

Fall 9-27-2018

Adjunct Faculty: The Silent Majority

Erin M. Hillstead Walton
Concordia University - Portland, erin.hillsteadwalton@gmail.com

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.csp.edu/cup_commons_grad_edd



Part of the [Adult and Continuing Education Commons](#), [Adult and Continuing Education Administration Commons](#), [Community College Education Administration Commons](#), [Community College Leadership Commons](#), [Higher Education Administration Commons](#), and the [Online and Distance Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Hillstead Walton, E. M. (2018). *Adjunct Faculty: The Silent Majority* (Thesis, Concordia University, St. Paul). Retrieved from https://digitalcommons.csp.edu/cup_commons_grad_edd/227


This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Concordia University Portland Graduate Research at DigitalCommons@CSP. It has been accepted for inclusion in CUP Ed.D. Dissertations by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@CSP. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@csp.edu.

Fall 9-27-2018

Adjunct Faculty: The Silent Majority

Erin M. Hillstead Walton
Concordia University - Portland

Follow this and additional works at: <https://commons.cu-portland.edu/edudissertations>

 Part of the [Adult and Continuing Education Commons](#), [Adult and Continuing Education Administration Commons](#), [Community College Education Administration Commons](#), [Community College Leadership Commons](#), [Higher Education Administration Commons](#), and the [Online and Distance Education Commons](#)

CU Commons Citation

Hillstead Walton, Erin M., "Adjunct Faculty: The Silent Majority" (2018). *Ed.D. Dissertations*. 187.
<https://commons.cu-portland.edu/edudissertations/187>

This Open Access Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate Theses & Dissertations at CU Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Ed.D. Dissertations by an authorized administrator of CU Commons. For more information, please contact libraryadmin@cu-portland.edu.

Concordia University–Portland

College of Education

Doctorate of Education Program

WE, THE UNDERSIGNED MEMBERS OF THE DISSERTATION COMMITTEE
CERTIFY THAT WE HAVE READ AND APPROVE THE DISSERTATION OF

Erin Maree Walton

CANDIDATE FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

Brianna Parsons, Ed.D., Faculty Chair, Dissertation Committee

Okema S. Branch, Ed.D, Content Specialist

Mary E. Robinson, Ed.D, Content Reader

Adjunct Faculty: The Silent Majority

Erin Maree Walton

Concordia University–Portland

College of Education

Dissertation submitted to the Faculty of the College of Education

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Education in

Higher Education

Dr. Brianna Parsons, Ed.D., Faculty Chair Dissertation Committee

Dr. Okema S. Branch, Ed.D., Content Specialist

Dr. Mary E. Robinson, Ed.D., Content Reader

Concordia University–Portland

2018

Abstract

The increase in use of part-time faculty, commonly referred to as “adjunct,” has shifted the academic workforce. Utilization of this populace has increased steadily over the past several years and is anticipated to continue this growth as colleges and universities seek cost-cutting measures in balancing their annual budgets. With this increase, however, comes unexpected consequences for the educators who fill these roles; often they are underpaid, overworked, and employed tenuously from term-to-term with no security in employment. This dissertation examines the adjunct faculty role; including what adjunct faculty need to be successful, versus what they have been provided to succeed in their roles. The research uses a constructivist framework alongside Maslow’s Hierarchy of Needs and Herzberg’s Theory of Motivation to juxtapose the adjunct work experience with traditional models of satisfaction and self-actualization; the data collected support the theory that adjunct faculty cannot feel secure and valuable in their role under the current adjunct faculty work model, and provides insights for administrators in an effort to better support these faculty and potentially positively impact student outcomes in kind.

Keywords: adjunct, faculty, Maslow, Herzberg, educational administration

Dedication

For my children and my husband, both of whom have never known me without homework. It's all done now; let's go play.

Acknowledgments

The dissertation process could never be completed without a mentor; Oprah Winfrey stated (as cited in Cruell, 2012),

A mentor is someone who allows you to see the hope inside yourself. A mentor is someone who allows you to know that no matter how dark the night, in the morning joy will come. A mentor is someone who allows you to see the higher part of yourself when sometimes it becomes hidden to your own view. (p. 6)

And this process would be incomplete without acknowledging Dr. Brianna Parsons for her sustained interest in my personal well-being, my academic success, and my professional competency. Thank you for the gift of “hope”, Dr. P.

Table of Contents

Abstract	ii
Dedication	iii
Acknowledgments.....	iiv
List of Tables	x
Chapter 1: Introduction	11
Background, Context, History, and Conceptual Framework.....	13
Statement of the Problem.....	15
Purpose of the Study	16
Research Questions	17
Rationale, Relevance, and Significance of the Study	19
Definition of Terms.....	20
Assumptions, Delimitations, and Limitations.....	23
Summary	24
Chapter 2: Literature Review.....	26
The Problem Statement.....	29
The Organization	30
Conceptual Framework.....	31
Constructivism.....	31
Social Exchange and Social Capital Theories	32
Maslow’s Hierarchy of Needs	33
Review of Research Literature and Methodological Literature.....	34
Understanding the Adjunct Condition.....	34

Adjunct Staffing Ratios.....	35
Adjunct Compensation and Benefits	35
Student Perceptions of Adjunct Faculty.....	36
Colleagues' Perceptions of Adjunct Faculty	37
Adjunct Faculty and Student Outcomes.....	37
Adjunct Support Systems	38
Conclusions	38
Review of Methodological Issues	39
The Quantitative Methodologies	39
The Qualitative Methodologies.....	41
Strengths and Weaknesses	42
Synthesis of Research Findings	42
Critique of Previous Research	44
Conclusion	44
Chapter 3: Methodology	46
Research Questions	46
Purpose and Design of Study.....	48
Research Population and Sampling Methods	49
Instrumentation	51
Data Collection	54
Identification of Variables and Attributes.....	55
Attributes	55
Variables.....	57

Data Analysis Procedures	58
Limitations of Research Design.....	60
Validation (Credibility and Dependability)	61
Expected Findings.....	61
Conflict of Interest Assessment	62
Researcher’s Position	63
Summary	64
Chapter 4: Data Analysis and Results.....	65
Description of the Sample.....	68
Demographics and Academic Background.....	68
Instructional Tasks and Workload	73
Current Employment, Instructional Resources and Time Management	767
Perceptions of Adjunct Faculty and Satisfaction Factors	81
Qualitative Data Analysis	87
Theme 1: Quality of Communication with Adjunct Faculty	90
Theme 2: Compensation and Workload Expectations of Adjunct Faculty.....	91
Theme 3: Course Content and Technology	94
Theme 4: Student Concerns.....	95
Interpretation of Responses.....	96
Theme 1: Compensation for Adjuncts.....	97
Theme 2: Consistency in Employment Terms	98
Theme 3: Relationship with Institution	99
Theme 4: Classroom and Student Concerns.....	101

Interpretation of Responses.....	101
Theme 1: Value in the Institutional Connection and Compensation Package ...	101
Theme 2: Value in the Andragogy, Autonomy, and Mentoring	102
Theme 3: Value in Student Interaction	102
Theme 4: Value from Gaining Experience	103
Summary	104
Chapter 5: Discussion and Conclusion	105
Summary of the Results	105
Discussion of the Results	107
Discussion of the Results in Relation to the Literature	111
Limitations	118
Survey Dissemination.....	1189
Implications of the Results.....	119
Implications for Institutions.....	120
Implication of Value	120
Implication of Utilization	121
Recommendations for Future Research.....	122
Evaluation of Compensation Factors	122
Evaluation of Time Management	123
Summary	123
References.....	124
Appendix A: Survey Instrument	1377
Appendix B: Email Request for Participants.....	1467

Appendix C: Email Reminder Notice 1478
Appendix D: Statement of Original Work 1489

List of Tables

Table 1 <i>Survey Sample Response Rate, IPEDS Database</i>	60
Table 2 <i>Demographics of Survey Respondents</i>	70-71
Table 3 <i>Academic Background of Survey Respondents</i>	72-73
Table 4 <i>Instructional Tasks and Workload of Survey Respondents</i>	76
Table 5 <i>Current Employment of Survey Respondents</i>	78
Table 6 <i>Instructional Resources Available to Survey Respondents</i>	79
Table 7 <i>Communication Methods for Survey Respondents</i>	80
Table 8 <i>Participant Time Distribution, Average Hours Per Week</i>	81
Table 9 <i>Professional Interpersonal Relationships</i>	82
Table 10 <i>Job Satisfaction for Survey Respondents</i>	83-84
Table 11 <i>Perceptions of Survey Respondents</i>	86-88
Table 12 <i>Q27 Codes, Themes and Subthemes; Advice to Administration</i>	89
Table 13 <i>Q28 Codes, Themes and Subthemes; Requests for Change</i>	97
Table 14 <i>Q29 Themes And Subthemes; Identified Value</i>	102

Chapter 1: Introduction

As access to electronic technologies increases, college campus administrators must reevaluate the way they deliver academic content (Boord, 2010). Students increasingly desire mobility in their pedagogy (Chen, 2012); this desire may be leading to a rise in online courses offered, and subsequently the hiring of more part-time faculty members. Adjunct faculty are a common sight on college campuses, utilized by both 2-year and 4-year universities at an exponential rate; rates of use vary from 40% to 75% depending on the sector of the education industry (Ginder & Kelly-Redi, 2013). The employment statistics for adjunct faculty have increased regularly for almost 45 years. Historical data indicate that as of 1970, only 22% of employed college faculty were employed as adjunct (Snyder & Dillow, 2012); a figure that rose to 36% in 1985, and 43% in 1999. 2011 became the first year on record in which the amount of part-time faculty exceeded that of full-time faculty, and adjunct workers were noted as 50.01% of total faculty nationwide (National Center for Education Statistics, 2013b).

These part-time faculty members take on teaching roles for various reasons: to fill their time as they find more free time in their retirement years, to “break into” a full-time teaching job, or to keep abreast of their industry through teaching (Tomanek, 2010). Regardless of the reason, adjunct faculty are being hired and employed at higher rates now than in years prior. However, the duties required of adjunct faculty are not equitable when compared to that of their full-time colleagues. A lack of benefits, inconsistency in employment terms, burnout, poor pay, and disengagement from administration and campus culture are all cited as major flaws in the adjunct-teaching role (Reigle, 2016).

The adjunct faculty member enables the college to hit their financial benchmarks, as adjunct faculty are compensated at a much lower rate than their full-time counterparts, allowing school

administrators to reroute funds previously set aside for full-time salaries (National Center for Education Statistics [NCES], 2012). Benefits are also found within their employment structure, as adjunct employees can be utilized sporadically from term-to-term with no guarantee of future use (Mangan, 2009). Occasionally, an adjunct will be contracted for a particular term, only to have their course canceled after the first week. Should an adjunct faculty member request better employment terms, equitable treatment from the administration, or even attempt unionization, their respective institutions can often find a replacement for the displeased employee within days (Hutto, 2013). Monks (2009) stated, “this growth in the use of part-time faculty has occurred despite low pay, almost nonexistent benefits, inadequate working conditions, and little or no opportunity for career advancement” (p. 33). Regardless of the compensation shortfalls and varying working conditions, hopeful faculty members continually accept these jobs leaving few bargaining chips on the table.

The dependence of institutions on the adjunct faculty appears warranted from a financial perspective; however, its long-term sustainability is questionable. “Most students attend public colleges and universities, which are subsidized by taxpayers through state appropriations and through state grants to students. Nationwide, these subsidies approach \$10,000 per student per year; in some states the average is higher” (Schneider, 2010, p.2), and while this figure may seem to add up, it does not equivocate with academic institutions providing high salaries to their employees. The financial security of higher education often requires cutting corners, and hiring adjunct faculty is an example of this very practice (Louis, 2009). The increased use of adjunct faculty continues to be debated as departments fill their teaching positions with eager adjuncts, expected to participate in revising course materials, holding office hours, meeting with students and administration; all for a fraction of the salary of their full-time peers (Morthland, 2010). However, it is noted that prior researchers have contended that students receive lower quality instruction from adjunct instructors when compared to their full-time counterparts (Jacobs, 1998; Rouche, Rouche, & Milliron, 1996;

Schmidt, 2008). Concerns surrounding adjunct faculty cannot be ignored, and the continued reliance on contingent employees bears scrutiny. Any institution that relies heavily on adjunct faculty must address their treatment, their contributions to academia, and their motivation as employees and instructors in an effort to provide a more balanced and equitable place of employment. The goal of this dissertation is to create and continue an open line of communication on this topic, as well as contribute substantive literature and research for future researchers.

Background, Context, History, and Conceptual Framework

Before the working conditions currently surrounding adjunct faculty can be properly digested, it is important to acknowledge the various theories that discuss workplace satisfaction. These theories can be utilized to measure work-related fulfillment and satisfaction. Many researchers have pursued research surrounding the working conditions and workloads of faculty; after delving into the literature, it is apparent the problem is widespread (Jaeger & Hinz, 2009; Louis, 2009; Lyons, 2007). As a result, the question may arise as to motivations of the faculty members to stay in this field; if the conditions and expectations are so poor, why does an adjunct continue to work within the industry? The answer may lie in the inherent satisfaction that these employees glean from their work.

The idea that inherent satisfaction can be derived from working is not a foreign concept (Tomanek, 2010). However, the degree to which an individual feels satisfied with the career choices he or she has made varies based on several factors. Herzberg (1968) examined the concept in a 1968 study, and focused on employees in the business sector, seeking to discover the items that professionals used as motivation to continue in these positions. After investigation and analysis, the author came to the conclusion that satisfaction and motivation were two distinct concepts that should be measured independently (Herzberg, 1968). Herzberg determined that the aspects that lead to job satisfaction, also known as motivators, included: achievement, recognition, joy in the work itself,

responsibility, and career advancement. Conversely, the aspects that prevented job satisfaction, or hygienes, included: company policies, working conditions, levels of supervision and/or autonomy, interpersonal relations with coworkers, and monetary compensation. What ultimately developed from this research was Herzberg's Theory of Motivation (also known as "Hygiene Theory"), which is still used today and is considered a seminal work in the study of human motivation. While Herzberg's theory originally focused on the business sector, it is still used in academia as well, and Boord (2010), Hagedorn (2000), and Schulz (2009) are all more recent, 21st century examples. Their use of Herzberg's theories applied to academic research helped provide a basis for the design and framework of this study.

In addition to Herzberg's theories, the ideas of Maslow are particularly relevant. Maslow introduced his Theory of Motivation in 1943 and adapted it further in 1954 to reflect the attitudes of employees in their respective workplaces. The theorist believed that human beings follow a sequence of need-satisfaction, beginning at lower levels with basic needs and moving to higher levels, more abstract needs and more complex levels of satisfaction. Human beings must first meet physical requirements for survival, such as air, water, food, clothing, and shelter. They move on to ensuring their safety and security, then to finding a sense of belonging within society and establishing respect and esteem. The top level originally concerned being the best person one can be; however, Maslow later criticized the original view of this need, adding transcendence where one seeks altruism, a higher goal outside of the self. Maslow also theorized that the varying levels of satisfaction had to be completed linearly; in other words, the person cannot seek to meet higher needs (or even recognize their possible existence) until the lower-level needs are satisfied.

According to Maslow's Theory, employees often show resistance and difficulty when required to articulate their "needs" in the workplace to themselves, to their colleagues, and to their employers. As a result, employers have developed an approach to management that treats every

employee with equity in both their intrinsic and extrinsic motivations (Fisher & Royster, 2016); that is, management assumes all employees have similar goals and desires from their careers rather than approaching the individual employee to formulate specific goals and rewards (McLeod, 2014).

Maslow's theories have contributed to past research on education, though mainly in the elementary and secondary level classrooms. If a student has not met the basic physiological need of nutrition (i.e., they are hungry during classes), they cannot focus on the higher cognitive requirements of school. These ideas can translate to the working environment for adjunct faculty as well. Adjunct employees, for example, are often employed only on a term-by-term basis. This means they will have income for the current/contracted term; however, once it concludes there is no guarantee of future employment. This policy of adjunct staffing threatens an adjunct's ability to pay their bills and buy food, thus impacting their satisfaction of physiological needs. The staffing practice also threatens the employees' need for safety and security in their employment, another of Maslow's needs (Jonas, 2016; Lester, 2013).

Through the lens of both Maslow (1943) and Herzberg (1968), administration can begin to understand the need for adjunct employees to feel safe and satisfied in their position, or they cannot be successful in their teaching duties. When employees are marginalized, they cannot innovate or hone their teaching skills; they are disposable and replaceable. The academic research is clear; it is the irreparable perception of disposability held by adjunct faculty that can impact student outcomes if left unacknowledged.

Statement of the Problem

The research on adjunct faculty and their roles and contributions to higher education is copious; however, many studies focus on how adjunct faculty members are treated. These studies examine the utilization of faculty at varying post-secondary institutions (Batiste, 2016; Benjamin, 2003), often focused on either two-year (Fry, 2009) or four-year (Tomanek, 2010) colleges and

universities. These studies usually focus on the perceptions of adjunct faculty (Marlier, 2014; Scott, 2010), how they are utilized (Deutsch, 2015), and how they view their career prospects as part-time employees (Mangan, 2009; Rossi, 2009; Watts, 2002).

Due to the increasing enrollment numbers, community colleges must be prepared to find part-time faculty who are capable and qualified to teach. However, more than finding faculty, institutions must be prepared to train and develop them professionally; this includes treating them as valued members of the academic community. Tomanek (2010) stated, “. . . achievement, recognition, work itself, responsibility, and advancement are motivators. . .” (p. 8) when it comes to creating a positive and effective learning employment scenario for adjunct faculty. This dissertation attempts to explore the gap between what adjunct faculty need to be successful, as defined by Herzberg (1968), and understand what adjuncts are given by their institutions (e.g., resources, training), in an effort to provide a meaningful working environment with the potential for improved student outcomes as a result.

Purpose of the Study

This study examined how academic administrations handle the unique and dynamic workforce known as “adjunct faculty” in an effort to implement changes that will increase job satisfaction, which affects both adjunct faculty and students. The study has several goals, each of which has the potential to impact the academic literature on the topic of adjunct faculty. The main goal of the study was to gain the knowledge needed to affect adjunct job satisfaction and inspire administrative and/or institutional support and policy changes. Secondary to this is the goal to improve student outcomes and experiences when adjunct faculty are present in the classroom.

To achieve these goals, this descriptive survey research study examined the perception of “support” in the adjunct faculty member’s institution of employment using Herzberg’s Hygiene Theory (1968) and Maslow’s Hierarchy of Needs (1943) as methods of identifying motivators that

may lead to this inherent satisfaction and perceived support, or lack thereof. Prior research has found that as a general rule, student outcomes suffer when adjunct faculty members are leading the classroom unless the faculty feels supported, respected, and vital in the function of their institution (Eagan & Jaeger, 2008). As such, participants in this study were expected to rate their own level of support from administration, including a report of policies and training already in place (i.e., the “haves”), versus what the adjunct requests (i.e., the “needs”) to feel supported. It is the space between these two items that holds vital information and can assist future researchers to close the gap between an adjunct’s “need” and “have,” ultimately improving the workplace for all parties: student, faculty, and administration.

In addition to supporting adjunct faculty and providing insight for academic administration, the study created a baseline for an adjunct faculty demographic. Due to the diverse nature of academia an accurate demographic of adjunct faculty has been difficult to obtain. There is no legal requirement to report adjunct demographic information to databases like the Integrated Post-Secondary Education Data System (IPEDS), a database vital to navigating the demographic landscape of higher education because it requires institutions to report their faculty (full-time only) employment numbers, student enrollment numbers, persistence rates, and graduation rates in order to receive federal financial aid. After collecting and analyzing the initial characteristics (e.g., gender, race, ethnicity, academic discipline) of adjunct providers, a fuller, varied, and current picture of the adjunct faculty workforce has been added to the literature on the topic.

Research Questions

The intention of the descriptive survey research was to examine the relationship between adjunct faculty members and students, adjunct faculty members and their respective university of employment, and methods for optimizing interactions among all parties to improve student outcomes. To explore the topic, the following research questions guided the study:

- RQ₁: What administrative support and other conditions do adjunct faculty members at colleges and universities need to be successful?
- RQ₂: How do full-time, tenured/non-tenured faculty members perceive adjunct faculty members' contributions to their university?
- RQ₃: Is there a relationship between job satisfaction reported by adjunct faculty, and the self-reported success or failure of an adjunct faculty member?

These questions represent the first aspect of the research, which was to identify adjunct faculty members' needs to identify the areas for improvement; to do this, the deficits need to be defined first.

Concurrent to identifying the needs of adjunct faculty, the study also examined the same issue from the perspective of the university administration. The following questions were developed to accomplish this:

1. What can university leadership do to better support adjunct faculty members?
 - a. What support systems, policies, procedures, and/or guidelines are in place to support adjunct faculty?

A gap between what adjunct faculty members need to feel successful in their work, and what they have was anticipated to be discovered, as well as the idea that an increase in institutional support from administrators and other faculty members would allow adjunct faculty to glean more satisfaction from their jobs. This satisfaction was assumed to lead to better student outcomes for classes led by adjunct faculty, or at minimum, allow retention to remain on par with their colleagues; however, the focus on student outcomes was not specifically measured in this study, and is only mentioned as a potential contribution to academia.

Rationale, Relevance, and Significance of the Study

The need for variable teaching modalities, accessible education, and a surplus of new students has led to increased utilization of adjunct faculty in post-secondary institutions (Hutto, 2013). This increase is affecting student outcomes like retention, persistence, and continuation rates; all prior research tells us the effect is wholly negative for the students (Deutsch, 2015). The significant and ongoing dependence on adjunct faculty is concerning particularly when student outcomes are taken into consideration. The National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) reports that graduation and retention rates are low, citing that only 72% of freshmen persist from year one into year two; with a mere 39% of these freshmen continuing to complete a four-year degree (2013b) in the four-year university setting. These statistics are often important to educational policymakers, and receive plenty of consideration from academic administration; however, it is possible the administration is missing an overt factor from the equation as they attempt to weigh the importance of these statistics. These dwindling numbers are often attributed to the large amount of adjunct faculty who teach lower-level courses (Tomanek, 2010; Umbach, 2007). The universities that choose to acknowledge this potential correlation may be better prepared to comprehend the impact their hiring policies have on the future of education.

Very little research has examined the professional motivation of the adjunct faculty members entrusted with new students' education. This motivation includes adjunct faculty's feelings of satisfaction with their job, their perception of institutional support systems in place, and their career mobility. The academic literature on the topic also fails to make a connection between the two aforementioned topics: adjunct satisfaction and student outcomes. The continuing rise in adjunct usage and decline in student outcomes cannot be ignored, particularly if adjunct utilization continues or increases as projected (Huffman, 2000).

Currently, the quantity of employed adjunct faculty utilized in higher education surpasses that of full-time faculty (NCES, 2013b), which has led to questions regarding the quality of education being given to incoming college students (Scott, 2010; Thompson, 2003) as well as the cost of student attrition (Schneider, 2010). These financial losses motivate educational institutions to make various attempts at curbing attrition rates, which often appear in the form of additional classes and seminars on student success skills, increased use of counseling and career advisors, and student retention committee formation—all designed to help the students (Deutsch, 2015). The Delta Cost Project (as cited in Johnson, 2012) discovered that “. . . student attrition accounted for 19.5% of higher education costs” (p. 5) meaning that almost 20% of annual education subsidies and tax dollars go to students who never receive their degree. The total impact of any attrition-related financial loss is larger than that, however. Additional losses to the university derived from student attrition found that “. . . first-year students who did not return (had a) total loss to the taxpayer of \$9 billion over 5 years” (Schneider & Yin, 2011, p. 2), including indirect costs from taxing higher wages earned after completing a degree. If the policies or procedures surrounding adjunct faculty utilization added in any part to the lost investment the practice bears deeper scrutiny. These efforts fail to address any underlying issues in staffing policies or educator efficacy. The attention of policymakers must be rerouted to focus on adjunct impact either through a shift in hiring policies or support systems.

