very proud to tell others that I teach at the university.
		Quality of Students (alpha = .79)
12	Q	I am completely satisfied with the quality and caliber of students in my classes.
6	Q	Students lack motivation or the academic skills to succeed in my courses.*
19	Q	Students here are highly engaged and very interested in their academic work.
		Personal Growth (alpha = .72)
11	P	I have enhanced my teaching ability by learning several new teaching methods or techniques during this past year.
25	P	My teaching skills and abilities have substantially improved this past year.
14	P	I am putting in extra time and effort to become a better teacher.

1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = somewhat disagree, 4 = somewhat agree, 5 = agree, 6 = strongly agree.
* Negatively worded questions are reverse coded to match the direction of positive questions.

References

Job Satisfaction section from:

Hoyt, J. E. (2012). Predicting the satisfaction and loyalty of adjunct faculty. *The Journal of Continuing Higher Education, 60*(3), pp. 132-142.

doi: 10.1080/07377363.2013.722417

Hoyt, J. E., Howell, S. L., & Eggett, D. (2007). Dimensions of part-time faculty job satisfaction: Development and factor analysis of a survey instrument. *Journal of Adult Education, 36*(2), pp. 23-34, Insert.

Faculty Development section modified from:

Pedras, M. J. (1982). *The conceptualization and development of a staff development model for community college part-time faculty.* Paper presented at the American Vocational Education Conference, Anaheim, CA.

Appendix C

Letter of Consent

My name is Lisa Davidson and I am an Adjunct Faculty member at Marylhurst University and Concordia University. I am also a Doctoral student in the Educational Foundations and Leadership program at George Fox University. I am conducting research on adjunct faculty job satisfaction levels and professional development interests.

You are invited to participate in this study by completing an online survey. Most of the questions include a Likert-type summated rating scale. You will be indicating your opinions and interests on the scale. The survey should only take approximately 15 minutes of your time.

The risks associated with this research are negligible. The results of the survey will be published in an aggregate form to ensure that no specific responses can be traced to an individual. General demographic data will be collected such as gender, college for which you teach (Undergraduate-Arts and Sciences, Undergraduate-Professional, and Graduate), highest academic degree, and years teaching as an adjunct. Department affiliation or other specific identifying information will not be collected. Even with all of the safeguards in place, I can assure confidentiality, but am unable to absolutely guarantee anonymity.

The survey data will be retrieved electronically and stored in an electronic file. I will be the only individual with access to the data. The data as stored on the survey will be deleted after seven years.

This study has the potential to provide insight into the needs and interests of all adjuncts, and will be organized by the reasons for choosing part-time work. The aggregate results will be shared with your university administrators in order to help them better understand and respond to the unique needs and interests of the part-time faculty.

Thank you for considering this study. You have the right to withdraw from participation in this research at any time. If you have questions regarding this research, please contact me at (503) 307-1461.

If you understand the use of this research and agree to participate, please mark the "ACCEPT" button below.

Thank you for your assistance.

Lisa Davidson

If you have questions about your rights as a research participant, you may contact the George Fox University Institutional Review Board (IRB), which is concerned with the protection of volunteers in research projects. You may reach the board by calling (503) 538-8383, or by

writing: Institutional Review Board, College of Education Committee Representative Dr. Huffman, 414 N. Meridian St., Newberg, OR, 97132.

George Fox University
School of Education
Newberg, Oregon

"COMMUNICATING VALUE: UNDERSTANDING ADJUNCT TYPOLOGY, JOB SATISFACTION LEVELS, AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT INTERESTS," a Doctoral research project prepared by LISA P. DAVIDSON in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Doctor of Education degree in the Educational Foundations and Leadership Department.

This dissertation has been approved and accepted by:

April 9, 2015 Patrick Allen		Committee Chair
Date	Patrick Allen, PhD	Professor of Education
4/10/15 Rebecca Addleman		
Date	Rebecca Addleman, EdD	Associate Professor of Education
4/10/15 Karen Buchanan		
Date	Karen Buchanan, EdD	Professor of Education