This study contributed to the academic perspective and literature on the two factors of adjunct satisfaction and helped to identify practical ways educational leadership and administration can assist their adjunct faculty population in gleaning more satisfaction from their roles. This “satisfaction” has the potential to yield better student outcomes as well as happier faculty overall.

Definition of Terms

In this dissertation, several key terms are used as defined below. Definitions are provided in this section for clarification.

Adjunct Faculty: faculty teaching in a post-secondary institution in a part-time capacity, less than 30 hours per week. Also referred to as “contingent faculty.”

Benefits: health insurance, vacation and/or sick time, retirement benefits or plans, and/or professional development opportunities offered to employees.

Classroom materials: any materials, supplies, or training provided to faculty to enhance classroom instruction; including textbooks, teaching aids, miscellaneous supplies, or training.

Full mooner: defined in Rouche, Rouche, & Milliron’s taxonomy of adjunct faculty (1995), this term is applied to adjunct faculty who work 35+ hours in another position or industry, outside their teaching responsibilities.

Full -time part-timer: defined in Rouche, Rouche, & Milliron’s taxonomy of adjunct faculty (1995), this term is applied to adjunct faculty who hold two or more adjunct teaching positions, simultaneously, for different institutions.

Hierarchy of Needs: a theory, defined by Maslow (1943), which categorizes human needs into varying tiers including basic needs (food, water), security needs (safety in housing and/or career stability), belonging needs (having friends, colleagues, or other social relationships), esteem needs (self-respect, ego), and self-actualization.

Hygiene factors: various items that might prevent an employee from feeling satisfied in their position, as categorized by Herzberg (1968). These items include administrative policies, working conditions, autonomy and oversight, salary, relationships with colleagues and managers, and career status.

Homeworker: defined in Rouche, Rouche, & Milliron’s (1995) taxonomy of adjunct faculty, this term is applied to adjunct faculty who work from home, so they may care for children, and/or parents in the home.

Hopeful full-timer: defined in Rouche, Rouche, & Milliron's (1995) taxonomy of adjunct faculty, this term is applied to adjunct faculty who are hoping to transition to full-time teaching positions.

Institutional support: varying policies, procedures, and/or training materials provided by an institution to assist adjunct faculty in successfully performing their teaching duties. These resources can be college-specific (Hagedorn, 2000).

Modalities: routes by which learning materials (i.e., lectures, assigned readings, and resources) are delivered. Modalities include face-to-face or on-ground (teacher and student present in the classroom synchronously), online (teacher and student work asynchronously in an online Learning Management System), and hybrid or blended learning (learning is delivered both synchronously and asynchronously by combining in- and out-of-class work).

Motivators: aspects of a job from which someone can derive satisfaction; the duties themselves, opportunities for advancement, achievement, and recognition.

Onliner: defined in Rouche, Rouche, & Milliron's (1995) taxonomy of adjunct faculty, this term is applied to adjunct faculty who teach solely in an online modality.

Part-mooner: defined in Rouche, Rouche, & Milliron's (1995) taxonomy of adjunct faculty, this term is applied to adjunct faculty who hold two or more part-time jobs, not necessarily in teaching roles.

Semi-retired: defined in Rouche, Rouche, & Milliron's (1995) taxonomy of adjunct faculty, this term is applied to adjunct faculty who have retired from a full-time job and currently teach as a hobby or for supplemental income.

Student: defined in Rouche, Rouche, & Milliron's (1995) taxonomy of adjunct faculty, this term is applied to adjunct faculty who are teaching in order to further pursue their own education.

Assumptions, Delimitations, and Limitations

The literature regarding certain aspects of the contingent faculty population is sparse, particularly in areas like satisfaction, continuing education needs, and professional development opportunities. Due to the rarity of relevant materials regarding job satisfaction in the post-secondary landscape, it has been necessary throughout the research process to draw upon prior research performed outside of academia. In some cases, the business world was examined for reference; particularly when developing the framework of this research (Ang & Slaughter, 2001; Ellingson, Grys, & Sackett, 1998). Studies aimed at the private sector, and temporary employees, found the same outcomes as those within various academic settings. When one dissatisfied employee goes, two more are eager to take his or her place.

After examining both academic and professional sectors' populations and their responses to past inquiries on job roles, a few assumptions were made regarding the research. It is the assumption of the researcher that the population who responded to the request for participation did so honestly, and with candor. Due to the anonymous nature of this survey, no repercussions were associated with participating fully; there was no reward or incentive for participants to give any other response than a truthful one. It was also assumed that the participants who assisted in this research were representative of the population as a whole, that they fit the required limitations for participants, and did not respond to the survey if they not did fit these guidelines.

The research had limitations: the first was a concern about the desired response rates. Prior research indicates that roughly 25% of adjuncts who receive the request for participation will not respond to it (Leslie & Gappa, 1993). More current information lowers that number to 13.59%; particularly low considering an ideal response rate is around 70% (Babbie, 2012). The faculty who did not respond to the participation request create a lack of visibility in the survey numbers, which had the potential to skew the representability of the sample population.

This study also had a qualitative inquiry as part of its design. As is the goal of qualitative research, a saturation point for applicable themes and categories in the recorded responses was obtained. Qualitative responses to surveys are vulnerable to researcher bias in the interpretation and classification of themes; however, a triangulated methodical approach was used to objectively analyze the data revealed in the content. By creating this measure for objective analysis, the research and subsequent qualitative findings can be considered unbiased in interpretation.

As in any research process, delimitations were present as well. Because adjunct faculty are often employed on a term-to-term basis, the availability of adjunct faculty being present and able to participate could have been low. This was dependent on each respective employer's hiring and course load policies. The participation request was sent to various department heads and indicated the requirement of the adjunct faculty's teaching within a year of the institution's current term. Any adjunct faculty who fit that criterion was invited to respond; if an adjunct was not teaching in their institution's "current" term, but had taught within the year prior, the adjunct was still able to participate in the research.

Summary

The pursuit of a higher education is a worthy and valuable experience and, more than ever, young adults are taking advantage of its benefits. The student surplus has created a whole generation of students who have been exposed to new ideas and concepts at the hands of capable, insightful, and invaluable instructors; some of whom are working as full-time educators and dedicated their careers to academia, and others who are teaching part-time and are no less devoted to the work. This study attempted to add to the academic literature on the latter type of instructor, by explicitly investigating their satisfaction levels.

Chapter 2 will overview the prior research performed on the topic, as well as detail the related studies that bear relevance. These studies examine the chronological arrival of the adjunct

faculty member into academia, how the adjunct (as an employee) is utilized, the rates at which he or she is employed compared to full-time counterparts, the perceptions of the adjunct's academic contributions by both colleagues and students, employment benefit and compensation information, relevant job satisfaction theories, and factors that may ultimately lead adjunct faculty to higher levels of satisfaction within their positions. Additionally, management of adjunct faculty members is examined from an administrative perspective.

In Chapter 3, the research design will be presented. The methodologies of both the survey design, survey instrument, and analysis are examined; the participant selection process is also detailed. The methods for analyzing and interpreting data are covered, including an overview of the variables that were measured. The discussed methodologies will outline the research questions as each was proposed, including their relevance to the topic. Finally, chapter three will detail data analysis techniques and explain how the returned data will answer its corresponding research question.

Chapter 4 will discuss data collection processes and display the analyzed data. The chapter will focus on the responses of the sample population and collate demographic information and participant ratings and results. The data will be presented in the text and by table where appropriate and will detail any statistical methods utilized in its analysis.

Chapter 5 will include a summary of the data presented in chapter four and will further examine the outcomes of the study, including the researcher's interpretation of the data and conclusions. In addition to straightforward analysis of the data, any gaps in the research will be detailed. This was done in effort to direct future research on the topic. The chapter will conclude with the personal perspective of the researcher and detail future implications for academic research.

Chapter 2: Literature Review

Colleges and universities have reached a crisis point. The tried and true pedagogical methodologies of previous generations are being replaced by new technologies, and with that shift comes a new aspect of education: online education (Rossi, 2009). The movement of classrooms from the traditional on-ground method has allowed schools to broaden their programs and services, as well as provide resources for students with geographic limitations, time constraints, and economic difficulties. Matriculating enrollments are now a mix of remote/online and traditional/ground students, all receiving the same access to classrooms and faculty (Western Governors, 2017). The mobility of the new modality has broadened enrollment demographics and allowed education to become accessible to more people, with a few notable side effects.

As enrollment increases so does the need for general education courses to be offered in alignment with these varying modalities. Furthermore, a need for trained educators, competent in many modalities, exists. These needs amid a challenging economy, increased budget cuts, and the pressure to meet new and diverse needs of today's students have created a tempest in academic hallways as higher education attempts to adapt to the new educational landscape, and educational institutions struggle to find balance (Polard, 2016). One attempt to find this balance is through the practice of hiring adjunct faculty members "to offer the broadest array of courses to meet varying student curricular and scheduling demands" (cited in Fain, 2014), although this practice has yet to be met with overwhelming success (Deutsch, 2015; Rossi, 2009).

A solution to the problem may lie within the problem itself. To effectively manage the growing subset of adjunct and other part-time faculty members and ensure quality instruction, administrators must utilize available resources in the pursuit of those aims (Selby, 2009). This study sought understanding of current administrative practices and employment outcomes at the community college level; a sector of the market seeing particularly high areas of growth in

enrollment. Furthermore, this study examined how the adjunct faculty members evaluate their institutions, the overt deficiencies in support systems, and potential for governance, which could provide a remedy.

In the continuous cycle of increasing enrollment and decreasing budgets, colleges are struggling to support their students and remain within their budgetary allocations. A solution that many adopt is the use of adjunct instructors to reduce the stress placed on ever-extended departments; although finding that adjunct faculty are less educated in the art of education itself. Wallin states “. . . while many of these part-time faculty have great command of their subject matter, they have . . . little experience teaching what they know” (2005, p. 3). Perhaps the lack of experience explains why adjunct faculty members are compensated at a lower rate than their full-time colleagues, with an average pay at a quarter to one-third less than a salaried faculty member teaching the same course (Fountain, 2005). This disparity is common enough to elicit humor, as in the American Federation of Teachers' (AFT) 2001 press release that read, “What do elephants and part-time faculty have in common? Both work for peanuts” (as cited by Wallin, 2001, p. 6). Adjunct faculty, when utilized as a cost-saving strategy, allow the colleges to increase the number of courses that are taught while only nominally increasing the budget for salary (Polard, 2016). Employment of adjunct faculty is not a recent trend, but rather one that has gained momentum only in recent years. In fact, it is estimated that two-thirds of community college faculty members are adjuncts (Louis, 2009), and according to the National Center for Education Statistics (2010), the trend shows no sign of slowing.

Despite an increased reliance on adjunct faculty, the disparity in their treatment from full-time faculty is well-documented. Duncan, Jr. (1999) summed the issue up succinctly “. . . In this half of the twentieth century, the academic equivalent of the indentured servant is the adjunct faculty member in higher education" (p. 514). Studies have revealed that adjunct faculty members are

concerned about their pay and benefits, their lack of support, and the overall disregard college administration shows in their employment practices, not to mention a struggle with course degradation (Lyons, 2007; Roueche & Milliron, 1995; Sloan, 1998).

The hiring of adjunct faculty members benefits institutions in many ways. More classes can be taught for significantly less money than hiring an additional full-time faculty member; the institution also avoids paying for luxuries such as healthcare benefits or contributing to a company retirement plan. Cohen and Brawer (1996) alluded to the archaic employment practices, drawing the stark comparison that "[p]art-time instructors are to the community colleges as migrant workers are to the farms" (p. 85). Gappa and Leslie (1993) noted the "wildly random collection of institutional and departmental practices" and conclude with the ". . . discomfoting universality in the feelings of part-time faculty that somehow they were being exploited, and blatantly so" (p. xiii). Both the researchers and the subjects seem keenly aware of their situation; however, no changes seem to come from this knowledge.

As the trends indicate continued growth and reliance on the adjunct workforce, there is a need for colleges and universities to provide training and support for them (Scott, 2010). As Frias (2010) emphasized, "If institutions fail in their responsibility for [integrating] part-time faculty, there will be significant consequences; part-time faculty are often the primary institutional contact for first and second-year students, who are in the 'risk zone' for retention" (p. 85). Gappa and Leslie (1993) indicated that "adjuncts feel most like members of their academic community when they enjoy access to supervisors and they are given evidence by those supervisors that their teaching is appreciated" (p. 140) and Roueche et al. (1996) reminded us that "adjunct faculty (are) estranged from the collegiality of their campuses due to lack of institutional support, socialization, and integration" (p. 39). The conversation Gappa and Leslie (1993) and Roueche et al. (1996) started nearly 20 years ago is still being discussed; research performed more recently found many university

administrations “. . . renewing debate on whether the quality of education is compromised when most teachers are not fully immersed in campus life and earn less than their fulltime peers” (Rossi, 2009) and denied “basic faculty rights and freedoms” (Fruscione, 2014). Descriptions and conditions that detail the poor state of the average adjunct faculty member have been documented for decades, yet very little advancement in policies or procedures to aid the underserved workforce have been documented.

Scott (2005) found that some universities are engaging the issue with a proactive approach by assigning a manager or faculty coordinator to provide resources and support. This role is varied and is sometimes held by an adjunct with seniority who receives a stipend, or who may be a full-time faculty member in the role of mentor (Tomanek, 2015). Some schools have created a separate role solely for the purpose of managing adjunct labor. Regardless of the structure of the role, research needs to be done to evaluate what support adjuncts need. When any faculty members, whether full-time or not, are properly supported and trained they are far more likely to provide superior outcomes for students.

To this point, studies indicate that over-utilization of adjuncts may not be in the best interest of students (Polard, 2016). If the past is an indicator, the future use of adjunct faculty in academia creates shaky ground for colleges to tread; reduced student retention, outcomes, and persistence (among others) are all topics that need to be explored as they relate to adjunct exposure. If educational institutions cannot ebb adjunct use, they may be able to improve the efficacy of the practice by supporting contingent faculty (Hughes, 2013) through continuing research, policy revision, and awareness of the underserved population.

The Problem Statement

Technology has provided a unique opportunity for institutions to teach more classes and impact more students. Due to increasing enrollment numbers, community colleges must be prepared

to find part-time faculty who are capable and qualified to teach. However, more than finding faculty members, community colleges must be prepared to train them, including developing them professionally and treating them as valued members of the academic community. Tomanek (2010) stated, “. . . achievement, recognition, work itself, responsibility, and advancement are motivators . . .” (p. 8) when it comes to creating a positive and effective learning employment scenario for adjunct faculty.

The administrative support of adjunct employees has yet to be covered in depth in the literature, and without this knowledge administration-level conversations cannot begin to provide adequate services to the workforce, which provides a vital service in the academic community. This dissertation research is important to better understand adjunct faculty; including their motivations, their needs, and how best to support this growing and diverse workforce.

The Organization

The purpose of the study was rooted in the understanding of what adjunct faculty members need to be successful, as defined by Herzberg (1968) and Maslow (1943). By focusing on adjunct hiring and training policies, the development of standardized protocols for adjunct support can begin. This includes ideal modes of curriculum delivery, training, orientation, and mentoring focuses which can potentially shape future best practices for adjunct faculty management.

The literature review begins with a focus on the challenges that adjunct faculty members find in their workplace, a natural starting point for understanding where deficits lie. Subsequent theories regarding the management of contingent faculty will illustrate past successes and failures for both administration and faculty. The theoretical framework of both social exchange and social capital theories will be explored to provide an understanding of the rigors of and motivation for management of contingent faculty. Finally, existing support systems and programs currently in colleges are examined in an effort to provide context to the overarching argument.

Conceptual Framework

The conceptual framework of any study should provide a link between the variable concepts being discussed in academic research. Jabereen (2009) described a conceptual framework as an antithesis, stating they “provide not a causal/analytical setting but rather an interpretative approach to social reality” (p. 51) and suggested, “conceptual frameworks can be developed and constructed through a process of qualitative analysis” (p. 51). To associate the ideas of adjunct use, student outcomes, and administrative responsibility, the concepts must be assumed to be linked through the theory of constructivism, social exchange, and social capital theories, and Maslow’s Hierarchy of Needs.

Constructivism

Piaget introduced constructivism in 1967 as an approach to “learning theory,” or approach to acquiring knowledge. Piaget believed that learners must be proactive and shape their own understanding as it relates to the world around them; research that spawned subtheories including Social Constructivism (Vygotsky, 1978) and Radical Constructivism (von Glaserfeld, 1984). Creswell (2003) also studied and simplified the constructivist theory, believing that people look for knowledge to explain the environment they are in by acknowledging their own experiences and using them as definitions and implications of deeper meanings. The meanings span many objects, observations, and events, and, by accepting the theory, readers are encouraged to view an individual as a complex and complete ideology rather than a single person with a span of experiences. Duffy and Cunningham (1996) defined constructivism with two specific parameters: “(1) learning is an active process of constructing rather than acquiring knowledge, and (2) instruction is a process of supporting that construction rather than communicating knowledge” (p. 2).

Constructivism dictates that the framework of all knowledge is contextual, individual, and dictated by social norms. These facets of an individual’s reality or experience act to shape the

individual and how he or she interprets events (Bean, 2006). Crotty (1998) noted that the key to performing qualitative research is the ability to understand how others associate meaning, stating that “research is largely inductive, with the inquirer generating meaning from the data” (p. 9) and indicates that this principle is a tenet in performing research within the framework of constructivism. This also speaks to the supposition that understanding research must include understanding of the worldview, motivation of the contextual questions, and the subject matter.

Constructivist frameworks also include the participants of the research. Other frameworks seek to remove the view of the participant from the result, effectively creating a sample of people with no distinguishing features. However, Creswell (2003) believed that studies and research performed within a classroom setting cannot be considered accurate without the context of the participants’ views on things such as methodology, pedagogy, and educational value. Creswell (2003) also encouraged analysis of the ethical core of each participant in defining a constructivist framework. Analysis of these factors provides a broad arena for gathering qualitative data on the impact of consumer culture and academic entitlement from the standpoints of faculty, students, and staff.

Social Exchange and Social Capital Theories

Social capital theorists teach that the relationships must have meaning, a give and take, or a positive transactional quality. As it relates to adjunct employment, it teaches that there is a mutual relationship between an adjunct and the institution by which they are employed; measuring the “level of commitment to an institution, job satisfaction, and performance” (p. 695) against the “feelings of isolation, abysmal pay, and poor working conditions” (p. 695) in the academic environment (Ang & Slaughter, 2001; Van Dyne & Ang, 1998). Social exchange theory adds, “social behavior is an exchange of goods, material goods but also non-material ones, such as the symbols of approval or prestige” (Homans, 1958). If social exchange theories are applied to the

management of adjuncts, it becomes clear that the more the institutional administration invests in their adjuncts, the more likely the adjuncts are to invest in the institution.

Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs

In 1943, Maslow developed a complex system of determining the drive of those around him, noting several distinct levels of motivations and subsequently deriving the *Theory of Human Motivation*. This theory stipulates that needs must be met in a certain order, and cannot be truly satisfied unless they are. These needs include physiological needs (air, food, water), safety (security at home, job security), inclusion (a valued member of a group), esteem (self-worth), and self-actualization (realizing own potential) (Maslow, 1943). If the current state of adjunct employees is examined against against this theory, it can be argued that adjunct faculty cannot move beyond safety needs, as they function as expendable employees in the eyes of their institutions (Chen, 2012). Gappa and Leslie (1993) wonder how any institution expects quality work from talented faculty when they are subject to poor employment practices, going so far as to refer to contingent faculty as “victims” (p. xi) of their working environment, and “marginal, temporary employees with no past and no future” (p. 63). This research reveals very personal and intrinsic motivation in the relentless pursuit of the profession. Rouche and Milliron (1995) stated that:

Part-time faculty are sleeping giants; their sheer numbers and their impact on college instruction cannot and should not be ignored . . . the issues . . . will not go away . . . They will be addressed, or they will maim higher education. (p. 514)

It seems that researchers acknowledge the adjunct faculty members' low-level status in the hierarchy of academic authorities but (as with many in a low-power position) adjunct faculty are stuck with little recourse.

Review of Research Literature and Methodological Literature

In an effort to understand student outcomes, educators and students ourselves, must seek to understand how these outcomes developed; asking how a theory or conclusion is formed, how researchers came to their conclusions, and in what ways the process can be improved for future iterations. To fully comprehend the prior literature, it must be understood how the studies were conceived and the motivation researchers had for choosing the design of their respective studies. These studies, organized below by thematic focus, are both qualitative and quantitative in nature and provide a variety of variables and data for analysis. It is the wide-reaching impact of these various perspectives that influenced the current research in its current, descriptive survey format.

Understanding the Adjunct Condition

Every individual college or university has its own policies and procedures in place regarding the hiring, training, and support of adjunct faculty members. (Gappa & Leslie, 1993). Unfortunately, due to the lack of standardization in these methods, adjunct faculty members report varied levels of support provided by their institutions. Often, an adjunct will be retained to teach a single course for a defined term and is unable to predict any future course offers. (Street, et al., 2012). These faculty members rarely have a choice with regard to textbook selection for their courses, curriculum outcomes, or syllabi development (Curtis & Jacobe, 2006).

It has been suggested in prior research that all adjunct faculty desire full-time teaching positions (West & Curtis, 2006). Unfortunately, most adjunct faculty face a significant disadvantage when applying for a tenured position and are “forced into these positions by the structure of academic employment” (West & Curtis, 2006, p. 4). Adjunct faculty often accept their roles with the misconception that they may lead to tenured, or tenure-track, teaching appointments with more stability, higher pay, and benefits; unfortunately, adjunct employment rarely guarantees consideration for these positions.

Adjunct Staffing Ratios

The utilization of adjunct faculty members in higher education is widespread. The Coalition on the Academic Workforce (2012) cited additional findings in their exploration of the adjunct faculty member. They looked to the United States' Department of Education 2009 survey to determine that “. . . of the reported 1.8 million faculty members, 75.5% of them were employed in contingent positions . . .” (as cited in the Coalition on the Academic Workforce, 2012, p. 1). Further, they indicate that more than three-quarters of the instructors at any given school have little guarantee of employment beyond the current term. Schibik and Harrington (2004) found that 40% to 56% of undergraduates had the bulk of their courses instructed by adjunct faculty; Ronco and Cahill (2006) found similar use, noting 40% of undergraduate courses being taught by adjunct faculty (Deutsch, 2015). With the bulk of the undergraduate students' learning being placed in the hands of the adjunct faculty, it is alarming to consider the adjunct may be working hard and providing a future for the next generation—and doing it for less money, at a higher rate, and with less career stability than those considered skilled enough to warrant a tenured position.

Adjunct Compensation and Benefits

In the fall of 2010, the Coalition on the Academic Workforce wondered how adjuncts were compensated, what benefits they earned, and for which institution(s) they taught. The findings of this research support the idea that adjunct faculty are underpaid and receive few “perks” compared to their full-time colleagues. The salaries reported by participants in the survey detailed consistently low wages, especially considering the credentials each participant obtained to teach; these adjunct faculty find little return on investment into their own education. Adjunct faculty with the same education, certifications, and/or work-experience fell far behind in wages compared to those reported by full-time counterparts. A lack of control regarding career advancement was also noted, as adjunct faculty find few advancement opportunities regardless of the years employed by a given institution;

however, this has little to do with institutional loyalty. In fact, over 75% of the adjunct respondents indicated they would take a full-time position, if offered, by their institution (the Coalition on the Academic Workforce, 2012).

Student Perceptions of Adjunct Faculty

The variables related to the adjunct faculty members' success or failure are broad; one that cannot be excluded is the perception of their students. Students seek mentors for their classrooms and want quality and experience from their instructors. When a student feels valued, taught, and properly supported, they are more likely to rate the instructor in a positive manner. The very nature of adjunct employment leaves a gap in what a student wants versus what an adjunct instructor can provide, namely, the lack of permanence (i.e., lack of office space, meeting rooms, or consultation hours) at the heart of being a contingent employee. This can lead to a student feeling neglected, which leads to a poor course review from the student and, potentially, the loss of employment opportunities (Malechwanz, Lei & Wang, 2016).

Cotten and Wilson (2006) evaluated the student perception of contingent faculty using focus groups with undergraduate students. The focus groups were telling, as the researchers observed: ". . . students noted that part-time faculty were less accessible and had less of a campus presence as compared to full-time faculty" (p. 501). Umbach (2007) followed this research and validated adjunct faculty interacting with their students less frequently (as cited in Deutsch, 2015).

The student perception is a driving theme in studies regarding adjunct faculty, and can be seen as relevant when deciding how adjunct faculty perceive their working conditions. If students know their instructor is an adjunct, they assume that the role of "teacher" is not the primary focus for the instructor (Cotton & Wilson, 2006; Malechwanz, Lei & Wang, 2016). Knowing that the student is lower priority for the instructor can lead to poor performance by the student overall (Umbach, 2007). Knowing that the student may distinguish them as less valuable than their colleagues has

potential to impact the adjunct faculty's perception of their role as teacher. These factors should be acknowledged when discussing job satisfaction as it relates to the role of adjunct faculty.

Colleagues' Perceptions of Adjunct Faculty

Of course, there is the perspective of the tenured and full-time faculty to consider. In a professional academic environment, the presence of "tenure" is considered a high honor to obtain. The Coalition on the Academic Workforce (2012) asked full-time faculty to report their feelings toward the roles of and value in adjunct faculty. These participants reported little professional commitment or support toward adjunct colleagues. They confirmed that few policies or procedures are in place to support the contingent workforce and a disregard of the contingent employee's inclusion in the university community and/or culture (Metzger, Petit & Sieber, 2015; Rossi, 2009; The Coalition on the Academic Workforce, 2017).

Adjunct Faculty and Student Outcomes

A common thread when examining prior scholarly research regarding adjunct faculty is an evaluation of their effect on student retention term to term, as well as term over term. However, before a full understanding of how the use of adjunct faculty impacts student outcomes and how academic administrators might optimize a positive impact, consideration should be taken for how adjunct faculty can be managed efficiently. Prior research conducted by both Levesque and Rousseau (1999) and Bland et al. (2006) shows promising correlations ". . . between the faculty members who were well prepared and supported . . . (and those who are) productive in the areas of research, teaching, tenure and promotion" (Bland, et al., 2006, p. 99). This lead to more devotion to their institution and simultaneously creating opportunities for improving adjunct policies and procedures at other institutions. Understanding the challenges management faces, including what works and conversely what does not, is vital to these processes.

Adjunct Support Systems

Mentorship. Due to the temporary nature of an adjunct faculty's appointment with a university, they are unlikely to receive support or mentoring from tenured peers (Curtis & Jacobs, 2006); however, many adjuncts believe mentorship to be beneficial to their own academic and professional development (Feldman & Turnley, 2004). A 2012 survey conducted by the Coalition on the Academic Workforce discovered 20,000 adjunct faculty respondents indicated the need for professional development (CAW, 2012), and further research suggests that adjunct engagement would likely increase if mentorships were supported at the institutional level. (Gappa & Leslie, 1993; Murphy-Nutting, 2003; Nestor & Leary, 2000). It is believed that these relationships would also assist adjunct faculty in their orientation to the campus environment (Dedman & Pearch, 2004). Lyons and Kysilka (2000) recommend a mentorship as a required onboarding component, and Luna and Cullen (1995) say "mentoring promotes faculty productivity, advocates collegiality, and encourages a broader goal of attracting, retaining, and advancing faculty members" (Luna & Cullen, 1995, p. 3). Few positions exist in which a need for training specific to the role is not given to a new employee; research shows that both the newly retained adjunct faculty, and their students, could benefit from additional layers of onboarding and support from administration.

Conclusions

The methodologies and frameworks by which prior researchers gained their knowledge must be recognized and improved if any future effort is to impact the problem. An examination of each individual study is necessary to formulate new research as researchers build on older methods, try new approaches, and seek understanding where there was none prior. By acknowledging the weaknesses in prior research, future studies can be honed to create wider impact. There is a variety of information available on the topic of adjunct faculty, each with varying degrees of depth and

breadth. Finding the strongest approach to the issue will be paramount in gleaning any new information in the study.

Review of Methodological Issues

There are strengths and weaknesses inherent in all methodologies and areas of inquiry. As anticipated, the literature available for review contained various pitfalls. The ability to examine the weakness of a study is important to structuring future studies and acts as a guide for improvement. For example, the consistency of statistical methods of analysis for factors measured in the quantitative and qualitative studies are nonexistent; multiple regression models, econometric, hierarchal linear, and logistic regression models are all utilized to interpret the data. While these studies were designed to suit a specific set of variables appropriate to their setting, these results are not predictable.

A particularly difficult issue to tackle is the generalizability of any study to another setting. Traditional, quantitative research is deemed meritorious when the research can be duplicated with expected results and outcomes. However, most prior research is limited to a particular setting or includes specific, measurable variables. The studied qualitative research is also difficult to generalize, as it is inherent to qualitative studies. Here, too, inherent variables such as teacher's delivery style, background, and experience, can affect outcomes significantly. At the basic level, this seems to be a topic that must be tackled within each institution and for its unique data sets – that is, its students and faculty.

The Quantitative Methodologies

The studies that examine the impact of adjunct faculty on student outcome are largely quantitative in nature. The quantitative studies used a plethora of methods and analysis models, including multiple regression, logistic regression, econometric modeling, and hierarchical linear modeling. Schibik and Harrington (2004) created a data set that followed four incoming freshman

groups; setting retention over one term as a dependent variable, and demographics, incoming GPA, credit hours enrolled, and exposure to adjuncts as independent variables. Furthermore, they provided evidence that use of adjunct faculty has a statistically significant impact on student outcomes. Eagan and Jaeger framed their 2008 study by looking at the logical regression of three separate levels of students; while in 2011, they examined the use of a standard logistic regression as a potential for bias in the data. Because prior exposure to adjunct faculty could color the perspective of the students, Jaeger and Eagan (2011) developed an instrumental variable analysis that acted as a control for this measure.

In a 2011 study, Johnson used a multilevel model that circumvented potential issues that can occur when large amounts of data are collected for analysis. However, Johnson (2011) acknowledged the limits in the design, namely that the large amount of data was derived from a single institution and from a single freshman class. Chen (2012) expanded on the multilevel model and proposed a similarly comprehensive study drawing from Bean (1983), Berger and Milem (2000), Tinto (1987), and Titus (2004, 2006), all of which examined characteristics of institutions and the risk of students withdrawing from their course of study. Ehrenberg and Zhang (2005) used an econometric model and hypothesized graduation rates for full-time students, controlling for background characteristics. Regardless of the controls, the models for accommodating bias, or the sample student populations, all studies returned solid quantitative data which indicates student outcomes suffer when they are exposed to adjunct faculty as instructors.

An effort to identify characteristics of community colleges with increased graduation rates was proposed by Calcagno et al. (2008). This team used a production function method to test both graduation and attrition outcomes, controlling for both institutional and student variables, and highlighted the methodology and framework for this study as rare in measuring variables like student completion or persistence. It concluded that students who were enrolled in an institution that

employed a high number of part-time, or contingent, faculty were less likely to obtain a degree or transfer to another institution. Using a hierarchical linear model, Jaeger and Eagan (2009) analyzed the effect of various institutional and student variables on the dichotomous variable of associate degree completion. The consistency of statistical methods of analysis and models for these factors is nonexistent; multiple regressions, econometric, hierarchal linear, and logistic regression models are all utilized to interpret the data.

Overall, the research offers solid data and analyses that act as persuasive evidence for stakeholders, faculty managers, and student service members, suggesting that attention should be devoted to policies that place adjunct faculty members in front of undergraduate students. If the results are as bleak as the quantitative methodologies suggest, then regardless of any financial considerations, the logical choice is to remove adjunct faculty from the classroom.

The Qualitative Methodologies

Qualitative inquiry presents a shift from raw numbers to a different kind of data, measuring quality rather than quantity, and the topic of the studies shifts in unison. Unable to quantify adjunct faculty members' feeling of loyalty to their institution or their commitment to their position and students, researchers sought to examine how they felt in their positions, both mentally and emotionally (Selby, 2009). Across the research, qualitative studies evaluate the role adjuncts feel they have. Unanimously these qualitative studies are driven by surveys, and are responded to anonymously and with impunity. Some of the studies paired their results with data compiled from employee handbooks, specifically with information regarding policies and procedures; however, because these studies are institution-specific, they are difficult to utilize as a model for studies going forward.

When referring to the qualitative research, the organization of data collection and analyses are split. Researchers De Witte and Naswall (2003), Donald and Makin (2000), and Gappa and

Leslie (1993) included a variety of controlled responses, ranges, and multiple-choice questions in their research. The goal was to streamline the data as much as possible without dissecting qualitative data as a part of the resulting information. Conversely, Fountain (2005), Lyons (2007), and Wallin (2005) used open-ended response surveys to record the feelings of adjunct faculty in their own words and led with questions regarding salary, feelings of inclusion, feelings of value to students and other faculty members, and loyalty to their employer. While the approach to the information is different, both groups' responses are attributed to a corresponding management theory. For example, social-exchange and social-capital theories lead to conclusions that will inform theoretical and conceptual frameworks for the study.

Strengths and Weaknesses

Strengths and weaknesses can be found in every type of research methodology. In quantitative data, much of the strength lies in the numbers produced, yet numbers can be difficult to argue with or misunderstood when presented; especially when calculated using complicated and detailed theorems and methods. Overall, the design methods analyzed in the term-to-term and term-over-term studies are apt and the data sets are comprehensive; meaning that the data, conclusions, and interpretations provided by the researchers have been vetted through appropriate and rigorous procedures. Qualitative research also has its weaknesses. The design of these studies makes interpretation and accessibility an issue. Qualitative research on the topic utilize very limited information to influence their numbers. The data is outdated and could use refreshing with more current information, as well.

Synthesis of Research Findings

The act of synthesizing and evaluating methodologies used to perform prior research on the topic of student outcomes, adjunct use, and proper adjunct management techniques is an essential step in understanding the problems at hand. Both quantitative and qualitative study methodologies

were examined critically to determine which methodology may be most suited to future research on the topic. The process of synthesizing prior work involves examining the research with a critical eye and evaluating the outcomes in relation to the methodological designs inherent in the study. Several themes were examined, including adjunct bullying, adjunct demographics, and institutional loyalty for example. The quantitative studies sought hard data return and used a wide range of methods, including multiple regression, logistic regression, econometric modeling, and hierarchical linear modeling. The qualitative data adds a level of clarity to the “big picture” of adjunct faculty and provides the unique perspective of the faculty members themselves; including their own thoughts on areas of improvement on small-scale and institutional levels.

Ultimately, the findings of these studies resulted in persuasive evidence for interested parties concerned with policies regarding adjunct use and student outcomes. Chen (2012), Eagan and Jaeger (2008), Jaeger and Eagan (2011), Jaeger and Hinz (2009), Johnson (2011), Ronco and Cahill (2006), and Schibik and Harrington (2004) all provided a sound connection indicating a measurable relationship between adjunct faculty and retention; that is, the use of these faculty members hurts overall persistence rates. Of the studies examined, four provided solid data that stated adjunct faculty negatively affected student retention as well. Archival, action, and case-study research were used in these studies; however, the results were straightforward based on their respective variables.

The impact of student-faculty interaction is a dominant thread found in the qualitative studies and should not be ignored when looking at the issue as a whole; that is to say, the type of study pursued cannot be considered complete without the presence of qualitative data return. The results of the analyzed studies leave little room for interpretation; students are heavily affected personally, professionally, and academically by their instructors (regardless of adjunct or full-time status), and when information about socioemotional impact is requested, it is difficult to quantify.

Critique of Previous Research

Although previous studies may have delved into iterations of adjunct success and satisfaction, they are not without limitation or error. For instance, Ronco and Cahill (2006) and Schibik and Harrington (2004) lacked any overt or stated frameworks, making them difficult to critically analyze. Jaeger and Eagan (2009) performed their study using California students solely, which limits scaling it to meet the larger issue at hand and presents a sample size that is too small. Much of the data available to the researchers is extremely dated and newer data sets would be beneficial to future studies as well. Qualitative research like that conducted by Eagan and Jaeger (2008), Jaeger and Eagan (2011), and Johnson (2011) can be difficult to analyze; with broad ranges of open responses and little clarification, the data is useful for action in specific institutions and classrooms, but can be limited in its applicability on a broader scope. However, without this type of data, a complete picture of the adjunct faculty member cannot be obtained.

Conclusion

The relationship between adjunct faculty and student outcomes has undergone several major advances that have helped to clarify and understand retention and graduation rates. While the earlier studies had underdeveloped reviews of literature and inadequately defined theoretical frameworks, later studies evolved. This shows progress as awareness of the subject grows, and, based on the review of the literature on the subject, it is believed that a common thread can be discovered in the issue of adjunct faculty and student outcomes. It is well established that the two impact each other, and for the most part that interaction is negative for the student. The variable that was found to positively change these outcomes involves policies, procedures, management, and systems of support for adjunct faculty. This is the piece that warrants closer inspection. In an effort to improve the quality of education, preserve the reputation of academia, and instill a multigenerational impact

through a variety of educational means, administrators must know if supporting adjunct employees will close the academic gap in outcome achievement that has become so overt in recent years.

Chapter 3: Methodology

Adjunct faculty members are a large factor when examining the employment practices and culture of an institution, and may hold more power than they believe; in fact, Rouche and Milliron (1996) stated that "part-time faculty are sleeping giants; their sheer numbers and their impact on college instruction cannot and should not be ignored . . . the issues . . . will not go away . . . They will be addressed, or they will maim higher education" (p. 157). This excerpt from more than two decades ago rings true today, as the utilization of part-time faculty increases, and the longitudinal effects of this utilization reveal themselves in the form of declining student outcomes, retention, continuation, and persistence. Much of the prior research hypothesizes that the perception of an adjunct faculty's employee experience may be to blame and could vary from university to university (Deutsch, 2015; Tomanek, 2010). As widespread as the use of adjunct faculty is, academic leadership has been slow to address the population's concerns regarding their working environment.

Research Questions

The intention of this descriptive survey research was to examine the relationship between adjunct faculty members and students, adjunct faculty members and their respective university of employment, and how to best optimize these interactions. Key academic metrics collected by both public and private universities show that when adjunct instructors are used, academic quality tends to suffer (Jaeger & Eagan, 2009). These include student satisfaction and confidence in the course offerings and instruction, grade inflation, adherence to established curricula, and conformity to various accreditation standards, just to name a few (Jaschick, 2008). Despite this, adjunct faculty continue to be relied on for the universities to function.

As the practice of hiring adjunct faculty members continues to increase, it is vital to ensure the quality of instruction, the integrity of the university, student experience, and optimal and fair adjunct management. If this is not achieved there is the disastrous potential to create a generation of

disenfranchised students and mistreated faculty members. If university administration is using adjunct faculty, do they understand all that utilizing this resource may require? Often employment conditions and expectations mirror that of temporary blue-collar labor and freelance services. Does it make sense to optimize their employment conditions from what they currently are so that students may have greater opportunity for higher success rates? To explore the topic, the following research questions provided a guide for this study:

RQ₁: What administrative support and other conditions do adjunct faculty members at colleges and universities need to be successful?

RQ₂: How do full-time, tenured/non-tenured faculty members perceive adjunct faculty members' contributions to their university?

RQ₃: Is there any relationship between job satisfaction reported by adjunct faculty and the self-reported success or failure of an adjunct faculty member?

These questions represented the first aspect of the research, which was to identify adjunct faculty members' needs; to determine what areas of improvement are needed the deficits must first be identified. Concurrent to identifying the needs of adjunct faculty, the same issue was examined from the perspective of the university administration. The following questions were developed to accomplish this:

1. What can university leadership do to better support adjunct faculty members?
 - a. What support systems, policies, procedures, and/or guidelines are in place to support adjunct faculty?

Purpose and Design of Study

The purpose of this descriptive survey research was to define and clarify potential weaknesses that may exist in university policies and procedures regarding the utilization of adjunct faculty from the perspective of the faculty member, as well as the university. The perspectives were examined through the framework of well-known theories (i.e., Maslow's Hierarchy and constructivism) to discover how adjuncts can be better supported, which in turn will potentially improve student outcomes. The research is clear when looking at hiring trends in academic environments: adjunct employees are now the new normal (Ronco & Cahill, 2006). This trend is one that continues to persist, as do increasing student enrollment numbers and the demand for flexible modalities, and as such must be examined.

Academic leadership utilizes adjunct labor for many reasons, such as stop-gap hiring with full-time faculty turnover, flexibility in academic catalog offerings, and catering to student needs just to name a few; however, prior research into the outcomes of this trend is disheartening (Deutsch, 2015; Rossi, 2009). A preliminary literature exploration shows that the students' academic experience suffers from the use of adjunct employees (i.e., student satisfaction and confidence in the course offerings and instruction, grade inflation, adherence to established curricula, and conformity - to various accreditation standards) with a single outlier. The results of a single study by Jaeger and Eagan (2011) have altered prior views on the topic, and claim that when adjuncts are properly supported by both leadership and administration, their student outcomes remain on par with full-time faculty outcomes or are slightly higher.

Creswell's (2003) concurrent triangulation design was selected because its purpose, "to obtain different but complementary data on the same topic" (as cited in Morse, 1991, p. 122) is in line with the goal of understanding the problem of adjunct faculty, and combines quantitative and qualitative methods. Descriptive survey research was designed to record several pieces of

information; this began with research into the basic characteristics of adjunct faculty including demographic characteristics (race/ethnicity, gender, age range), level of education, and academic discipline. These factors were not defining variables in the study itself but served to illustrate a broad spectrum of the participants. This study also recognized the existing support systems, policies, and procedures made available to adjunct faculty. Finally, this study asked what support systems, services, policies, and/or procedures the adjunct feel would increase their job satisfaction.

Concurrent triangulation was chosen as it was developed to find “convergence across qualitative and quantitative methods” (Creswell, 2004, p. 15) and provided a fuller picture of the adjunct faculty situation utilizing the data returned.

The chosen methodology for this study was both qualitative, with open-ended survey questions to provide additional data, and quantitative, with a portion of this study providing demographic data, the purpose of which was to gather data on the average adjunct faculty member. The study used a descriptive survey research design to collect data on the job satisfaction of post-secondary adjunct faculty. This methodology was specifically chosen as the diverse array of adjunct faculty members employed across the nation makes it difficult to find a sample population that is representative. However, the survey data helped generalize information in an effort to draw conclusions about the whole (Babbie, 1990).

Research Population and Sampling Methods

Often research studies can build on a data set that was previously collected; unfortunately, this type of data is not accessible when it comes to adjunct faculty. This is because adjunct faculty are diverse and atypical; the broad range of demographics which describe adjunct faculty make an accurate or representative sample population incredibly difficult (Wallin, 2005). The upswing in adjunct faculty hiring is also a factor and recent trend, occurring over the past fifteen years. The number of adjunct faculty employed in post-secondary institutions in the United States is currently

in the millions (the Coalition on the Academic Workforce, 2012), making the collection of individualized data an insurmountable feat. When researching potential sources for study participants, the current Department of Education (DOE) and Integrated Postsecondary Education Systems (IPEDS) systems were utilized for information, as these databases house various pieces of information reported by schools that receive federal financial aid. Reporting the information to this database is a legal requirement and misreporting can affect the institution's ability to receive federal aid, making accuracy in reporting a high priority. Information on graduation rates, enrollment, and costs are all reported, along with a complete classification of all employees by employment status.

A complete 2017 IPEDS directory search yielded 7,000 schools, and after criterion sampling was applied using filters (those that award Associates and Bachelors degrees, are either public or private and are either profit or nonprofit), the list shrank to 1,587 results. From this list, 500 schools were selected through random probability (utilizing Microsoft Excel) for outreach, giving each school a 32% probability of being chosen. Research was conducted using school websites and catalogs, and survey requests were sent to public contacts with titles containing Dean of Faculty or Associate/Assistant Dean of Faculty, requesting the survey be disseminated among adjunct faculty members at their respective institution, for the purpose of doctoral research. Social media platforms were also used to disseminate the survey to adjunct faculty. A return rate of the survey instrument was estimated at 25%, or 125 responses, which is considered a statistically significant sample and is in line with past research conducted using adjunct faculty. Prior studies reported much higher return rates than 25%, however, because these studies were often based on action research (e.g., specific campuses and populations) and the researchers had a higher degree of control over research participation. The study was predicted to have a lower response rate than past studies; however, the risk was accepted as a lower return rate with information from a broader sample can provide data that would be more widely applicable. The data collected allowed analysis of a large population and

simplified the demographics and levels of job satisfaction among adjunct faculty, turning individuals into a large sample with which assumptions can be made.

Instrumentation

The survey for this study was originally created by Tomanek (2010), based on a survey created by Boord (2010) and Schulz (2009). Boord and Schulz were interested in several different facets of the adjunct faculty experience, from job satisfaction to professional development. Because their study aligned well with the original motivations, Tomanek (2010) made only slight modifications to their original survey, which were kept in-tact for use in this research. These modifications included rewording of questions (for clarity and sentence structure), the addition of questions outlining adjunct faculty support, and the addition of Roueche, Roueche, and Milliron (1995) taxonomies, which were used to categorize adjunct faculty. Additional job satisfaction questions were also added by Tomanek (2010) based on research from previous studies on both adjunct success, as well as that of full-time faculty, and were developed from the study of the job satisfaction theories of Herzberg (1968) and Hagedorn (2000) as well as Maslow's Theory of Motivation (1943). For the purpose of this research, two letters and two email requests were sent, seeking permission to modify and use this survey instrument. These requests were made to both Tomanek herself, as well as her supporting institution; however, no response was received.

Validity. The survey instrument was validated using a two-phase pilot test scenario; a preliminary survey was sent to a small group of faculty members selected through convenience sampling. These faculty members reviewed the survey instrument and assisted in clarification and focus on design issues and wording disparities. Change suggestions included "Revise for punctuation in Q27" and "Include 'significant other' instead of spouse?". After minor changes were made, the final version of the survey was resent to the group; no further changes were needed and it was approved for distribution to the population. Through this pilot test, the instrument was further

validated as a credible tool for use in this research; while the approval for use from a prior study can be considered validity, the two-phase pilot study was able to further verify the credibility of the survey instrument.

This scenario was considered a two-phase pilot test, and by approaching such a large-scale research topic on a smaller scale, it could be refined and optimized for success. By using the test-retest scenario, changes to the study could be explored, and scaled to a larger population. If the data collected is found to be significant, future researchers may refine this research to further provide an accurate and reliable portrait of the adjunct faculty member and may potentially expand the sample population significantly.

Creswell (2003) states that validity must confirm “individual scores from a survey to make sense” (p. 153) and that these scores are “meaningful to the researcher and allow good conclusions to be drawn” (p. 154). After data collection, a construct validity determined if the information met Creswell’s requirement of being significant, meaningful, and useful; responses were reviewed for validity by evaluating the intended use and consequences of the information. Because the results were useful and have positively impacted the conclusions the research was attempting to answer, they were assumed to meet the requirements Creswell (2003) set forth. The goal was to provide data with external validity as well, so the results may be replicated in varying environments.

The survey consisted of questions organized into subsections under the following categories:

- *Demographics:* The purpose of this segment was to collect demographic data from participating faculty. Questions included gender identity, ethnic background, and age.
- *Academic background:* This section asked participants about academic degrees they earned, including the area of concentration, and teaching experience in a variety of settings.
- *Instructional tasks and workload:* The questions in this segment of the survey pertain to the specialties that adjuncts teach, as well as modalities, and whether they teach class on-ground,

online, or a blend of each. This information was used alongside demographics information to find any correlation between demographics and modalities.

- *Current employment:* Because adjunct faculty members are incredibly diverse (in both teaching and career specialties) this data helps clarify which participants have taught consecutively, or concurrently, as well as outside employment. This section also asked about the motivation of an adjunct and provided insight into the “why” of the adjunct employee.
- *Instructional resources:* This section allowed participants to inventory any existing faculty support services at their institution of employment.
- *Time management:* This section asked adjunct employees to describe how they break up their varied responsibilities as adjunct faculty and asked them to determine how many hours are applied to each task. These tasks consisted of standard academic responsibilities relating to teaching, classroom preparation, grading, and advising. Participants were provided hourly ranges (i.e., 10–13 hours per week, 14–17 hours per week, and so forth) to categorize their time. This data helped the researcher understand how adjunct faculty are spending their time, if that time could be used better, and if the faculty member is satisfied with how their day is divided.
- *Job satisfaction:* Using various Likert-style scales, faculty members were asked their satisfaction with their teaching experience. These questions were formulated after the theories of Maslow’s Theory of Motivation (1943), and were reflective of motivators and hygienes as defined by Herzberg’s Motivation/Hygiene Theory (1968).
- *Opinion:* The questions in this section were used to identify adjuncts using the taxonomy created by Rouche, Rouche, and Milliron (1995) along with two new taxonomies created by Tomanek (2010). Adjuncts were asked to self-identify at various taxonomy levels and were

allowed to mark more than one response if needed. This section also asked the respondent to evaluate their pay received against their workload, and their perceptions of equity.

- *Open-ended Questions:* This open-ended section created a place in which adjunct faculty openly expressed their concerns and opinions regarding the treatment they have received as adjunct faculty, as well as comment on things they'd like to change. This data was qualitative in nature, but also seen as valuable in the search for insight into the adjunct mindset.

Triangulation of data. The ability to triangulate the data being sought in this study assisted the researcher in verifying validity. Triangulation of data is often used in qualitative studies and requires the researcher to analyze various perspectives of the data (Flick, von Kardoff, Steinke, & Jenner, 2010) collected at various times from differing sources and in various places; finding it is most often “. . . realized by applying different means of methodological approaches” (p. 178). This strategy is thought to be particularly useful when tying together different types of studies and methodologies, such as qualitative and quantitative.

This study utilized theoretical triangulation through concurrent implementation; meaning that both qualitative and quantitative data were collected in the same survey instrument and concurrent triangulation strategy was used to cross-validate the results. The qualitative data set was analyzed by content, with the researcher noting prevalent themes in returned narrative responses. These themes were categorized individually and mapped back to corresponding research questions. Patton (2002) suggests that many people who attempt to triangulate their data are looking for consistency in their results, and when it is not discovered the data is weaker. The author continued by encouraging researchers to view inconsistencies as opportunities to look for further meaning.

Data Collection

The survey was created and administered using Qualtrics; a free, web-based, service that can be widely shared and accessed. Qualtrics also provides limited in-house aggregate data analysis of

results, if needed. Upon committee approval, the survey was sent to identified members selected from the collected IPEDS data described above. The survey closed approximately 30 days from initial distribution.

As with much technology, there were pitfalls to using various electronic tools. There was the potential for the initial email to be diverted in various ways, including spam filters, misaddressed email addresses, and outdated IPEDS information. In an effort to minimize lost emails, a follow-up email was sent to non-responsive parties reminding of the deadline to return information. Additionally, emails that were returned were tracked and correct information was requested from both the institution and the IPEDS directory.

In addition to using data pulled from the IPEDS databases, social media networks were used to disseminate the survey tool. Professional networking groups on social media platforms like LinkedIn and Facebook can provide access to teaching professionals with the background to contribute to the research. This route was used, particularly when response rates to the initial survey dissemination were lower than anticipated.

Identification of Variables and Attributes

Attributes

The study was defined by the underlying attributes it examines. For example, the theory of constructivism, as proposed by Creswell (2003), states that people will inherently create meaning in their day-to-day lives, particularly as it relates to their career paths. This study qualitatively examined how adjunct faculty have created meaning in the work they do, how they feel about their worth to an institution, and their ability to impact change in their students' lives. Throughout the research into past studies, it has been clear that adjunct employees have been a marginalized group with poor working conditions, low salaries, and a loss of connection to their students and/or institution; “. . . more adjuncts are being hired, exploited and abused at more community colleges

and universities around the United States than ever before” (Zoebel, 2009, para. 1). With the reported working conditions, the motivation for adjunct faculty to continue their work within the profession and industry should be examined.

Similarly, Maslow’s *Theory of Motivation* (1943) defines the levels an individual must achieve in their lifetime to be considered “successful,” stating the following:

It is quite true that man lives by bread alone—when there is no bread. But what happens to man’s desires when there is plenty of bread and when his belly is chronically filled? At once other (and “higher”) needs emerge and these, rather than physiological hunger, dominate the organism. And when these, in turn, are satisfied, again new (and still “higher”) needs emerge and so on. This is what we mean by saying that the basic human needs are organized into a hierarchy of relative prepotency. (p. 375)

At the most basic level, a human being needs physiological needs met (i.e., food, water, and so forth); however, this theory discusses more than these physiological needs. On the list that Maslow suggests must be satisfied is a sense of security. This can mean safety in their surroundings, but also security in their economic situation, stating

. . . we can perceive the expressions of safety needs only in such phenomena as, for instance, the common preference for a job with tenure and protection, the desire for a savings account, and for insurance of various kinds (medical, dental, unemployment, disability, old age). (p. 379)

There is an additional sense of belonging that must be achieved, as well as a need to be respected by those around you, believing that all people “. . . have a need or desire for a stable, firmly based, (usually) high evaluation of themselves, for self-respect, or self-esteem, and for the esteem of others.” (p. 381). Beyond feeling safe and secure, a human must feel respected, both by peers and his or her own standards.

By framing the needs defined by Maslow against the goals of the research, an adjunct faculty member must achieve much more than their profession allows. The majority of their work is temporary, low-paid, and unsecured (Conley et al., 2002); adjunct faculty are less respected than their full-time peers by students (Huffman, 2000), and adjuncts are disregarded professionally and not considered academic equals (Reigle, 2016). This type of work environment, per Maslow, does not allow adjuncts to thrive. Through the quantitative results of this research, this study has obtained a fuller picture of the “adjunct condition” which could lead to stronger support systems on their behalf.

Variables

The variables within the broad and diverse array of adjunct faculty members’ demographics are difficult to predict or control. Because the adjunct faculty population is not limited to a specific subset or group, adjunct faculty members comprise all ages, races, gender (and gender identities), ethnic backgrounds, and education levels. These many variations may impact how the adjunct is treated by a particular university and may lead the adjunct to claim extra favors or, conversely, prejudice than other adjunct faculty members in the same setting.

This study hoped to return data from many post-secondary schools in the United States. Although these schools are sure to have traits in common, there is an equally likely chance that their policies regarding hiring and/or evaluating adjuncts, as well as institutional policies regulating adjunct use and workload, were unique to their institution. These policies could be responsible for a perceived lack of support from the institution but are not reported as a policy or procedure, rather a working condition. Without delving into the policies of each individual school and determining their impact on a participant’s response, the research could not accurately report how this variable affected the data.

Data Analysis Procedures

To effectively measure and analyze returned data, both comparative and descriptive analyses were performed, which describe various intersections within the data set. A comparative analysis determines the reasonable conclusion the data returns; while the descriptive analysis breaks down the quantitative data for study. Triangulation was utilized to ensure data collection were utilized for a comprehensive interpretation; this method supports accurate interpretation and representation of data. The study followed a descriptive survey research approach as both qualitative and quantitative data were needed. The benefit of collecting both sets of information was to find a point of crossover, or “convergence across qualitative and quantitative methods” (Creswell, 2003), and by finding the triangulation point in the data future researchers may begin to see trends in adjunct employment and student outcomes. The survey instrument questions were separated into categories, each with a specific purpose, designed to answer a corresponding research question. Analyses focused on gathering trends and statistics among the sample population as they related to these categories, as well as individually.

The initial research question asked what (in terms of pay, support, benefits, and respect/esteem) an adjunct faculty member would need to feel supported by their institution. To answer this research question, several facets of the sample population were collected to determine if any trends in adjunct success, as defined by Herzberg (1968), could be tied to other data. Several sections of the survey instrument were designed to collect information that may impact the findings. Of the nine survey sections, five of them (titled *Demographics*, *Academic Background*, *Instructional Tasks and Workload*, *Current Employment*, and *Job Satisfaction*) had the purpose of collecting demographic data from the sample population as a method of defining the typical background characteristics of a subject (i.e., age, gender, race), the academic specialty of the subject, workload, and job satisfaction. This data was collected and analyzed in Microsoft Excel using frequency

distribution, dividing the responses for each of the survey sections and noting the frequency of its appearance. These results were then cross-tabulated using an Excel Pivot Table in an effort to correlate the relationship among the various responses. The analysis was also checked for correlation in Excel, in an effort to find a positive covariance of +1.

The secondary research question dealt with the opposing perspective and asked what university leadership could do (in terms of pay, support, benefits, and respect/esteem) to support their adjunct faculty members. This question was answered through collection of qualitative data, using an exploratory factor and allowing the research to be carefully deciphered for existing constructs. The remaining four survey sections (titled *Time Management, Opinion, and Open-Ended*) contained information relating to Herzberg's Motivation/Hygiene Theory and Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs and were examined for additional cross-tabulation with demographic data collected for RQ₁.

The survey was built with Qualtrics software and was sent to the appropriate population via email. Respondents took the survey electronically, and after the survey had closed, the results were then downloaded and categorized using Microsoft Excel. The open-ended and qualitative replies were collected and categorized using a thematic analysis. This type of data analysis process was specifically used because the data reviewed was not numerical. In a thematic analysis, qualitative answers are read and categorized by theme based on their content. As researchers analyze the returned data, they note any emerging patterns in the themes (Braun & Clarke, 2006) and tie back that information corresponding to applicable research questions. After thematic analysis, the data was triangulated for further validity. The ultimate goal of the analyzed data was to conclude whether or not job satisfaction (as defined by Herzberg, 1968 and Maslow, 1943) could act as a predictor of satisfaction in adjunct teaching roles.

Limitations of Research Design

Each study has a unique set of limitations; this study was no different. This study was designed to collect both qualitative and quantitative data, in an effort to glean accurate and representative responses from the sample population. Because qualitative data is difficult to generalize for future research, limitations within the research were expected. Ronco and Cahill (2006) cited apprehension to the concept of referring to the adjunct populous as a standardized group. Jaeger and Eagan (2011) cited the same concern and felt they should have included more information about the adjunct faculty members' experience within the industry; they also wondered about the goals of adjunct faculty. The information gathered from the IPEDS database for this study does not give a picture of an adjunct faculty's long-term plan. Prior researchers have indicated that the effectiveness of an adjunct must depend on their commitment to the role, but no prior studies have approached this variable. Fortunately, the Tomanek (2010) adaptation of the survey instrument contains a taxonomy of part-time faculty by Rouche, Rouche, and Milliron (1995), allowing for a broader understanding of adjunct faculty members.

The addition of quantitative data to this research bolstered potential outcomes and added complication to the research design. One independent variable that had presented itself was the percentage of adjunct faculty utilized at any one institution (the total adjunct population at each respective institution, as a percentage of their full faculty complement); there is also a question of adjunct faculty teaching graduate courses versus undergraduate courses. Prior research on adjunct usage delved into the number of adjuncts used in varying institutions, and their students' outcomes; some noted adjuncts were used strictly to lead undergraduate courses, and tenured faculty took the graduate courses. The individual adjunct makeup of each university is difficult to estimate and changes from term to term. The IPEDS data does not give any information in either regard, and not having knowledge of the portion of adjunct faculty teaching only undergraduates was potentially

limiting. While faculty makeup has played a role in prior research, it was not reexamined in the current research, as a representative sample population has been difficult to define; rather, this study collected and quantified the data for future research implications.

Validation (Credibility and Dependability)

An effort to authenticate validation (including credibility and dependability) was tested via two-phase pilot test. Prior to sending this survey to the target population, a scaled-back version was sent to a single institution, with the purpose of receiving feedback on the survey instrument; was it comprehensive, confusing, or unclear? This pilot test served as a test for collecting and analyzing data returned, as well. The pilot test allowed for honing and optimizing the quantitative questions prior to scaling up the project and ensured the validity of the qualitative portion within the survey instrument.

The two-phase pilot test was conducted in a similar process as the full study; including methodologies and attention to rigor, data analysis, and scope. However, rather than sending the participant request to anonymous university managers requesting a response, willing members of academic administration were sent the instrument with instructions to complete the survey on my behalf. After receiving results, but prior to analysis, the participants were solicited for feedback regarding the clarity of the questions and ease with which they completed the survey. Any suggestions for improvement were considered, as long as they increased credibility or efficacy of the survey instrument. Minor changes to wordings were made, however the majority of the instrument was considered effective; after the minor changes were implemented, the instrument was resent to the pilot test population who approved the survey for wider dissemination.

Expected Findings

Many researchers embark on their scientific journey with solid foundations of the outcomes they are trying to achieve; these foundations dictate how the researcher will structure their approach

to the problem. In researching prior attempts to study the problem, the results have been fairly consistent with regard to outcomes for students (as described in Chapter 2). This research attempted to clarify an outlier among those consistent results; if researchers can replicate the results of the Eagan and Jaeger (2008) study, the ramifications of such a pattern could ultimately lead to the development of support systems for adjunct employees. While this research was analyzing a disparity in adjunct employment needs, finding a way to optimize student outcomes while improving the working conditions of adjunct employees is ideal. This research has the potential to play a role in future research; hopefully, understanding adjunct faculty members' needs and improving the environment where they teach will lead to better student outcomes.

This research sought understanding as to what an adjunct needs to be successful in their role. There are several variables and individual traits that make the definition of "success" different for every adjunct faculty member surveyed; this research used Herzberg's (1968) hygienes and Maslow's (1943) motivational theories to narrow these definitions. By attempting to find patterns of "need" versus "have" the research was able to close the gap between adjunct faculty satisfaction and their students' educational outcomes; this research attempted to provide insight into how administration can effectively support adjunct faculty to improve student outcomes.

Conflict of Interest Assessment

The research was conducted with no conflict of interest present. Because the research was not collected at a specific institution, but rather on a larger scale, institutions for which I have taught had an equiprobable chance of being chosen for participation. After the sample data was returned from IPEDS it was narrowed to 500 institutions utilizing randomization software. Should any institution for which I have taught or designed courses be chosen at random, I planned to omit that school and randomly select an additional institution from which to solicit participation; this need did not arise, however.

Researcher's Position

Although the institutions to which I have a connection were omitted from the study, there was still potential for researcher bias in this study. I have worked as an adjunct employee for approximately seven different institutions over the past five years; including private, public, for-profit, and non-profit, as well as two-year and four-year, trade schools, and traditional state colleges. I have taught in online, on-ground, and hybrid modalities, and have worked as both an employee and an independent contracting instructor. I have also had the privilege to see university policies that allow adjuncts to thrive and those that do not. Due to my extensive history in this profession, there is an inherent bias in my perception toward the adjunct condition. To avoid bias, any schools with which I am associated would be omitted if selected for participation in the study. The results of the survey were read and interpreted against the previous contributions to academic literature on the topic, and rigorous data analysis was performed under academic standards and guidelines. All qualitative data was read and categorized based on thematic content, rather than a personal interpretation of the content in support of the research.

Ethical issues in the study. To conduct a study, it must be designed in an ethical fashion with consideration and care for the treatment of the study participants. A clearly worded purpose statement was given in all correspondence regarding this study in an effort to avoid any confusion in the motivation for collecting information. The same statement was included in the participation consent form which must be read and accepted prior to allowing the participant access to the survey instrument. The purpose statement was reviewed by the IRB and feedback was incorporated as recommended; it boldly indicated that the study was voluntary and that the questions in the survey may be left blank if the participant was uncomfortable answering them. In addition, participants were not asked to release personal or identifying information (i.e., names), however, basic demographic data was collected. All data regarding study participant information is housed securely,

including transcripts of interviews and survey responses. This data is password-protected and the researcher assures compliance with all University regulations.

Summary

This descriptive survey research study employed a constructivist framework to understand why adjunct faculty continue to persist in their industry, and utilized Maslow's *Theory of Motivation* (1943) to help identify gaps that could lead to improved working conditions, employment policies and procedures, or generalized improvements in student educational outcomes (i.e., graduation, persistence, and retention). Due to the consistent, upward trend (Jaeger, 2008) in adjunct hiring practices, optimizing the labor force will be the key to maintaining quality education for all students and ethical employment practices for faculty administration.

Chapter 4: Data Analysis and Results

Adjunct faculty are an increasingly common sight on college campuses; rates of use have increased regularly for almost 45 years (Snyder & Dillow, 2012). There are many conversations surrounding the reasons for this increase; including financial and regulatory motives on the employer side, and autonomy-based employment on the adjunct faculty side (Benjamin, 2003; Batiste, 2016). Regardless of the impetus behind this increase of presence of adjunct faculty on college campuses, prior studies have noted an impact on outcomes for students as a result of this hiring trend. Past research has concluded that students receive a lower quality of instruction from adjunct instructors when compared to their full-time counterparts (Jacobs, 1998; Rouche, Rouche, & Milliron, 1996; Schmidt, 2008), however discontinuing the practice of utilizing adjunct faculty is not an idea that has gained momentum. Therefore, it is vital to student outcomes and the integrity of higher education institutions to utilize this work force appropriately; including training, support, and inclusivity in the campus environment. This research aimed to identify various factors which have the potential to increase adjunct faculty efficacy in higher education and subsequently impact student outcomes in a positive way. These factors were viewed through constructivist theories, and included considerations stemming from Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs and Herzberg's Theory of Motivation, to determine what an adjunct faculty needs in order to feel supported and effective in their role. Their resources were also noted, and a fuller picture of the gap between adjunct faculty members' "needs" and "haves" comes into view as it relates to this research.

This chapter gives an inclusive overview of the survey results collected in relation to the research questions proposed by this study. It is noteworthy to mention that participants were not required to enter a response for any question they felt uncomfortable answering; this affected the sample size for certain variables within the responses. Data for the survey was generated using Qualtrics software, and an initial version of the survey was sent to a pilot group of volunteer faculty

members prior to mass dissemination. The purpose of the two-phase pilot test was to find weaknesses within the questions or structure of the survey; after receiving feedback from the pilot faculty, no questions were changed. Minor modifications to correct grammar were suggested and applied.

The finalized version of the survey was disseminated beginning January 14, 2018 via social media platforms (e.g. Facebook, LinkedIn, Twitter). Simultaneously, the survey link was sent (via email) to selected schools' publicly listed administrators' email addresses. The Integrated Postsecondary Education Systems (IPEDS) system was used to select these schools; an initial report listed 7,000 schools. However, criterion sampling was applied as described in chapter 3 (application of search filters to include only schools that award Associate's and Bachelor's degrees, are either public or private and are either profit or nonprofit). This reduced the qualifying schools to 1,587 results, of which 500 were selected through random probability via Microsoft Excel software functionality. Of the 500 returned, approximately 32 were removed from the list after being identified as no longer operating. These schools were replaced with additional selections, in order to bring the full sample to 500.

After selecting the 500 schools, another IPEDS database returned the publicly listed contact information for "Chief Administrator" listed for each respective institution. An email containing an explanation of the research, consent to participate, and the survey hyperlink was sent to each of these administrators (see Appendices A, B, and C). Of the 500 emails sent, 68 were immediately returned, citing bad addresses; of the 68 returned, 20 email addresses were able to be corrected and the messages resent: 48 were not. This reduced the number of universities reached from 500 to 452. The results of the sample response rate to email dissemination are found in Table 1 below.

Table 1

Survey Sample Response Rate, IPEDS Database

Survey Invitation	Occurrences
<u>Original requests to participate</u>	500
Colleges no longer in operation, replaced with alternates	32
Email addresses not functional	48
<u>Eligible sample from IPEDS Database</u>	452
Completed the survey	159

After dissemination via social media platforms LinkedIn and Facebook, views of the survey were noted. Algorithms measuring views of a posted item are included in the LinkedIn electronic platform. After accessing the LinkedIn report, it was found that approximately 60 individuals viewed the survey invitation on LinkedIn. Unfortunately, LinkedIn does not track whether the survey was accessed to completion; subsequently it cannot be determined how many responses were collected by this method. The Facebook media platform, on the other hand, gives an alternate set of data. While the Facebook platform does not track views of the posted survey invitation, approximately 42 individuals communicated that they had completed this survey via reply to the survey invitation.

When performing an analysis of survey research, the response rates are viewed as confirmation of validity. Response rates are measured by the total responses as a percentage of the potential responses from the identified sample population (Martsolf, Schofield, Johnson, & Scanlon, 2012). Due to the expansive reach of social media platforms, however, it cannot be determined with any certainty the eligible sample population reached. This makes determining a response rate to the survey item difficult and is a limiting factor in determination of response rate.

In total, 159 respondents participated in the survey. If the IPEDS database was the only avenue of distribution for the survey, the response rate would be 35.18%. This is above the percentage needed to be considered statistically significant in relation to prior research on the topic,

and for this type of research. It is important to understand that this is a hypothetical response rate and does not account for the sample population reached via social media.

Description of the Sample

As mentioned, the diverse nature of academia makes an accurate demographic of adjunct faculty difficult to obtain. By collecting and analyzing the initial characteristics of adjunct providers in many sectors (including public and private, nonprofit and for-profit, and 2- and 4-year institutional settings) a fuller, varied, and current picture of the adjunct faculty workforce is available. This full picture will add to the literature on the topic of adjunct faculty, their working conditions, and the ideal ways an institution can support the adjunct population; all of which attempts to improve learning outcomes for students and working conditions for adjunct faculty.

Demographics and Academic Background

The survey for this study was originally created by Tomanek (2010), based on a survey created by Boord (2010) and Schulz (2009) and was designed to address several pieces of the adjunct faculty experience: professional development, resources available, and support systems, for example. The survey requested basic demographic information from each participant, including gender, age, racial/ethnic background, and marital status. This information was not collected to directly answer any research questions, but rather to gain a clear picture of the overall adjunct faculty population. A frequency analysis was conducted in Qualtrics to analyze the returned information; the data returned showed most respondents were female, 72.9% ($n = 110$), while men represented 25.8% ($n = 39$) of the sample population. The majority of adjunct faculty (31.80%) were in the 46–55 age bracket with the *mean* age of all respondents being 30.2 years of age.

The racial or ethnic background was predominately white with 77.5% ($n = 117$) of the total selecting this option. Black or African American, 12.6% ($n = 19$); Latino, Hispanic, 4.6% ($n = 7$); Asian, 2.6% ($n = 4$); and other, 2.6% ($n = 4$) were also listed in the responses. The primary language

of respondents was English, with 95.36% ($n = 144$) giving this response. Spanish represented 2.65% ($n = 4$), with Punjabi, Chinese, and Norwegian representing less than 1% of the total.

Respondents indicated that their marital status was married/living with partner or significant other, 72.5% ($n = 108$); single, 12.7% ($n = 19$); and separated, divorced or widowed, 14.8% ($n = 22$). Detailed accounts of the personal demographic information reported are listed below in Table 2.

Table 2

Demographics of Survey Respondents

Variable	<i>N</i>	Percent
<u>Gender</u>		
<i>n = 151</i>		
Male	39	25.80
Female	110	72.90
Other	0	0.00
Decline to identify	2	1.30
<u>Age Range</u>		
<i>n = 151</i>		
18-25	2	1.30
26-35	19	12.60
36-45	43	28.50
46-55	48	31.80
56+	39	25.80

Table 2

Demographics of Survey Respondents (continued)

Variable	<i>N</i>	Percent
<u>Racial/Ethnic Background</u>		
<i>n = 151</i>		
Alaska Native	0	0.00
Asian	4	2.60
Black or African American	19	12.60
Latino, Hispanic	7	4.60
Native Hawaiian, or other Pacific Islander	0	0.00
White, Non-Hispanic	117	77.50
Other	4	2.70
<u>Primary Language</u>		
<i>n = 51</i>		
English	144	95.36
Punjabi	1	>1.0
Spanish	4	2.65
Chinese	1	>1.0
Norwegian	1	>1.0
<u>Marital Status</u>		
<i>n = 49</i>		
Single	19	12.70
Married/Living with partner or significant other	108	72.50
Separated, divorced, or widowed	22	14.80

An effort to obtain information regarding the participants' academic background was made during the survey process, detailed in Table 3 below. Respondents provided information related to their educational history and degree status; they were also asked if they had ever experienced community college as a student. A percentage of 47.3 ($n = 169$) of participants disclosed they had

enrolled in community college as a student, while 52.7% ($n = 77$) indicated they had not enrolled. Of the participants who completed the question regarding degree completion, 57.1% ($n = 84$) had indicated they had completed a doctoral degree, and 39.5% ($n = 58$) had completed a master's degree. Only 2% ($n = 3$) had completed a bachelor's degree only, and 1.4% had completed a specialist certificate.

Table 3

Academic Background of Survey Respondents

Variable	<i>N</i>	Percent
<u>Community college enrollment</u>		
<i>n = 146</i>		
Yes	69	47.30
No	77	52.70
Decline to answer	0	0.00
<u>Highest degree obtained</u>		
<i>n = 147</i>		
Doctorate (Ph.D, M.D., Ed.D, J.D., etc.)	84	57.10
Education Specialist (Ed.S)	2	1.40
Master's Degree (MA, MBA, MS, M.Ed, etc.)	58	39.50
Bachelor's Degree	3	2.00
Associate Degree	0	0.00
Diploma	0	0.00
Certificate	0	0.00
High School Diploma/GED	0	0.00
Less than High School Diploma/GED	0	0.00

Table 3

Academic Background of Survey Respondents (continued)

Variable	<i>N</i>	Percent
<u>Field of most advanced degree</u>		
<i>n = 45</i>		
Education	39	26.89
Business	8	5.51
Sociology	9	6.20
Science	4	2.75
Information Technology	8	5.51
Music	2	1.38
Psychology	11	7.58
Leadership	5	3.45
Nursing	5	3.45
Law	4	2.75
Communication	3	2.07
Math	2	1.38
Economics	3	2.07
English	13	8.96
Management	10	6.90
Religion	2	1.38
Marketing	1	>1.00
Public Services	4	2.75
Language	2	1.38
Engineering	2	1.38
International Relations	1	>1.00
Other	7	4.83

The survey requested respondents to indicate the number of years they have been teaching in various sectors, from secondary to post-secondary settings. The respondents had a *mean* experience

level of 5.40 years for K–12 teaching; 5.75 years teaching in the 2-year, public/non-profit setting; 3.72 years in the 2-year private/for-profit setting; 7.60 years in the 4-year, public/non-profit setting; and 6.18 years in the 4-year, private/for-profit setting. There was a *mean* experience level of 1.68 years in the vocational setting, and an average of 2.12 years was spent in an unidentified setting according to respondents.

Instructional Tasks and Workload

To understand fully the variety of settings and circumstances in which adjunct faculty are hired, questions were asked regarding their instructional tasks and daily workloads; these responses are detailed in Table 4. In an effort to clarify the modalities in which adjunct faculty were employed, the survey instrument asked participants to detail the methods in which they delivered educational content. Participants were given the opportunity to divide their current teaching responsibilities to indicate the percentage each modality represented of their total course load. The responses indicate that 33.6% ($n = 74$) are teaching face-to-face, and 50.9% ($n = 112$) are teaching online. A hybrid modality is used by 11.4% ($n = 25$), and 1.4% ($n = 3$) are instructing by conferencing. It is important to note that respondents were able to select more than one response in this question, which led to higher return rates for the question being asked.

The survey also asked respondents to give insight into their motivation for teaching, asking each participant to indicate the reason they chose to pursue teaching at their current institution. An overwhelming majority indicated they were teaching because they needed to obtain extra income, with 34.3% selecting this response ($n = 92$). Respondents indicated they enjoy the experience of teaching, as 26.5% ($n = 71$) selected this as their primary motivation, 20.5% of participants ($n = 55$) indicated they enjoyed the students, 16.8% ($n = 45$) plan to use the experience as a career-ladder, and 1.9% ($n = 5$) selected “other” as their primary motivator. Responses recorded in the “other” category included location and retirement savings as motivators for teaching. Once again,

respondents were allowed to select multiple entries for this question, leading to a higher response rate for this question.

Table 4 also attempts to categorize the respondents, based on a taxonomy created by Rouche, Rouche, and Milliron (1995) and expanded for the purposes of this study to be inclusive of new online teaching modalities. The participants in the study ascribed themselves a taxonomy status based on their employment situation; taxonomy statuses included Homeworkers (working part-time to allow time to care for children and/or other relatives), Onliners (currently teaching strictly online courses at a post-secondary institution), Full-Time Part-Timers (currently holding two or more adjunct teaching positions at two or more post-secondary institutions), Part-Mooners (currently holding two or more part-time jobs of less than 35 hours per week), Full-Mooners (currently working 35 or more hours per week elsewhere), Hopeful Full-Timers (currently would like to secure a full-time college teaching position), Student, or Semi-Retired. In alignment with prior responses regarding outside employment, 19.1% ($n = 43$) classified themselves as Full-Mooner; whereas 18.2% ($n = 41$) consider themselves a Hopeful Full-Timer and 18.7% ($n = 42$) selected Onliner. 15.1% ($n = 34$) of respondents label themselves a Full-Time Part-Timer, 11.1% ($n = 25$) classify themselves Part-Mooner, and 9.3% ($n = 21$) consider themselves Semi-Retired. Rounding out the data, 4.9% of respondents ($n = 11$) indicated they were a Homeworker and 3.6% ($n = 8$) classified themselves as a Student.

Table 4

Instructional Tasks and Workload of Survey Respondents

Variable	<i>N</i>	Percent
<u>Methods of delivery at most current institution</u>		
<i>n</i> = 220		
Face-to-face/Classroom	74	33.60
Online	112	50.90
Course conferencing (telecourse)	3	1.40
Hybrid	25	11.4
Other	1	>1.0
Not currently teaching	5	2.3
<u>Motivation for teaching at current institution</u>		
<i>n</i> = 268		
Needed the income	92	34.30
Enjoy the students	55	20.50
Enjoy the experience	71	26.50
Plan to use this as a career-ladder	45	16.80
Other	5	1.90
<u>Taxonomy status</u>		
<i>n</i> = 225		
Semi-Retired	21	9.30
Student	8	3.60
Hopeful Full-Timer	41	18.20
Full Mooner	43	19.10
Part-Mooner	25	11.10
Full-Time Part-Timer	34	15.10
Onliner	42	18.70
Homeworker	11	4.90

Current Employment, Instructional Resources and Time Management

This section addresses RQ₁: *What administrative support and other conditions do adjunct faculty members at colleges and universities need to be successful?* The research sought to address the employment habits of respondents, which are detailed in Table 5 below. The information indicates that 126 participants in the survey had outside or additional employment to their adjunct teaching duties. 40.4% ($n = 57$) held one additional job, 22% ($n = 31$) held two additional jobs, 10.7% ($n = 15$) held three additional jobs, 6.4% ($n = 9$) held 4 different jobs, and 9.9% ($n = 15$) held 5 or more jobs. Almost half of the respondents, 44.3% ($n = 62$) indicated that one of these jobs was considered “full-time” in addition to their part-time teaching duties, with 55.7% ($n = 78$) indicating the additional job(s) was part-time status. Subsequently, participants were asked if they would have preferred full-time teaching at their current adjunct institution, and 61.2% ($n = 85$) of participants indicated they would have preferred a full-time teaching position; 38.8% ($n = 54$) indicated they would not have preferred a full-time position.

Table 5

Current Employment of Survey Respondents

Variable	<i>N</i>	Percent
<u>Jobs held outside adjunct teaching duties</u>		
<i>n = 141</i>		
0	15	10.60
1	57	40.40
2	31	22.00
3	15	10.70
4	9	6.40
5 or more	14	9.90
<u>Employed full-time outside of teaching</u>		
<i>n = 140</i>		
Yes	62	44.30
No	78	55.70
<u>Preference for full-time teaching at current institution</u>		
<i>n = 139</i>		
Yes	85	61.20
No	54	38.80

To better understand the educational tools available to adjunct faculty, participants were asked to note any instructional resources they had access to during their adjunct employment. The survey allowed participants to mark multiple selections, as it is possible more than one resource could be provided. In total, 281 responses were collected; with 43.1% ($n = 121$) of participants indicating an institutional email address had been provided. No other response was selected as often; the next most common resource selected was the use of a shared office space with 16% ($n = 45$) selections. Subsequent resources indicated include clerical support as the next most common resource, with 10% ($n = 28$) of the responses. Faculty mentors received 8.9% ($n = 25$) responses, which tied with use of a personal computer 8.9% ($n = 25$). Phone/voicemail services were indicated

7.5% ($n = 21$) of the time, use of a private office was noted in 2.1% ($n = 6$) responses, and 3.5% ($n = 10$) respondents selected “other” as a resource. These responses are detailed in Table 6.

Table 6

Instructional Resources Available to Survey Respondents

Variable	<i>N</i>	Percent
<u>Instructional resources available</u>		
<i>n = 281</i>		
Use of a private office	6	2.10
Shared office space	45	16.00
A personal computer	25	8.90
An email account	121	43.10
A phone/voicemail	21	7.50
Clerical support	28	10.00
Faculty mentor	25	8.90
Other	10	3.50

Because adjunct faculty are so diverse, it is difficult to obtain any standard expectation of time management expected in the role. Adjunct duties are varied, as are interpersonal commitments in a variety of teaching settings. The survey asked participants how they spent their time during the week both socially and professionally with colleagues, administrators, and students.

Participants were asked specifically how they communicate with students outside of the classroom; they were presented a variety of options and could select all that were applicable; in total, 398 responses were collected for the question. 33.7% ($n = 134$) indicated they used email to communicate, 20.1% ($n = 80$) used the phone. 15.8% ($n = 63$) used before/after class time to speak with students, 14.3% ($n = 57$) utilized office hours, and 13.8% ($n = 55$) communicated using an online venue (e.g. Facebook, Skype, or Twitter). Only 2.3% ($n = 9$) indicated “other” as a response. These responses can be found in Table 7.

Table 7

Communication Methods for Survey Respondents

Variable	<i>N</i>	Percent
<u>Methods of communication with students</u>		
<i>n</i> = 398		
Phone	80	20.10
Email	134	33.70
Office hours	57	14.30
Before/after class	63	15.80
Online venues (chat, Skype, Twitter, Facebook, etc.)	55	13.80
Other	9	2.30

Finally, participants were asked about their instructional duties specifically; respondents reported the average time spent on a variety of tasks throughout the average work week. Results are displayed in Table 8. In analyzing the hour distribution, a *mean* was calculated to determine a pattern within the responses. Again, the responses were collected in Likert Scale fashion, with numerical values applied to the categories as follows: (1) 0 hours per week, (2) 1–4 hours per weeks, (3) 5–8 hours per week, (4) 9–12 hours per week, (5) 13–16 hours per week, (6) 17–20 hours per week, (7) 21–34 hours per week, and (8) 35–40 hours per week. Once again, calculation of the *mean* allows the data to be interpreted with varying responses. In this section, the highest number indicates the most time allotted to that variable. After calculating the *mean* of each category and variable, it was determined that adjunct faculty spend the majority of their time in outside employment (M=4.59), followed by household/childcare duties (M=3.79), preparing to teach (M=3.57), and in scheduled teaching (M=3.42). The data showed also that the participants spent the least amount of time performing institutional community service (M=1.17), committee work (M=1.39), and personal community service (M=1.67). This survey question also gave respondents the opportunity to enter

alternate weekly activities in a free form comment box; responses included “blogging” and “working on doctorate.”

Table 8

Participant Time Distribution, Average Hours Per Week

Variable	0 hours per week	1-4 hours per week	5-8 hours per week	9-12 hours per week	13-16 hours per week	17-20 hours per week	21-34 hours per week	35-40 hours per week	Responses	Mean
Scheduled teaching (give actual not credit hours)	4	40	34	30	6	9	2	5	130	3.42
Preparing for teaching (including reading student papers and grading)	0	39	39	22	14	6	5	5	130	3.57
Advising and/or counseling of students	19	90	13	1	3	3	0	0	129	2.13
Committee work and meetings	84	39	4	1	0	0	0	0	128	1.39
Community or public service (institutional)	106	19	1	0	0	0	0	0	126	1.17
Community or public service (personal)	73	36	9	7	0	2	0	0	127	1.67
Outside consulting/freelance work	66	25	16	6	5	5	4	1	128	2.17
Household/childcare duties	16	30	26	14	12	11	7	13	129	3.79
Commuting to work	37	54	25	9	3	1	0	0	129	2.15
Other employment	23	11	13	19	7	13	8	30	124	4.59
Research and scholarly writing	54	43	14	10	4	0	3	0	128	2.05
Other	23	1	4	3	0	0	0	0	32	1.53

Perceptions of Adjunct Faculty and Satisfaction Factors

This section addresses RQ₂: *How do full-time, tenured/non-tenured faculty members perceive adjunct faculty members' contributions to their university?* Participants were asked to evaluate the time they spent with various populations encountered in the teaching setting. Responses were gathered using a 4-point Likert Scale, and numerical values were applied to the categories as follows: (4) hardly ever, (3) sometimes, (2) often, (1) very often. In this section, the lower *mean* score is indicative of the most time allotted to the variable. Based on the calculated means, adjunct faculty spent the majority of their time with their students (M= 1.81), which is to be expected for faculty. The population with which the respondents spend the least amount of time with is administrators (M=3.67). The means of these responses were calculated using the Likert Scale numerical data and are detailed in Table 9. Knowing the *mean* response allows a clearer idea of the significance of this data while accommodating for varying response rates.

Table 9

Professional Interpersonal Relationships

Variable	Hardly Ever	Sometimes	Often	Very Often	Responses	Mean
Part-time faculty	98	20	15	4	137	3.54
Full-time faculty	94	21	12	8	135	3.48
Department Management	88	35	9	4	136	3.52
Administrators	96	27	6	1	130	3.67
Students	16	18	27	75	136	1.81

A number of survey items were constructed to measure adjunct faculty level of satisfaction with a variety of items at their current teaching assignment. This survey section was also structured utilizing a traditional 5-point Likert Scale, however, this scale had a wider variety of responses which were assigned numerical values as follows: (1) extremely satisfied,

(2) moderately satisfied, (3) neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, (4) slightly dissatisfied, and (5) extremely dissatisfied. Table 10 outlines the frequency and *mean* of these responses.

Overall, respondents were most satisfied with the quality of their students (M=1.92), followed by autonomy and independence (M=2.10) and the freedom they have to determine course content (M=2.48) and course assignments (M=2.61). Responses to the survey indicate that participants are least satisfied with benefits available (M=3.77), prospects for career advancement (M=3.63), social relationships with full-time faculty (M=3.49) and job security (M=3.45).

Table 10

Job Satisfaction for Survey Respondents

Variable	Extremely satisfied	Moderately satisfied	Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied	Slightly dissatisfied	Extremely dissatisfied	Total	Mean
Salary	10	45	18	30	21	124	3.05
Benefits available	7	14	29	21	50	121	3.77
Teaching load	14	44	18	29	20	125	2.98
Quality of students	19	50	22	22	13	126	1.92
Office/lab space	6	12	51	15	33	117	3.49
Equipment and facilities available for classroom instruction	13	27	45	11	24	120	3.05
Institutional support for teaching improvement and professional development	14	35	31	28	16	124	2.96
Autonomy and independence	49	42	14	10	9	124	2.10

Table 10

Job Satisfaction for Survey Respondents (continued)

Variable	Extremely satisfied	Moderately satisfied	Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied	Slightly dissatisfied	Extremely dissatisfied	Total	Mean
Professional relationships with full-time faculty	11	20	38	23	29	121	3.32
Professional relationships with other adjunct faculty	11	26	45	18	23	123	3.13
Social relationships with full-time faculty	6	13	53	11	36	119	3.49
Social relationships with other adjunct faculty	9	12	54	14	29	118	3.35
Competency of colleagues	22	31	52	15	4	124	2.58
Job security	7	31	19	31	35	123	3.45
Relationship with administrators	10	39	37	25	13	124	2.94
Departmental leadership	19	46	29	15	13	122	2.65
Course assignments	20	55	14	21	13	123	2.61
Freedom to determine course content	40	35	15	15	18	123	2.48
Prospects for career advancement	5	17	37	23	41	123	3.63

In addition to gauging a response regarding personal satisfaction, survey respondents were asked to rank their level of agreement with a variety of statements regarding their current institution

of employment. A 6-point Likert scale was used with numerical values assigned as follows: (6) strongly agree, (5) somewhat agree, (4) neither agree nor disagree, (3) somewhat disagree, (2) strongly disagree, (1) don't know/not applicable. The *mean* of the answers was calculated in order to determine an average response rate, with the higher means indicated the strongest agreement. These responses are detailed in in Table 11 below.

In a review of the *mean* responses, the highest incidence of agreement among survey respondents was with the statement that adjunct faculty do not have any guarantee of employment (M=5.19); they also agree that adjunct faculty are respected by students (M=4.88). Secondary to these items, respondents agreed that adjunct faculty are provided with necessary course competencies (M=4.74) but agree that adjunct faculty rarely get hired into full-time positions (M=4.66). When analyzing the statements respondents disagreed with, it was found that respondents disagreed that administration considers adjunct faculty when making policies (M=3.11), are rewarded for their efforts (M=3.51) and respected by full-time faculty (M=3.55).

Table 11

Perceptions of Survey Respondents

Variable	Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't Know/Not Applicable	Responses	Mean
Are given specific training before teaching.	34	36	8	15	28	4	125	4.17
Are encouraged to attend orientation.	48	21	17	13	17	9	125	4.34
Are provided course competencies and/or standards.	48	36	14	17	8	2	125	4.74
Are given opportunities to participate in professional development activities.	39	38	16	17	12	3	125	4.53
Rarely get hired into full-time positions.	60	25	11	6	9	13	124	4.66
Receive respect from students.	45	44	20	6	8	1	124	4.88
Are primarily responsible for lower-level/undergraduate/introductory course instruction.	45	29	22	7	12	9	124	4.49
Have no guarantee of employment.	73	28	11	2	5	5	124	5.19
Are provided support in the classroom.	13	33	33	21	16	6	122	3.90
Are provided support outside the classroom.	13	24	28	22	25	10	122	3.57

Table 11

Perceptions of Survey Respondents (continued)

Variable	Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't Know/Not Applicable	Responses	Mean
Are required to attend meetings.	15	27	25	16	29	11	123	3.59
Have good working relationships with administration.	26	29	34	12	19	3	123	4.18
Are respected by full-time faculty.	15	27	25	15	26	15	123	3.55
It is easy for students to see adjunct faculty outside of regular office hours.	11	41	16	20	23	14	125	3.64
Adjunct faculty and administration work together to achieve common goals.	12	27	33	26	19	7	124	3.73
Students are provided with individual attention and support.	27	54	14	17	9	4	125	4.49
Adjunct faculty are regarded as good teachers.	25	47	26	10	8	9	125	4.36
Adjunct faculty are rewarded for their efforts.	6	25	30	33	23	6	123	3.51
Adjunct faculty are rewarded for their efforts to work with underprepared students.	6	15	26	35	33	7	122	3.22

Table 11

Perceptions of Survey Respondents (continued)

Variable	Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't Know/Not Applicable	Responses	Mean
Administration consider adjunct faculty concerns when making policy.	6	14	28	29	32	14	123	3.11
The administration is open about its policies.	12	35	32	21	17	7	124	3.86
I am compensated fairly for the hours I work.	7	28	20	24	43	1	123	3.42

Qualitative Data Analysis

The final three questions in the survey instrument were open-ended, allowing participants to express personal opinions freely. These questions asked the respondent to provide the following information: advice to their employer regarding improving the adjunct experience, what the respondent would change about their own experience as adjunct faculty, and what they find most valuable from their experience as an adjunct faculty member. To analyze the qualitative data returned from these three questions, a thematic analysis was used. This type of analysis is used to determine themes and patterns within a data set through coding of responses and categorization of codes into themes.

A theoretical thematic analysis was performed on open-ended questions asked in the survey instrument; data was analyzed through the Braun and Clarke (2006) method. First, all submission data was reviewed at length to provide a foundational knowledge for the analysis. After initial review, open coding was performed to identify data with similar properties or themes. The open

coding process transforms the data patterns within the responses into codes; these codes were applied only to recorded responses relevant to the research. Answers not relevant to the research and/or left blank were not included in the analysis. After open coding was performed, axial coding began, employed to recognize overarching themes between the established codes. Themes were constructed through identified similarities in responses and were based on the context of the response and relevance to the research. The initial themes were further refined to include subthemes, further streamlining the data set.

Question 27 is the first open-ended question and asks adjunct faculty to advise their institutional administration on how best to provide a positive adjunct employment experience. After review, initial codes, themes, and subthemes were identified in Table 12.

Table 12

Q27 Codes, Themes and Subthemes; Advice to Administration

Codes	Theme	Subtheme
Support	Quality of	Institutional Communication and Feedback
	Communication with	Policy and Procedure Creation
	Adjunct Faculty	Adjunct Feedback
		Respect and Inclusion from Administration and Peers
Employment Factors	Compensation and	Full-Time Status
	Workload Expectations	Existing Pay Structure, Employment Benefits, and
	of Adjunct Faculty	Full-time Perks
		Additional Compensation and Scheduling Consistency
Content	Course Content and	Curriculum Design
	Technology	Additional Technology and Support
Students	Student Concerns	Student Readiness
		Student Complaints

Theme 1: Quality of Communication with Adjunct Faculty

In analyzing the responses, many centered on the perceived quality of communication between an institution and their adjunct faculty members. This communication could mean a variety of items: verbal and written correspondence, and communication of institutional policies and procedures. These responses consisted of basic feedback, such as “communicate honestly” and “communication.” Short answers like these provide a blunt and straightforward piece of advice for administration. Additionally, responses that indicated a desire for continued training in areas of deficiency, and development of prowess and skill in teaching, were noted.

Subtheme 1: Institutional Communication and Feedback. Several remarks were made by participants regarding generalized feedback given to adjunct faculty members. These remarks indicate a lack of communication during the policy-making process, including “survey and poll adjuncts. Elicit feedback.” One respondent seemed to have given advice; however, indicates it was not used; saying “Listen to their advice + support them.” The ability for the faculty to be heard is prevalent within this subtheme, indicating that current practices at their institution of employment do not support this type of communication.

Subtheme 2: Policy and Procedure Creation. Many comments from participants indicated a lack of communication in the course creation procedures. These comments included “involve faculty in course content” and “include the adjunct faculty in the course planning. Ask them for ideas regarding the course(s) they teach.” Some respondents indicated they would like to be present for policy decisions as well, stating, “Allow adjuncts to contribute to college-wide policies and decisions.” Having a voice in regard to the course content being taught seems vital to these respondents; without a say in the pedagogy, the role of adjunct faculty can be relegated to simply grading assignments.

Subtheme 3: Adjunct Feedback. When preliminarily viewing responses, a subtheme was noted that indicated adjunct faculty feel isolated in their roles. In this subtheme, many responses spoke to the segregation of the adjunct condition and indicated a need for acknowledgment of concerns with such issues as student conduct as well as scheduling. One respondent stated, “Value the opinion that not all students are always right,” while another commented, “afford the courtesy of notifying adjuncts of no course assignments [*sic*] during a given term.” This is particularly concerning when examining the current percentage of adjunct faculty in employment. According to the literature, adjunct use overtook full-time faculty utilization in 2013 (National Center for Education Statistics, 2013b); it is reasonable to assume that number has grown since, making the isolation of adjunct faculty more widespread than institutions may realize.

Subtheme 4: Respect and Inclusion. Responses under this subtheme refer to respect, lack of respect, and inclusivity in the institutional community. Comments included blunt feedback such as, “Treat us like faculty. Stop trying to make our lives harder and start supporting us. 70% of your full-time teaches [*sic*] are adjuncts.” Comments that were broader were also noted, such as “listen to our concerns.” An overt feeling of segregation was noted by one respondent, who stated, “make me feel like I am a part of the community here, not just passing thru [*sic*].” The adjunct teaching model is noted to lack engagement in the wider community (Reigle, 2016), which is apparent in these responses. When this subtheme is reviewed with the prior subtheme, an overall trend of isolation begins to take shape.

Theme 2: Compensation and Workload Expectations of Adjunct Faculty

There are many components of the adjunct faculty role: the workload placed on adjunct faculty, and compensation provided in return, yielded much insight about the experience of these faculty members. By far, however, responses were noted that indicated overall dissatisfaction with compensation. These included comments like, “Increase pay for successful faculty,” “pay decently,”

and “Pay the faculty members more.” Comments left regarding employer benefits (both traditional and non) were also noted, and included a general desire for benefits, such as “More sections and benefits” or “Please provide benefits.”

There were also indications of a high workload, with comments such as “HIRE MORE ADJUNCTS” and “lower enrollments per course. . . .” Additionally, a noted distaste for unpaid course prep was present, with responses stating, “I would like to not prep for a course and then have it drop the day school starts with no pay.” Responses within this theme also mention required (unpaid) professional development: “Not having so many other requirements such as meetings and professional development. It is a part time job and requires a lot of extra professional development per year.” These responses were divided into two subthemes.

Subtheme 1: Full-Time Status. This subtheme noted responses suggesting a polarized perspective of the topic. Responses requested consideration for full-time status, commenting “Give them the opportunity to earn full-time status” and “There should be more opportunity for advancement to a FT position.” Simultaneously, responses decry the assumption of wanting to obtain full-time status, stating “Don't assume adjuncts aspire to be full time.” These opposing viewpoints show the diversity in the adjunct population and are a depiction of the variety of conditions in which adjunct faculty work.

Subtheme 2: Existing Pay Structure, Employment Benefits, and Full-time Perks. While responses regarding pay were common, they were also diverse. Some simply expressed dissatisfaction at the institutional pay procedures entirely, encouraging a review of existing policies, such as “conduct a salary study to review compensation compared to peer institutions.” One response stated simply, “Salary has not changed in 8 years,” indicating a need for review of the assigned pay structure currently in place.

Outside hourly wages, various benefits are considered a part of a total compensation package for employees. Respondents indicate that adjunct faculty do not have the ability to participate in these additional benefits. Responses grouped in this subtheme specifically refer to medical, dental, and/or vision benefits, paid time off (PTO), and sick days, for example and state, “Recognize that we need office space, job security, and the tools necessary to perform our jobs as well as the full time faculty members.” One comment left said, “sick days” and another said, “Give bonuses.” These “perks” are awarded only to those with full-time status, and responses indicate dissatisfaction with this practice.

Subtheme 3: Additional Compensation and Scheduling Consistency. After examining responses that speak to the workload of adjunct faculty, it is noted that there are tasks outside teaching which adjunct faculty are required to perform. The responses in this subtheme indicate concern with mandatory meetings and professional development, which are unpaid. Submissions state, “pay for office hours,” “pay for prep grading and office hours,” and “why are meetings unpaid?” These working conditions fall in line with the common themes from the literature, noting that adjuncts are underpaid and often work for free in effort to gain favor with an institution (Hutto, 2013; Monks, 2009).

The desire to obtain reliability in scheduling was noted. Comments left included concerns with term-to-term scheduling; a practice commonplace within the industry. Some comments included “more consistent course load,” “working on a semester-by-semester basis with no contract is frustrating,” and “schedule me in advance.” Other responses included requests for advanced notice when courses are cancelled, as well as contracts that expand beyond the term-to-term structure (i.e., yearly). When examined with the prior subtheme, a full picture of stability (both in employment and monetary security) comes into view; a view that reveals a bleak and temporary position with little growth or advancement.

Theme 3: Course Content and Technology

Because many schools are modernizing their curriculum and enhancing course delivery via virtual means, the course content can impact adjunct faculty members' ability to perform their job. This theme is inclusive of all responses focused around andragogy and course content; from concerns about existing course formats (modalities, on-ground/traditional classroom settings or virtual ones), technology available for use, and the utilization of existing support services. One comment included "more autonomy in course design" but failed to offer further information.

Subtheme 1: Curriculum Design. Designing a course curriculum can be limited to the tools available at an individual institution. Responses noted under this subtheme point toward a desire to engage with the students differently than their existing course modality allows. These comments stated the respondent would "modify the class discuss board format in classes, in favor of a more engaging alternative for students." These comments may indicate frustrations with the limitations inherent in an online classroom. The comments may also reflect a lack of diversity within online education as a whole; as industry standards and best practices struggle to keep up with the onslaught of outside resources available.

Subtheme 2: Additional Technology and Support. Institutions with online course offerings often employ technical support teams to manage their learning management system. Some participants take issue with their existing technological support available by stating, "Consider how many hours adjuncts put in and the challenges of having off hours courses with hardly anyone around for support." Other responses desire more tools for their students, stating, "Update technology equipment in classrooms." The participants indicate dissatisfaction with the resources available to them, potentially causing delays in achieving positive student outcomes. In examining the lack of tools available for adjunct faculty, and the lack of support offered by institutions, prior themes and subthemes surrounding a feeling of isolation begin to take shape.

Theme 4: Student Concerns

Each institution has guidelines for student expectations; from the admissions process, classroom interactions, grievances, and complaints. Submitted comments indicated a desire for more stringent student expectations from the institutional level. These included “improve requirements for admission and stronger regulations for attendance.” Further concerns with students were addressed within two identified subthemes.

Subtheme 1: Student Readiness. This subtheme focused on the quality of the students admitted to the institution. Many questioned the readiness of existing students for the college setting. These comments included, “Quit bringing in students who are not prepared for college” and “these students are underprepared.” While these comments certainly speak to areas for improvement of each institution, it is difficult to ascertain any individual student’s aptitude for success in a given subject. However, when examined concurrently with prior responses regarding support for students (or lack thereof) with technology, it is possible that students who are less apt to the college environment, technology used, or expectations of college rigor, will appear unprepared, causing frustration from adjunct faculty. It is also worthy to note that prior literature indicates most first-term students are taught by adjunct faculty; as undergraduate and introductory courses are most often given to part-time instructors (Hutto, 2013; Tomanek, 2010; Umbach, 2007). This places the students with higher risk in the hands of dissatisfied and unsupported adjunct faculty.

Subtheme 2: Student Complaints. Administrative support during the grievance process was also addressed. Traditionally, universities and colleges have a process by which a student can make a complaint regarding a faculty member, to challenge the grade they were awarded, and so forth. The responses designated to this subtheme discuss the institutional support for adjunct faculty when one such student complaint has been lodged. Responses included, “Hold students accountable—don’t blame teachers” and could be indicative of a perceived lack of support from

administration. The literature explains that adjunct faculty are often cajoled into placating upset students with leniency, exceptions to policies, and inflated grading; all in an effort to obtain further employment with their university. When adjunct faculty refuse to bend personal and ethical principles, they risk losing a source of income (Deutsch, 2015).

Interpretation of Responses

The responses ($n = 97$) recorded in the thematic analysis found the majority referred to dissatisfaction in the pay structure ($n = 28$); one survey respondent wrote, “Pay more. You're killing us.” and another said, “I need more money!” Some respondents left more in-depth suggestions, like “Increase pay and try to pay more attention to the qualities these people possess to utilize these great people better.” And “Create a payscale [*sic*] that goes beyond the minimum for experienced adjuncts.” These responses show a clear dissatisfaction with existing compensation practices.

The next highest response category was Quality of Communication with Adjunct Faculty ($n = 23$). Many responses refer directly to the involvement that adjuncts have in policies and course design, with comments left including, “Allow adjuncts to contribute to college-wide policies and decisions” and “Include the adjunct faculty in the course planning. Ask them for ideas regarding the course(s) they teach.” Some respondents felt a lack of overall communication, writing, “talk directly to us—not just email” and “Stop pretending to care about adjunct concerns; admit that you don't.” The overtly cynical response seems indicative of a growing disillusion with the higher education industry and their treatment of faculty.

The frequency of responses to the Consistency in Scheduling ($n = 12$) theme proved to be enlightening. With many respondents indicating they are working several jobs, they continue to request more work. One participant said, “Develop a plan to provide more consistent course awards” and another “make scheduling consistent and fair.” Many respondents indicated dissatisfaction with

the notice they receive when a course cancels, saying, “I would like to not prep for a course and then have it drop the day school starts with no pay for prep.”

Question 28 is the next open-ended question and asked respondents to identify an aspect of their adjunct faculty experience that they wish could change. Codes, themes, and subthemes were identified, as detailed in Table 13:

Table 13

Q28 Codes, Themes and Subthemes; Requests for Change

Codes	Theme	Subtheme
Employee Compensation	Compensation for Adjuncts	Financial Compensation Institutional Benefits
Scheduling	Consistency in Employment Terms	Flexibility in Scheduling
Association	Relationship with Institution	University Connection Institutional Support Expanding Employment Opportunities
Students	Classroom and Student Concerns	

Theme 1: Compensation for Adjuncts

When requesting a change, responses were collected that focused on compensation. The responses were then coded for consistent themes. Identified and coded responses referred to salary and/or pay as a negative factor of a respondent’s employment. Additional responses revolved around factors affecting employment terms; such as compensation rates and benefit packages.

Subtheme 1: Financial Compensation. Financial compensation was a common response. These comments included several basic comments including “pay” and “money.” Very little deviation from this basic response was found, which shows a universality in the concern. Adjunct faculty are often utilized as a cost-saving measure for institutions (Louis, 2009); however, utilized poorly this has strained faculty members financially. When looking at a larger picture of the adjunct

condition alongside Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs (1943), it becomes clear that adjunct faculty have very little likelihood of their *security* needs being met monetarily. Maslow states “. . . we find that the dominating goal is a strong determinant not only of his current world-outlook and philosophy but also of his philosophy of the future. Practically everything looks less important than safety. . . . A man, in this state, if it is extreme enough and chronic enough, may be characterized as living almost for safety alone.” (p. 376). The idea that an adjunct faculty member may continuously seek security and struggle to find it, has implications on student outcomes. After all, if the adjunct cannot satisfy their lower-level needs, how can they assist students in obtaining higher goals?

Subtheme 2: Institutional Benefits. In addition to financial compensation, benefit packages were requested. Responses discussed benefits provided to full-time faculty, which the respondent felt they should also receive. These responses included, “Give me employee status like library privileges and parking permits,” and “professional development.” It is likely that institutional benefits available to the adjunct faculty population could offset the poor pay structures found in the prior subtheme; it is also likely that being provided these benefits could increase the connection faculty felt with the campus environment. It is surprising that institutions would exclude the adjunct faculty in this manner, when benefits have the potential to improve the adjunct condition.

Theme 2: Consistency in Employment Terms

Scheduling concerns that implied a need for consistency were grouped within this theme. These responses referred to both the scheduling of an adjunct to teach, whether a last-minute addition or a last-minute reduction in classes. These responses stated, “consistent course contracts,” “consistency of schedules” and “more frequent contracts [*sic*].” As with prior subthemes, Maslow's (1943) need of *security* is mentioned; as adjunct faculty do not have consistency in either monetary compensation or continuance in employment.

Subtheme 1: Flexibility in Scheduling. The responses noted under this theme indicated dissatisfaction with the times/dates of their courses being offered. Comments included “start earlier” and “I would change the evening hours that I teach. After working a full-time day job, working late into the evening is tiresome.” These responses seem particularly relevant to adjunct faculty being utilized on campus in a traditional setting. As prior research has indicated, adjunct faculty are often utilized to fill undergraduate and introductory-level courses (Hutto, 2013; Tomanek, 2010; Umbach, 2007); it is logical to assume the adjunct faculty also receive the teaching schedules that are late, early, or held on weekends. Pairing this with the survey responses indicating many adjunct faculty are working more than a single job, and it becomes clear that adjunct faculty are likely spending more time with students than with their families.

Theme 3: Relationship with Institution

In alignment with prior comments noting the isolation of an adjunct faculty member, the relationship of the adjunct with their institution of employ was found. The responses left under this theme indicate a desire to be connected with the institution of employment. Several types of responses were left; simple and straightforward “engagement” alongside “more connection with the university.” A wider, more varied interpretation of the adjunct faculty member begins to emerge in this theme; if adjunct faculty spend more time devoted to the institution than their family, and relationship with the institution is strained, it is likely the faculty will experience miscommunication and a feeling of disconnect.

Subtheme 1: University Connection. The connection to the institution of employment is multifaceted. This subtheme referred to the participants’ emotional and physical connection with their employing institution. Responses that discussed an emotional connection were found, and consisted of, “would like to feel more included” and “relationship with administration.” A literal or physical connection to an institution was also mentioned; these comments included desires to visit

the campus physically, stating overtly, “More opportunities to connect on the physical campus with paid expenses for travel” and “PROVIDE OPPORTUNITIES TO VISIT THE UNIVERSITY.” Returning to Maslow’s (1943) theories, the author described the state of satisfying a need for *love* as “. . . hunger for affectionate relations with people in general, namely, for a place in his group.” Maslow continues, stating that man “. . . will strive with great intensity to achieve this goal.” (p. 381). It is this need that adjunct faculty seem unable to satisfy as they search for their own place within the annals of higher education faculty.

Subtheme 2: Institutional Support. The connection between a faculty member and their institution is important and can be affected by the initial hiring processes. Responses falling into this subtheme consist of “I wish I had the opportunity to shadow someone before being thrown in to the classroom” and “having a department head who helped me” and identify a clear lack of training, onboarding, and/or faculty support from the campus. Lack of rigor in the hiring and onboarding process for adjunct faculty has been noted in the literature (Lyons, 2007; Morthland, 2010) with insights that point to an academic institution’s ability to retain and support adjunct faculty in interest of student outcomes and institutional efficacy. The presence of responses with similar insights in this research, almost ten years after initial research was completed, indicates the problem remains fundamentally unaltered.

Subtheme 3: Expanding Employment Opportunities. This theme included responses that indicated a desire to pursue full-time employment and a perceived lack of ability to do so. Comments ranged from, “I would teach full-time and not adjunct” to specific scenarios, such as “There was no opportunity for advancement, and adjuncts were never given consideration for a FT post; I applied and didn't even get a first round interview, after having some of the highest course reviews of the faculty. It was very disheartening.” The employer/employee connection can also feel limited if an adjunct faculty member feels they have no growth in their position, with prior research

concluding that a “considerable amount of evidence indicates that employees having a high level of perceived organizational support experience their jobs more favorably (e.g., demonstrating increased job satisfaction, positive mood, and reduced stress) and are more invested in their work organization.” (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002). When pairing the traditional working conditions of adjunct faculty with organizational theories regarding engagement, the disconnect become clear.

Theme 4: Classroom and Student Concerns

Finally, when asking respondents to provide something they would change about their experience, a few noted their pupils. Participants comment on capabilities of students in the classroom, stating simply “student quality.” These responses do not provide insight or detail and provide little room for interpretation; however, they can be interpreted as a general dissatisfaction with the students and/or their ability to perform in the college setting.

Interpretation of Responses

These themes are similar to the ones found in the prior question, and in alignment yield a similar response. Financial compensation for adjuncts was found to be the highest reported area for change ($n = 32$), with submissions stating “The pay. It's awful. Must take on more sections than one can teach effectively in order to make ends meet” and “I need consistent pay and benefits, otherwise there is little reward in me teaching. . . . I am not able to pay my bills with good feelings and happy thoughts.” Of the responses ($n = 32$), a small amount ($n = 6$) simply wrote “pay.”

After salary and compensation, Consistency in employment terms ($n = 11$) was mentioned as a change-factor. The responses included issues with uncertainty, “Eliminate uncertainty from semester to semester” and “sufficient notice weeks in advance of teaching.” They also included a desire to move to longer terms of employment, “I'd like to know, say, a year ahead how much teaching I can count on.” Whether the latter question is achievable or not is dependent on the institution; however, the overarching instability of adjunct faculty is still forefront.

Finally, institutional support ($n = 10$) was mentioned as an area for change. Some survey participants voiced requests for guidance stating, “I wish I had the opportunity to shadow someone before being thrown in to the classroom.” Other respondents decried the process of being employed, asking for the institution to “provide onboarding and training” or simply “provide better onboarding.”

The final open-ended question was Question 29. This question asked participants to identify what they found the most valuable in their adjunct teaching experience. The identified codes and themes are detailed below; no subthemes were identified in this data set.

Table 14

Q29 Themes and Subthemes; Identified Value

Codes	Theme
Employment	Value in the Institutional Connection and Compensation Package
Working Conditions	Value in Andragogy, Autonomy, and Mentoring
Students	Value in Student Interaction
Experience	Value from Gaining Experience

Theme 1: Value in the Institutional Connection and Compensation Package

This theme included responses that refer to participants’ association with the institution as a positive, and cited support of administration and colleagues. These responses included, “support from colleagues and tech support as needed,” “care of administration,” and “the staff work together!” Additionally, participants identified the educational setting, salary, or an employee benefit (both traditional and non) as beneficial. Responses varied, but included “free basketball tickets,” “easy LMS,” “class size small,” and “professional development opportunities.” This assigned value seems to vary by respondent; and it is possible that the value is seen in the offering of the benefit, rather than the monetary value of the benefit.

Theme 2: Value in the Andragogy, Autonomy, and Mentoring

Responses grouped under this theme indicate the respondent enjoys their subject of instruction and/or methods in which they provide instruction, such as “I am a seasoned professional in my field and offer an immersive learning experience.” Additionally, these respondents value the impact they have on peers and colleagues. Responses grouped under this theme include, “collegiality, being able to support doctoral candidates” and “working with expert staff.” Finally, responses identified value in the freedom and autonomy available in their career setting. Responses were direct, stating “academic freedom and no micromanagement,” “the freedom to teach,” and “independence.”

The integrity of an institution of higher education often lies with faculty; as they often manage concepts such as rigor, academic depth, and breadth within the classroom atmosphere. This practice has been referred to as *academic freedom* in the literature. A statement released by a joint subcommittee of the Association’s Committee on Contingent Faculty and the Profession in 2013 warns against limitations on adjunct autonomy, saying, “. . . Academic freedom in colleges and universities is essential to the common good of a free society . . . and . . . is the responsibility of the entire profession” (p. 175). Adjunct faculty are given the trust of an institution when they are allowed autonomy to instruct classes as appropriate, with little oversight from administration and they should be allowed to continue without fear of repercussion.

Theme 3: Value in Student Interaction

All responses contained in this theme identified the connection with students and student learning experiences as valuable to their experience. Responses included, “the students and the relationships that have developed over the course of time,” “staying current and engaged with students,” and “I adore my students.” A plethora of responses simply stated, “students.” It is a common notion that faculty must perform their duties for the student’s benefit, rather than their own

(Tomanek, 2010) as the pay and working conditions are widely considered to be problematic in the profession (Jaeger & Hinz, 2009; Louis, 2009; Lyons, 2007); these respondents place a high value in these experiences, which answers any question of motivation for continued employment in the field.

Theme 4: Value from Gaining Experience

These responses cite experience gained in various areas of expertise as something of value within their employment. Many responses state simply, “experience.” Some expound further with, “experience in classroom management and curriculum development” as valuable.

This category was one which was easily identifiable when analyzing themes and frequency, as the overwhelming majority of respondents referred to their experience with students as most valuable ($n = 40$). These respondents reflected on their impact with students writing, “I value the interaction with the students” and “experience with students, they make me a better teacher.” Of the responses ($n = 40$), many ($n = 15$) simply wrote “students,” which indicates a straightforward and inherent value in interaction with the population.

Second to the student experiences, respondents value the experience they gain in a variety of areas ($n = 17$). Responses in the Value from Gaining Experience theme indicated skill growth, stating “The ability to develop online instruction approach” and “I was able to gain valuable experience in classroom management and curriculum development.” Several participants refer to this experience opening doors elsewhere, writing “the experience is going to help me get better jobs with better schools” and “Experience I am getting, taking that experience somewhere else” and “learning about the job, take those skills elsewhere.” Collectively, these responses indicate that adjunct teaching has inherent value in the personal growth of the adjunct faculty member, regardless of the institutional policies or procedures in place at an adjunct’s institution of employment.

While the codes and themes developed from the thematic analysis of the qualitative data may seem similar, they are important to consider as individual data sets. Each open-ended question asked

respondents for a unique piece of information: advice, change, and value. While it is valuable to view all three as an overarching picture of the adjunct experience the individual data is relevant and worthy to note as important to the research.

Summary

This research set out to determine disparity between what an adjunct faculty member needs to be successful, versus what they have. The data gathered in this research has identified several factors for administration to consider when employing adjunct faculty members, such as support, resources, and personal connections with the institution; these should be considered a valuable addition to research on this topic. Although patterns are emerging through analysis of the research, the results may not specifically apply to every institution of higher education. Knowledge on the topic of adjunct use, including shortcomings, complaints, and misgivings, can provide valuable insight into the future of academia.

Chapter 5: Discussion and Conclusion

Although the collection of data is vital to research, it is the analysis and interpretation of that data that makes it relevant. The researcher must draw conclusions and apply them to both the wider view of literature on the topic, and to the academic community at large. A comprehensive summary of the research results begins this analysis; followed by a detailed discussion, which includes alignment and relevance with seminal literature on the topic overall. Limitations of the research are discussed, as well as recommendations for future research; a detailed overview of the implications inherent in the field of academia, as related to the information, is also presented.

Summary of the Results

The increased use of adjunct faculty is a trend in academia that continues to grow. Motivations behind this trend vary; some institutions seek contingent workers as a method of budgetary control, while some institutions seek industry professionals who desire only part-time teaching work (Tomanek, 2010). Regardless of motivations, adjunct faculty are the “new normal” in academia; and the use of adjunct labor is between 40% and 75%, depending on the educational sector (e.g., for-profit, nonprofit, private) (Ginder & Kelly-Redi, 2013).

For all intents and purposes, work in the adjunct faculty sector is plentiful (Ginder & Kelly-Redi, 2013) but the working conditions correlated with the role often devalue the position’s appeal. Past research has analyzed workloads, salaries, and faculty resources as they revolve around the adjunct faculty role. Often, the research found these working conditions, and the complaints associated with them, extensive (Jaeger & Hinz, 2009; Lyons, 2007; Louis, 2009). Research has also indicated that student outcomes, when taught by adjunct faculty, are impacted negatively (Jacobs, 1998; Rouche, Rouche, & Milliron, 1996; Schmidt, 2008). On the surface it appears use of adjunct faculty is increasing, these faculty are unhappy, and ultimately the students are paying a price. If higher education is to maintain quality, parity, and integrity the utilization of adjunct faculty,

including their conditions and subsequent student outcomes, must be addressed. This study provides a means for a conversation about support for the adjunct faculty community, particularly from higher education administration.

The survey for this study was based on one developed originally by Boord (2010) and Schulz (2009) and adapted by Tomanek (2010) for prior research; questions in these original surveys were applicable to their original purpose and as such, minor modifications were made in an effort to align with the research conducted in this project. These modifications included an update in word choices, and incorporation of a taxonomy of faculty developed by Rouche, Rouche, and Milliron (1996). The modified survey was distributed to adjunct faculty to gain insight into working conditions, perceived value, demographics, and the gap between the “needs” and “haves” of this underserved population of faculty. The study also examined levels of job satisfaction, as related to Herzberg’s theories of Motivation and Hygiene (1968) and Maslow’s Hierarchy of Needs (1943). The research results give a full picture of the true adjunct condition, providing insight into workloads and resources. The results also indicate areas that institutional administration could examine, in order to support faculty in the effort to improve student outcomes.

Survey dissemination began in January 2018 via various channels. The Integrated Postsecondary Education Systems (IPEDS) data was used to collect administrator information, invitations to participate in the survey were sent to the identified sample population via email. Simultaneously, the survey invitation was sent via social media platforms Facebook and LinkedIn to a variety of organized groups of adjunct faculty members. An acknowledged limitation exists in the detailed data collection: there is only partial information available that determines how many responses came from each dissemination type. While response rates are difficult to calculate using these methods of dissemination, it is important to note the returned survey results display consistent themes throughout the respondents regardless of how the respondent accessed the instrument.

After the survey deadline closed, the data was analyzed using a variety of methods. These methods included validity confirmation and thematic analyses. These methods were selected because they correspond to the data sought; both qualitative and quantitative in nature. The thematic analysis was chosen for application to non-numerical data, which is read and categorized by theme based on content; this process highlights and aggregates qualitative data. Validity confirmation is then used to confirm relevancy via qualitative analyses. The combination of these types of data in analyses provides for a robust and comprehensive picture of the current state of adjunct faculty.

The research attempted to determine a level of job satisfaction in respondents by analyzing their satisfaction with a variety of factors present in their adjunct faculty role. A variety of approaches to developing the research were used concurrent to Herzberg's (1968) and Maslow's (1943) theories and builds on prior studies regarding adjunct workload, staffing ratios, compensation and benefits, student and colleague perceptions, student outcomes, and adjunct support systems. Furthermore, this research attempted to provide perspective and insight for institutional administrators as they employ and support their adjunct faculty workforce; the extended consequence of this support is one that affects student outcomes as well.

Discussion of the Results

The survey collected various pieces of data from respondents to answer the “who,” “what,” and “why” of the typical adjunct faculty member: that is, who comprises this population, what do they do, and why do they continue to persist in the role? To discover who the adjunct faculty are, the basic demographic data can be analyzed. While outside the scope of this research, it is worthwhile to note that 39 respondents identified as male, while 100 respondents identified as female. In alignment with information compiled from the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES, 2012) the research finds the data returned was representative of the wider reported population; the profession is female-dominated.

Several other pieces of data can be further extrapolated. The demographic data shows the predominant age of respondents is in the 46–55 age range. The data also returned the predominant marital status of respondents as married/living with partner, and the predominate racial background and primary language as white, non-Hispanic and English speaking. The academic background of respondents indicates that 96% of respondents currently hold a Master’s degree or higher. These findings, when correlated, give the impression that a typical adjunct faculty member is (plainly put) a middle-aged, married, white female with a graduate-level education.

After gaining an understanding of the demographics of the “typical” adjunct, a correlation of satisfaction was performed by gender. Questions asking respondents’ satisfaction on a variety of items (as outlined in Table 10) were compiled and cross-referenced with the gender of the respondent. The resulting data found 39% of the male respondents reporting extreme or moderate job satisfaction over the range of questions, while 37% of females reported identical levels of job satisfaction over the same questions. The difference here shows a disparity of overall satisfaction by gender: female respondents are less satisfied in their work, and yet, they make up the larger sector of the demographic.

After discovering who the adjunct faculty population are, questions regarding the expectations of role were asked. A primary teaching modality was identified in the survey instrument, with the majority of respondents selecting an online modality as their primary form of instruction; face-to-face/classroom was the secondary result for delivery of educational content. The teaching modality was cross-referenced with variables relating to satisfaction, in an effort to determine if satisfaction was more prevalent in one modality versus the other. Analysis found that 37% respondents who indicated they used a face-to-face/classroom teaching modality specified that they were either extremely satisfied or moderately satisfied across the variables being measured. Similarly, 40% of respondents who reported their primary modality as online specified that they

either extremely satisfied or moderately satisfied in their work. These findings indicate that regardless of modality, respondents find equal satisfaction in the role of adjunct faculty.

The survey instrument requested respondents to categorize themselves in alignment with a prior taxonomy of faculty developed by Rouche, Rouche, and Milliron (1995), which was expanded for prior research by Tomanek (2012), in order to incorporate online teachers as a taxonomy category. Results found that most respondents classified themselves as Full-Mooners (working 35+ hours per week elsewhere), followed by respondents who indicated they were Onliners (currently teaching strictly online courses). This result aligns with prior research on the topic, as traditionally adjunct faculty are employed full-time in their field of expertise and employed in teaching on the side (Deutsch, 2015). The numbers also correlate with past research regarding the theory that the advent of online education has increased the need for more adjunct faculty members with flexible schedules (Batiste, 2016; Benjamin, 2003).

After reviewing the results of the data collection and analysis, it is clear that adjunct faculty are not, or cannot, make teaching their first priority. Roughly 78% of the adjunct faculty population worked outside the adjunct role (see Table 5), with 44% working outside academia entirely. However, 61% of the respondents would prefer teaching full-time, rather than adjunct, at their current institution. It was concluded that teaching is supplementary to most adjunct faculty's primary employment although teaching is preferred.

Additionally, instructional resources and division of time were noted in the survey. Several instructional resources were identified by respondents as being provided by their institution; 43% of respondents indicated they have been provided access to an email account for educational use. Concurrently, 33% of respondents reported email was a primary method of communication with students. These two pieces of information, when correlated, suggest education is becoming reliant on technology. This could potentially be correlated with the onset of online education. The least

provided resource reported by survey participants was access to either a private or shared office space. Only 18% of respondents reported that they have access to such a space (either private or shared). When the adjunct faculty's division of weekly labor and tasks were reviewed, preparing to teach was identified as taking a large amount of time for adjunct faculty. These two pieces of data imply that preparation to teach is likely done in the home, or other communal space, which must be provided by the adjunct faculty member.

Findings. As the data have been assembled and analyzed, a bleak image of the adjunct faculty condition begins to take shape. The results of this survey illustrated the struggle happening in the workforce: the need to work more than a single full-time position, the lack of resources provided to accomplish this task, and a general sense of dissatisfaction with the processes and policies by which faculty are bound. All of these factors exist, however, alongside a seemingly inherent love for students and pursuit of knowledge. While the details are becoming clear, the motivators that drive these faculty are still marred with insecurity and dissatisfaction.

In response to RQ1: *What administrative support and other conditions do adjunct faculty members at colleges and universities need to be successful?* The findings suggest adjunct faculty need access to higher levels of administrative support, as well as peer mentors, alongside traditional employment factors such as higher compensation and additional benefits. The data returned was consistent in identifying the disparity between the current state of adjunct faculty and a desired future state, indicating room for improvement. While there were unique responses present in the data collection, an overarching increase in compensation is recommended as an initial step from administration in contribution to the success of their adjunct faculty population.

Secondarily, RQ2: *How do full-time, tenured/non-tenured faculty members perceive adjunct faculty members' contributions to their university?* was examined. The survey questions individually are not able to answer this question, as only adjunct faculty were surveyed and not their full-time

counterparts. The data in aggregate form does assist in clarifying the potential perception of adjunct faculty, however. Analyses indicate that adjunct faculty have little connection to their colleagues, their administrators, or their campus (either physically or emotionally). The data indicates adjunct faculty feel isolated and temporary; or “just passing through.” It would appear that adjunct faculty have low visibility with their peers, as well. It is a logical conclusion that the adjunct faculty population, being absent from many aspects of the college culture and environment, would not be looked upon as a significant part of the academic contribution. This topic, however, could be further explored in subsequent research.

Finally, RQ3: *Is there a relationship between job satisfaction reported by adjunct faculty, and the self-reported success or failure of an adjunct faculty member?* is examined. This question remains unanswered, however ambivalently. While the survey instrument did not specifically request the participants to self-identify their levels of perceived success, it is logical to assume that survey respondents’ continued employment in their field, dedication to their students, and persistence in the adjunct role show signs that the participants consider themselves successful, albeit not in traditional ways. The research, data, and analysis indicated that many adjuncts consider their working conditions to be poor, and yet they persist within them. The tenacity of the adjunct population shows success on a socioemotional level. Further correlational studies could be conducted in subsequent research to solidify quantitative data on this topic.

Discussion of the Results in Relation to the Literature

The conceptual framework chosen for this study is one that provides, as Jabareen (2009) outlines, “an interpretative approach to social reality” (p. 51). The study of various components of the adjunct faculty experience are linked in this study using a conceptual framework based around Piaget’s theories of constructivism (1967), social capital and social exchange theories, Herzberg’s Theory of Motivation (1968), and Maslow’s Hierarchy of Needs (1943).

Constructivism, Social Exchange, and Social Capital. Piaget's philosophies surrounding constructivism have evolved into many subtheories, notably those of Creswell (2003), von Glaserfield (1984), and Vygotsky (1978). However, primary and secondary iterations of the theory agree that constructivism occurs when people use their personal experiences and find within them a deeper implication or meaning. By using this lens when analyzing the results of the survey, adjunct faculty clearly find deep and personal meaning in their work. The qualitative data that allowed respondents to identify aspects of their jobs in which they found value revealed a steady, strong, and widespread response: the students. These faculty have constructed a deep meaning within their own lives based on the interactions and the lessons they have imparted. When placed in context with the whole survey, and after identifying many reasons why they feel mistreated, it can only be concluded that these faculty must operate from a constructivist mindset.

In alignment with a constructivist view, social capital and social exchange theories assign transactional aspects to the picture. These theories, within the context of this research, indicate there must be a mutual benefit between adjunct faculty and their employer, weighing the "level of commitment to an institution, job satisfaction and performance" (p. 695) against "feelings of isolation, abysmal pay, and poor working conditions" (p. 695) in the academic environment (Ang & Slaughter, 2001; Van Dyne & Ang, 1998). The relevant literature tells us that institutions see many financial benefits to the institution from the use of adjunct faculty (Boord, 2010; Chen, 2012; Ginder & Kelly-Redi, 2013; Hutto, 2013; Louis, 2009; Mangan, 2009; Monks, 2009; Morthland, 2010; National Center for Education Statistics [NCES], 2012; Schneider, 2010; Snyder & Dillow, 2012; Tomanek, 2010). However, it does not appear that the benefit is mutual. If the data is examined from a cost-benefit perspective, the adjunct faculty appear overworked, underpaid, underappreciated, and disposable; however, they love the job and their students. Adjunct faculty have only minor benefits to their role and cannot align with the theory, unless the student interactions provide enough social

capital to provide a benefit that outweighs the plethora of negative aspects found in the job.

Administration can learn from this deficit, and find ways to support adjunct faculty, correcting any imbalance found that may be unbeneficial to either party.

Herzberg's Theory of Motivation. In 1968, Herzberg theorized that several factors could contribute to an employee's satisfaction within their workplace. The positive factors (or motivators) were identified as: Achievement, Recognition, Work Itself, Responsibility, and Advancement. Collectively, these five motivators create a framework under which a positive working environment, replete with job satisfaction, is maintained. Within the current study, these motivators were used as guidelines to formulate the survey questions themselves. Survey questions were developed using the five Herzberg motivators as overarching themes. Notable areas from the survey that directly align or misalign with Herzberg's theory are noted below.

Recognition. A notable area of deficit, according to the Herzberg (1968) framework, is *recognition*, the idea that an employee wants to be valued or recognized for the impact they have on the workplace (Schulz, 2009); however, as the analyses of the current study show, adjunct faculty do not feel recognized or "heard" within their roles. Comments left in the survey indicate that adjuncts do not have a voice in making academic policies, nor do they feel they are "cared for" by their employer. Multiple responses indicated a laissez-faire attitude with adjunct faculty; one stated they felt "like they were just passing through." According to Herzberg, an invisible employee will not be able to find satisfaction with their role and are out of alignment with the higher institutional goals.

Advancement. If the ability to advance in one's career will provide satisfaction to that employee, adjunct faculty are unable to obtain this satisfaction, as information gathered from both qualitative and quantitative analyses indicates advancement is not common in the industry. The quantitative and qualitative data returned in the survey indicate a lack of stability in the role, as many adjuncts work on a term-to-term basis. Mentions were also made regarding desire for full-time

positions, and/or long-term contracts. Industry standards within academic employment do not consider advancement, or security of employment, in the current model. The adjunct nature of being “permanently temporary” is counterintuitive to the idea of functioning as a stable employee with opportunity to advance.

Work itself. The results of this survey show alignment with Herzberg’s theory in one area: *work itself*. This motivator revolves around the inherent joy found in an individual’s profession (Schulz, 2009). Survey results regarding the value found in adjunct employment is very high as it relates to student interactions. The alignment suggests that the work itself, (i.e., interacting with students and conveying knowledge) is the most motivating factor in job satisfaction; adjunct faculty are most satisfied in this area and according to Herzberg’s theories are likely to continue in the role as long as the motivator remains high.

Alongside the motivators, Herzberg (1968) identified negative factors or variables that could prevent job satisfaction, labeling them “hygienes.” These negative variables are identified in his theory as company and policy administration, working conditions, supervision, interpersonal relationships, money, status, and security. All of the hygiene factors had notable mentions in the data analyses; those most prominently found within the data are identified below.

Company and policy administration. The administrators of higher education institutions have many perspectives to consider when making policies; the adjunct faculty are included in these perspectives, but their perspective may be largely ignored, based on analysis done of the qualitative data in the survey. The thematic analysis performed on qualitative data found results indicating adjunct faculty do not have input into governing processes and are at a disadvantage when adjudicating student issues.

Interpersonal relationships. Herzberg believed that an employee needed a connection to their coworkers. This included superiors as well as colleagues and subordinates. The data returned

information that indicated adjunct faculty do not have a connection with their institution; 65% of respondents indicated they “hardly ever” interact with department management. The responses also indicate adjunct faculty do not receive mentoring or support from their peers and colleagues, and 78% of respondents indicate they “hardly ever” spend time with other full-time, or part-time faculty (Table 9). Improving interpersonal relationships among faculty and staff has the potential to impact an employee’s satisfaction; outreach from administration, alongside mentoring and support services for adjuncts could reduce dissatisfaction in this area.

Money. One negative component within the adjunct role that is consistently reported, in both seminal literature and research, is the pay for adjunct faculty. This survey adds to the notion that money is an area of extreme dissatisfaction within the adjunct community. Pay structures are widely variable between institutions, but a repeated and consistent response given from survey participants informs the academic community at-large that they are unreasonable and not necessarily competitive.

Security. Secondary to monetary compensation, the most notable data gathered from this study aligns with a dissatisfaction in staffing practices for adjunct faculty. The current model of employment places adjunct faculty in their role on a term-to-term basis, with no guarantee past the current term for continued employment. The lack of security in the role is widely noted as frustrating, with respondents indicating they occasionally prepare for classes only to have them cancelled at the last minute. It is reasonable to assume that an institution that cannot guarantee the security of those in their employ should not expect loyalty to the role in-kind.

Respondents indicated an overall dissatisfaction in all the identified “hygiene” factors; indicating an “uphill battle” in enjoying the role of adjunct faculty. The data analyses indicated multiple issues with administrators, collegiate relationships, security in employment, and

compensation. Although there are several variables which have potential to dissatisfy an employee, the role of adjunct faculty falls victim to each of them individually and collectively.

Herzberg's theories suggest evaluating the hygienes (aspects which prevent job satisfaction) and motivators (aspects which promote job satisfaction) present in each role and adjusting the working environment to a level that becomes ideal. From the analysis of the data, adjunct faculty have low hygienes and moderate motivators. These situations are often found in companies where the job is exciting, but the salary and/or working condition is not acceptable (Schulz, 2009). If the Herzberg theory is accurate, adjunct faculty are happy to fulfill their role, but have many complaints with the manner in which they are required to perform it, and job enrichment must take place in order to balance the working environment. Herzberg insinuates that job enrichment may not remove the hygienes completely, nor elevate the motivators entirely. However, providing a role that challenges the full abilities of the employee, allowing for advancement and increasing levels of responsibility, is a necessary first step to the enrichment of adjunct faculty.

Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs. Maslow (1943) studied satisfaction from a different perspective. Maslow identified personal "needs" that must be satisfied by each individual before the individual could "self-actualize" or realize their own potential. If data are analyzed through Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs, it becomes obvious adjunct faculty members will be unable to realize their own potential while they are employed in their role.

Low-level needs. The most basic needs, as identified by Maslow (1943), are physiological (basic human need for survival) and safety (physical safety and security). When the data analyses are reviewed, the qualitative data indicating that adjunct faculty cannot monetarily support themselves within their current compensation structures is apparent. This impacts the ability to do basic tasks, such as paying monthly bills and purchasing food items. The employment of the adjunct faculty

member is structured on a contract, or term-by-term basis; this does not allow a feeling of safety in employment, as you may receive work in one term only to be unemployed the next.

The low-level needs as identified by Maslow (1943) could potentially be achieved individually, through employment in multiple universities; a theory supported in the research. Eighty-nine percent (89%) of the survey participants are employed in more than one job, and sixty-two percent (62%) of them work outside academia. If compensation for teaching was secondary, or not required to maintain a household, the adjunct faculty would not require the role to meet the low-level needs identified in Maslow's Hierarchy (1943).

Mid-level needs. Satisfying the mid-level needs would be no easier for adjunct faculty members. The need next identified as important according to Maslow (1943) is inclusion. The analysis and review of data collected regarding university inclusion and full-time faculty collegiality, indicates that adjunct faculty feel separated and excluded from their working environments. Many responses indicate a desire to connect with both the campus and coworkers, but until administration can accommodate and value the adjunct's presence, this need will also remain unmet.

Upper-level needs. The highest need, as identified in Maslow's research, is esteem, met through realization of personal worth or accomplishment. This need represents the final level that must be satisfied to begin the process of self-actualization and it is mainly psychological. The qualitative data identified in this research indicates the impact of adjuncts on their students could potentially fulfill this need and allow the adjunct faculty member to consider their contributions to academia as valued. Having the psychological need met, without first satisfying the lower-level needs is not sustainable. Maslow indicated in his early research that each person must meet their needs in hierarchical order (e.g., low-level physical needs must be satisfied before the upper-level psychological needs) to create a sustainable and genuine level of individual satisfaction.

Summary. Herzberg's (1968) original theories were meant to be applied to a business environment; however, in an attempt to support Herzberg's research, they have been applied to the academic setting in prior studies (Batiste, 2016; Tomanek, 2012; Weiss & Pankin, 2011), which were further expanded upon in the current research. This study used the framework of Herzberg's Theory of Motivation (1968) and his work with hygienes and motivators to identify areas that impacted adjunct faculty satisfaction in either a positive or negative way. The research coupled that professional examination of adjunct faculty members with a personal evaluation of their success and potential to prosper, using Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs (1943) as insight. The intent was to identify areas of weakness that college administrators could use to make an impact. This could include providing more motivators and lessening the burden of the hygienes, or vice-versa; administrators could view the need level of each adjunct to determine how best to support the individual. It is believed that administration can adapt to the research results, and in doing so can maintain satisfied adjunct faculty as employees. Having well-supported adjunct faculty has a potential to impact student outcomes positively.

Limitations

Creswell (2008) discussed limitations and defines them as "potential weaknesses or problems with the study identified by the researcher" (p. 207). Limitations in research can come in many forms but must be identified in data analyses and collections, in order to present the research in an accurate context. Limitations within this research are identified here and should be considered when evaluating and implementing the research within the academic setting.

Survey Dissemination

The survey was disseminated via several technological avenues. Social media platforms Facebook and LinkedIn were utilized; email correspondence was also used for direct contact and dissemination of survey materials. However, knowing which respondents accessed the survey via

which avenue is impossible to determine. While the outcomes are not necessarily affected by this limitation, the avenue for communication and contact cannot be confirmed and is disclosed as a matter of research integrity. In future studies, specific metrics, or survey versions, could be implemented to identify the electronic platform which was used to access the information, if necessary.

Participation. The study was identified as voluntary in the initial consent process; prior to submitting feedback, participants had to acknowledge that they were not required to participate in the study. Respondents were also able to opt out of any questions they did not choose to answer. The result of allowing respondents the option to participate, is that the response rates were not steadily collected (i.e., some questions received higher response rates than others). The limitation is acknowledged and accommodated for when calculating and interpreting data.

Access to the sample. This research was heavily dependent on access to a sample population representative of the whole; the “whole,” in this case, is overwhelming, with numbers suggesting adjunct faculty employment is currently in the hundreds of thousands (CAW, 2012). This does not prevent the current research from being meaningful, however. Any data that can be collected is helpful in understanding and accommodating the population being studied. This research has provided valuable insight on adjunct faculty and is a worthy addition to the current academic literature surrounding the topic.

Implications of the Results

The use of adjunct faculty is a continuously growing phenomenon, and if past performance is indicative of future trends, it will likely continue to grow within higher education institutions (Louis, 2009; Mangan, 2009; Nevarez & Wood, 2010; Rossi, 2009). This analysis of the research presents implications for future practice from many perspectives. Universities and colleges, in all sectors, can use this data to learn how best to meet the needs of the adjunct faculty member; in an effort to

improve satisfaction within their roles, enhance their working conditions, and positively impact student outcomes.

Implications for Institutions

Monetary needs are often cited when the conversation turns to the motivation behind adjunct faculty employment and staffing ratios (Boord, 2010; Deutsch, 2015; Dolan, 2011; Eagan & Jaeger, 2008; Monks, 2009; Scott, 2009). Finances are anticipated to remain a priority for universities and colleges, leaving administration looking for cost-cutting methods. This may mean that adjunct faculty will continue to be preferred over tenured, or non-tenured, full-time faculty members. Support for adjuncts will be important; and understanding the adjunct faculty members' needs will be key to supporting their growth in service to students.

Implication of Value

Leadership at institutions must strive to ensure that adjunct faculty feel valued. This should be communicated overtly to both the adjunct and full-time faculty, as well as the institution at large. Many administrators may default to the idea that this means raising salaries and providing benefits; while that assumption could provide a level of monetary security to adjuncts, there is more surrounding the idea of job satisfaction, as shown in the survey results and prior literature. Some of the data returned within the scope of this research shows opportunity for growth in adjunct support—faculty seeking connection to their university, for example. Data were left regarding the desire to socialize with peers and colleagues, as well as attend functions on-campus; both tactics could increase levels of satisfaction in adjunct faculty while simultaneously creating a collegiate academic community.

Implication of Collaboration

Professional development and mentoring is another area for administration focus. Respondents mentioned either poor mentoring, or lack of mentoring, in their experience; but mentoring was something which they desired. The survey results reveal that only 8.9% of respondents had access to a faculty mentor. Administrators could take the opportunity to pair new adjuncts with mentors, such as seasoned full-time instructors or an adjunct faculty member with a track record of excellent outcomes. For online institutions, the use of e-learning courses to facilitate training and professional development could also be utilized for mentoring opportunities. This would assist in providing a layer of technical training to the adjunct experience; another area noted in the research results as unsatisfactory with respondents.

Implication of Utilization

Institutions should carefully examine adjunct faculty data trends; how many adjunct faculty are used term-to-term, what the outcomes for students within the classes are, and if existing policies that frame the adjunct experience can be modified or removed. This type of data, when collected regularly, can provide a deep well from which to pull information. When collected consistently and interpreted as a trend, the larger conversation surrounding budgetary and cultural support for adjunct faculty can emerge. The data trends can also assist academic leadership in determination of employment improvements to be made, and whether those changes will negatively impact the adjunct faculty populous. When asked if administration is considerate of the adjunct faculty population in policy making, only 4% of respondents “strongly agree” (Table 11). Improvements such as inclusion of adjunct faculty as senate committee members, and adjunct faculty unionization, are both part of that broader discussion.

This research provides support to Herzberg’s Theory of Motivation (1968) and reinforces Maslow’s Hierarchy of Needs (1943), further exposing issues that could be remedied through leaders

and administrators. Institutions should work to improve the salary and benefits offered to adjunct faculty members. This includes larger benefits, like professional development opportunities and career advancement, alongside smaller institution-specific “perks” allotted to faculty. Herzberg theorized that benefits and career advancement can reduce an employee’s dissatisfaction with their job; institutions must engage, in earnest, to offer all benefits to their adjunct faculty in effort to improve satisfaction and affect student outcomes. Administrators must find opportunities to engage in support through a variety of avenues; regular communications with all faculty, orientations and trainings, and invitations to planning forums are all recommended to engage the adjunct faculty in their workplace.

Recommendations for Future Research

This research acknowledges the current state of academic employment for adjunct faculty and assumes the trend in their use will only continue to grow. The research was intended to provide an avenue for discussion surrounding the support for and use of adjunct faculty, seeking to identify areas for improvement as well as soliciting independent feedback regarding the condition of academia. Information was gathered in an effort to broaden the academic literature on adjunct faculty but was not integrated into the data analyses and results; these pieces could be researched fully in future iterations of study on this topic.

Evaluation of Compensation Factors

The response from survey participants surrounding the practices of compensation for adjunct faculty suggests it needs revision. Future studies could analyze industry best practices for adjunct pay. Satisfaction of adjunct faculty compensated per student, rather than per course, could show an emerging trend in best practices. Or perhaps a movement away from contract pay, and aligning with an hourly pay structure instead, is more beneficial to the population. Compensation factors

surrounding committee work and course preparation could also provide a higher level of satisfaction within the role.

Evaluation of Time Management

This research suggests that adjunct faculty have an immensely diverse approach to division of weekly time and tasks (Table 8). An implication then arises regarding how adjunct faculty can be most efficient in their time management; this leads to further studies regarding division of adjunct labor, and analyses of “unseen labor,” such as course preparation and remediation with students. These are some potential research issues that would add data to the literature and provide insight on the overall state of employment in the academic sector.

Summary

The results of this research shed light on the adjunct faculty population, both in demographic information, and in job satisfaction levels; however, adjunct faculty are a complex population to evaluate. Those who make up this populace show inherent satisfaction in giving knowledge to others, as results of this study show; however, administrators are not giving back in kind. Assisting adjunct faculty by improving working conditions has the potential to improve student outcomes, a goal most educators can agree is worth investigating. Administrators should consistently review their policies and procedures, simultaneously considering new research and acknowledging the needs of the underserved population they employ; providing further care to the silent majority of academia.

References

- Allison-Jones, L. L., & Hirt, J. B. (2004). Comparing the teaching effectiveness of part-time & full-time clinical nurse faculty. *Nursing Education Perspectives*, 25(5), 238–243.
- American Association of University Professors. (2012). Trends in instructional staff employment status, 1975–2009. Retrieved from <http://www.aaup.org/NR/rdonlyres/7C3039DD-EF79-4E75-AZ0D-6F75BA01BE84/0/Trends.pdf>
- Ang, S., & Slaughter, S. A. (2001). Work outcomes and job design for contract versus permanent information systems professionals on software development teams. *MIS Quarterly*, 25(3), 321–350.
- Austin, A. E., & Sorcinelli, M. D. (2013). The future of faculty development: Where are we going? *New Directions for Teaching & Learning*, 2013(133), 1–97. doi:10.1002/tl.20048
- Babbie, E. (1990). *Survey research methods*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing.
- Baron-Nixon, L. (2007). *Connecting non full-time faculty to institutional mission: A guidebook for college/university administrators and faculty developers*. Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing.
- Batiste, H. (2016). *Understanding contingent faculty: A quantitative study of engagement, satisfaction, commitment, and mentoring needs*. Las Vegas, NV: University of Nevada.
- Bean, J. P. (1983). The application of a model of turnover in work organizations to the student attrition process. *Review of Higher Education*, 6(2), 129–148.
- Bean, J. P. (1990). Why students leave: Insights from research. In D. Hossler & J. P. Bean (Eds.), *The strategic management of college enrollments* (pp. 147–169). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Benjamin, E. (2003). Reappraisal and implications for policy and research. *New Directions for Higher Education*, (123), 35. doi: 10.1002/he.123

- Berger, J. B., & Milem, J. F. (2000). Organizational behavior in higher education and student outcomes. In J. C. Smart (Ed.), *Higher education: Handbook of theory and research* (Vol. XV, pp. 268–338). New York, NY: Springer.
- Bianco-Mathis, V. & Chalofsky, N. (1996). *The adjunct faculty handbook*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.
- Bland, C. J., Center, B. A., Finstad, D. A., Risbey, K. R., & Staples, J. (2006). The impact of appointment type on the productivity and commitment of full-time faculty in research and doctoral institutions. *Journal of Higher Education*, 77(1), 89–123.
- Bohonos, J. (2013). Key theories of Lev Vygotsky and John Dewey: Implications for academic advising theory. *Academic Advising Today*, 36(2). Retrieved from <https://www.nacada.ksu.edu/Resources/Academic-Advising-Today/View-Articles/Key-Theories-of-Lev-Vygotsky-and-John-Dewey-Implications-for-Academic-Advising-Theory.aspx>
- Boice, R. (1992). *The new faculty member: Supporting and fostering professional development*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Boord, M.A. (2010). *Analysis of adjunct faculty at Des Moines area community college: Use and application of Herzberg’s motivation—hygiene theory to predict job satisfaction and interest in professional development*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Iowa State University.
- Braun, V., and Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77–101.
- Burnstad, H., & Gadberry, J. (2005). Retention of part-time faculty. In D. L. Wallin (Ed.), *Adjunct faculty in community colleges: an academic administrator's guide to recruiting, supporting, and retaining great teachers*. Bolton, MA: Anker.

- Calcagno, J. C., Bailey, T., Jenkins, D., Kienzl, G., & Leinbach, T. (2008). Community college student success: What institutional characteristics make a difference? *Economics of Education Review*, 27(6), 632–645. doi:10.1016/j.econedurev.2007.07.003
- Cataldi, E. F., Bradburn, E. M., & Fahimi, M. (2005). *2004 National study of postsecondary faculty (NSOPF:04): Background characteristics, work activities, and compensation of instructional faculty and staff: Fall 2003*. (No. NCES 2006-176). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.
- Chen, R. (2012). Institutional characteristics and college student dropout risks: A multilevel event history analysis. *Research in Higher Education*, 53(5), 487–505. doi:10.1007/s11162-011-9241-4
- The Coalition on the Academic Workforce. (2012). *A portrait of part-time faculty members: A summary of findings on part-time faculty respondents to the Coalition on the Academic Workforce survey of contingent faculty members and instructors* (pp. 1–50). Retrieved from http://www.academicworkforce.org/CAW_portrait_2012.pdf
- Cohen, Arthur M. & Brawer, Florence B. (1996). *The American community college (3rd ed.)*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Cotten, S., & Wilson, B. (2006). Student–faculty interactions: Dynamics and determinants. *Higher Education*, 51(4), 487–519. doi:10.1007/s10734-004-1705-4
- Conley, V. M., Leslie, D. W., & L. J. (2002). Part-time instructional faculty and staff: Who they are, what they do, and what they think. (March ed., Rep.No. NSOPF:93). Washington, DC; National Center for Education Statistics.
- Creswell, J. W. (2003). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative and mixed methods approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Cruell, G. L. (2012). *The Leaders Competencies*. Morrisville, NC: Lulu Publishing Services.

- Cunningham, D., & Duffy, T. (1996). Constructivism: Implications for the design and delivery of instruction. *Handbook of Research for Educational Communications and Technology*, 51, 170–198.
- Curtis, J. W., & Jacobe, M. (2006). Consequences: An increasingly contingent faculty. *AAUP Contingent Faculty Index 2006*.
- Datray, J. L., Saxon, D. P., & Martirosyan, N. M. (2014). Adjunct faculty in developmental education: Best practices, challenges, and recommendations. *The Community College Enterprise; Livonia*, 20(1), 35–48.
- Dedman, D., & Pearch, W. J. (2004). Perspectives on adjunct and other non-tenure faculty. *Community College Enterprise*, 10(1), 23–33.
- Deutsch, S. (2015). *The relationship between adjunct faculty staffing and college student retention and graduation* (Doctoral). Seton Hall University.
<http://scholarship.shu.edu/dissertations/2120>
- Dewey, J. (1938). *Experience and education*. New York, NY: Simon & Schuster.
- Dolan, V. (2011). The isolation of online adjunct faculty and its impact on their performance. *International Review of Research in Open and Distance Learning*, 12(2), 62–77.
- Eagan, M. K., & Jaeger, A. J. (2008). Closing the gate: Part-time faculty instruction in gatekeeper courses and first-year persistence. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, 2008(115), 39–53. doi:10.1002/tl.324
- Ellingson, J. E., Gruvs, M. L., & Sackett, P. R. (1998). Factors related to the satisfaction and performance of temporary employees. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 83(6), 913–921.
- Ehrenberg, R. G., & Zhang, L. (2005). Do tenured and tenure-track faculty matter? *Journal of Human Resources*, 40(3), 647–659. doi:10.3368/jhr.XL.3.647

- Fain, P. (2014). Low expectations, high stakes. *Inside Higher Ed*. Retrieved from <https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2014/04/07/part-time-professors-teach-most-community-college-students-report-finds>
- Feldman, D. C., & Turnley, W. H. (2004). Contingent employment in academic careers: Relative deprivation among adjunct faculty. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 64*(2), 284–307.
- Fisher, M. H., & Royster, D. (2016). Mathematics teachers' support and retention: using Maslow's hierarchy to understand teachers' needs. *International Journal of Mathematical Education in Science and Technology, 47*(7), 993–1008. doi:10.1080/0020739x.2016.1162333
- Flick, U., Von Kardoff, E., & Steinke, I. (2010). *A companion to qualitative research* (B. Jenner, Trans.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Frias, M. L. (2010). *The socialization of part-time faculty at comprehensive public colleges*. Thesis (Ed.D.). University of Massachusetts, Boston, 2010.
- Fruscione, J. (2014). When a college contracts “adjunctivitis,” it’s the students who lose. *PBS*. Retrieved from <http://www.pbs.org/newshour/making-sense/when-a-college-contracts-adjunctivitis-its-the-students-who-lose>
- Fry, R. (2009). College enrollment hits all-time high, fueled by community college surge. *The Pew Research Center: Social and Demographic Trends*. Retrieved from <http://www.pewsocialtrends.org/files/2010/10/college-enrollment.pdf>
- Gappa, J., & Leslie, D. (1993). *The invisible faculty: Improving the status of part-timers in higher education*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Ginder, S. A., & Kelly-Reid, J. E. (2013). *Enrollment in postsecondary institutions, Fall 2012; Financial statistics, fiscal year 2012; Graduation rates, Selected cohorts, 2004–2009; Employees in postsecondary institutions, Fall 2012: First look (provisional data)*. (NCES

2013-183). Washington, D.C.: National Center for Educational Statistics Retrieved from <http://nces.ed.gov/pubsearch>

Grieve, D. (2001). *A handbook for adjunct/part-time faculty and teachers of adults*. Cleveland, OH: Info-Tec.

Hagedorn, L. S., (2000). Conceptualizing faculty job satisfaction: Components, theories, and outcomes. In L. Hagedorn (Ed.), *What contributes to job satisfaction among faculty and staff* (pp. 5–20). *New Directions for Institutional Research*, 105. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Herzberg, F., (1968). One more time: How do you motivate employees? *Harvard Business Review*, 46(1), 53–62.

Huffman, J. (2000). *Perceptions by community college adjunct instructors: Factors that hinder and enhance their classroom teaching and actions that can address those factor* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). George Mason University. Retrieved from <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED467200.pdf>.

Hutto, P. N. (2013). *A correlational analysis of course retention and faculty status in a community college setting* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Liberty University. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10668926.2015.1069227>

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

Jabareen, Y. (2009). Building a conceptual framework: Philosophy, definitions, and procedure. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 8(4), 49–62.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/160940690900800406>

Jacobs, F. (1998). Using part-time faculty more effectively. In D. Leslie (Ed.), *The growing use of part-time faculty: Understanding causes and effects* (pp. 9–18). *New Directions for Higher Education*, 104. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

- Jaeger, A. J., & Eagan, M. K. (2009). Unintended consequences: Examining the effect of part-time faculty members on associate's degree completion. *Community College Review*, 36(3), 167–194. doi:10.1177/0091552108327070
- Jaeger, A. J., & Eagan, M. K. (2011). Examining retention and contingent faculty use in a state system of public higher education. *Educational Policy*, 25(3), 507–537. doi:10.1177/0895904810361723
- Jaeger, A. J., & Hinz, D. (2009). The effects of part-time faculty on first semester freshmen retention: A predictive model using logistic regression. *Journal of College Student Retention: Research, Theory and Practice*, 10(3), 265–286.
- Jaschick, S (2008). Evaluating the adjunct impact. *Inside Higher Ed*. Retrieved from <http://www.insidehighered.com/news/2008/11/06/adjuncts>
- Johnson, I. Y. (2011). Contingent instructors and student outcomes: An artifact or a fact? *Research in Higher Education*, 52(8), 761–785. doi:10.1007/s11162-011-9219-2
- Johnson, N. (2012). *The institutional costs of student attrition*. Washington, DC: American Institutes for Research.
- Jonas, J. (2016). Making practical use of Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs theory to motivate employees. *Journal of Management and Administration*, 2016, 105–117. doi:10.5040/9781472596161-bed-h038
- Lester, D. (2013). Measuring Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs. *Psychological Reports*, 113(1), 15–17. doi:10.2466/02.20.pr0.113x16z1
- Levesque, L., & Rousseau, D. M. (1999). *Loose connections or met expectations? Socialization and obligations to part-time faculty*. Paper presented at the Academy of Management Meeting, Chicago, IL.

- Linehan, P. (2007). *Win them over. Dynamic teaching for college adjuncts and new faculty*. Madison, WI: Atwood Publishing.
- Louis, D. (2009). Adjuncts: Solutions for a mistreated majority. *The Chronicle of Education*, 55(39), A72–A78. <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.2466/02.20.PR0.113x16z1>
- Luna, G., & Cullen, D. L. (1995). Empowering the faculty: Mentoring redirected and renewed. *ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report No. 3*. ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education, One Dupont Circle, NW, Suite 630, Washington, DC 20036-1183.
- Lyons, R. (2007). *Best practices for supporting adjunct faculty*. Bolton, MA: Anker.
- Lyons, R. E., & Kysilka, M. L. (2000). *A Proven Program for Developing Adjunct Community College Faculty*. Speech presented at the 22nd Annual International Conference on Teaching and Leadership Excellence National Institute for Staff and Organizational Development in Austin, TX.
- Malechwanzi, J., Lei, H., & Wang, L. (2016). Students' perceptions and faculty measured competencies in higher education. *International Journal of Higher Education*, 5(3), 56–69. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5430/ijhe.v5n3p56>
- Mangan, K. (2009). Adjunct inspiration: As community colleges rely more heavily on part-timers, some try new strategies to improve teaching. *The Chronicle for Higher Education*, B1–B4.
- Marlier, A. (2014). *An examination of the psychological contracts of contingent faculty teaching at urban, proprietary colleges*. Milwaukee, MN: The University of Wisconsin.
- Martsof, G. R., Schofield, R. E., Johnson, D. R., & Scanlon, D. P. (2012). Editors and researchers beware: Calculating response rates in random digit dial health surveys. *Health Services Research*, 48(2pt1), 665–676. doi:10.1111/j.1475-6773.2012.01464.x
- Maslow, A. H. (1943). Theory of human motivation. *Psychological Review*, 50, 370–396.

- McLeod, S. (2014). *Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs*. Retrieved from <http://www.simplypsychology.org/maslow.html>
- Monks, J. (2009). Who are the part-time faculty? *Academe*, 95(4), 33–37.
- Morse, J. M. (1991). Approaches to qualitative-quantitative methodological triangulation. *Nursing Research*, 40, 120–123.
- Morthland, M. (2010). Instructional needs of part-time community college instructors. *Online Journal of Workforce and Development* (4)2, 3–13.
- Murphy-Nutting, M. (2003). Part-time faculty: Why should we care? *New Directions for Higher Education*, 2003(123), 33–39.
- National Center for Education Statistics (2012). *Employees in postsecondary institutions, fall 2010, and salaries of full-time instructional staff, 2010–2011* (NCES Publication No. 2012-276). Retrieved from National Center for Education Statistics website: <http://nces.ed.gov/pubs2012/2012276.pdf>
- National Center for Education Statistics (2012). *IPEDS glossary*. Retrieved from <http://nces.ed.gov/ipeds/glossary>
- National Center for Education Statistics (2013a). *About IPEDS*. Retrieved from <http://nces.ed.gov/ipeds/about>
- National Center for Education Statistics (2013b). *Advance release of selected 2012 digest tables*. Retrieved from http://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d12/tables_3.asp
- Nestor, P. I., & Leary, P. (2000). The relationship between tenure and non-tenure track status of extension faculty and job satisfaction. *Journal of Extension*, 38(4), 8–13.
- Nevarez, C. & Wood, J. L. (2010). *Community college leadership and administration: Theory, practice, and change*. New York, NY: Peter Lang.

- Patton, M. Q. (2005). Qualitative research. *Encyclopedia of Statistics in Behavioral Science*.
doi:10.1002/0470013192.bsa514
- Reigle, R. R. (2016) *Bullying of adjunct faculty at community colleges and steps toward resolution*.
Retrieved from <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED563989.pdf>
- Rhoades, L., & Eisenberger, R. 2002. Perceived organizational support: A review of the literature.
Journal of Applied Psychology, 87: 698–714.
- Ridenour, R. E. (1985). *An investigation of the relationship between characteristics of self-actualization and of job satisfaction of selected faculty in higher education*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Iowa State University.
- Ronco, S., & Cahill, J. (2006). Does it matter who's in the classroom? Effect of instructor type on student retention, achievement and satisfaction. *AIR Professional File, 100*, 1–12.
- Rossi, L. (2009). An army of adjuncts: more part time instruction renews debate over quality. *Community College Week*. Retrieved from <http://ccweek.com/article-867-an-army-of-adjuncts.html>
- Roueche, J. E., Roueche, S. D., & Milliron, M. D. (1996). Identifying the strangers: Exploring part-time faculty integration in American community colleges. *Community College Review, 23*(4), 33–48.
- Schibik, T., & Harrington, C. (2004). Caveat emptor: Is there a relationship between parttime faculty utilization and student learning outcomes and retention? *AIR Professional File, 91*, 1–6.
- Schmidt, P. (2008). Studies link use of part-time instructors to lower student success. *The Chronicle of Higher Education, B8–B9*.
- Schneider, M. (2010). *Finishing the first lap: The cost of first-year student attrition in America's four-year colleges and universities*. Washington, DC: American Institutes for Research.
Retrieved from http://www.air.org/files/AIR_Schneider_Finishing_the_First_Lap_Oct10.pdf

- Schneider, M., & Yin, L. (2011). *The high cost of low graduation rates: How much does dropping out of college really cost?* Washington, DC: American Institutes for Research. Retrieved from http://www.air.org/focus-area/education/index.cfm?fa=viewContent&content_id=1404
- Schulz, S. D. (2009). Predicting job satisfaction among Iowa community college adjunct faculty members: Use and application of Herzberg's motivation-hygiene theory. (UMI No. 8524688).
- Scott, K. L. (2010) *Managing community college adjuncts in the 21st century*. Ph.D. thesis, Pepperdine University.
- Snyder, T. D., & Dillow, S. A. (2012). *Digest of education statistics 2011*. (No. NCES 2012-001). Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Street, S., Maisto, M., Merves, E., and Rhoades, G. 2012. *Who is professor "staff?" and how can this person teach so many classes?* Center for the Future of Higher Education. Retrieved from <http://futureofhighered.org/policy-report-2/>.
- Tinto, V. (1975). Dropout from higher education: A theoretical synthesis of recent research. *Review of Educational Research*, 45(1), 89–125. doi:10.3102/00346543045001089
- Tinto, V. (1987). *Leaving college: Rethinking the causes and cures of student attrition*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Titus, M. A. (2004). An examination of the influence of institutional context on student persistence at 4-year colleges and universities: A multilevel approach. *Research in Higher Education*, 45(7), 673–699.
- Titus, M. A. (2006). Understanding college degree completion of students with low socioeconomic status: The influence of the institutional financial context. *Research in Higher Education*, 47(4), 371–398. doi:10.1007/s11162-005-9000-5

- Tomanek, K. J. (2010). *Job satisfaction of community college adjunct faculty at Midwestern Community College*. Ames, Iowa: Iowa State University. <http://lib.dr.iastate.edu/etd/11640>
- Tuckman, H. P., Caldwell, J., & Vogler, W. (1978). Part-time employment and career progression. *Part-Time Faculty Series* (pp. 74–85). Washington, D.C.: American Association of University Professors.
- Umbach, P. D. (2007). How effective are they? Exploring the impact of contingent faculty on undergraduate education. *The Review of Higher Education*, 30(2), 91–123.
- Van Dyne, L., & Ang, S. (1998). Organizational citizenship behavior of contingent workers in Singapore. *Academy of Management Journal*, 4(6), 692–703.
- von Glasersfeld, E. (1978). Radical constructivism and Piaget's concept of knowledge. In F. B. Murray (Ed). *The Impact of Piagetian Theory*. Baltimore, MD: University Park Press, 1978.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological process*. London, UK: Harvard University Press.
- Wallin, D. L. (2005). *Adjunct faculty in community colleges. An academic administrator's guide to recruiting, supporting, and retaining great teachers*. Bolton, MA: Anker.
- Walton, E. M. (2016). *Grading for presence: An examination of participation in post-secondary education*. *The Utah Academy of Sciences, Arts, and Letters*. Provo, UT; Brigham Young University Academic Publishing.
- Wargo, W. G. (2015). *Identifying assumptions and limitations for your dissertation*. Menifee, CA: Academic Information Center .
- Watts, G. (2002). Enhancing community colleges through professional development. *New Directions for Community Colleges*, 120. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Weiss, C.& Pankin, R. (2011) Part-time faculty in higher education. *Faculty Publications*. Paper 276.<http://digitalcommons.ric.edu/facultypublications/276>

- West, M. S., & Curtis, J. W. (2006). *AAUP faculty gender equity indicators 2006*. Washington, DC: American Association of University Professors.
- Wyles, B. A. (1998). Adjunct faculty in the community college: Realities and challenges. *New Directions for Higher Education* (104), 89–93.
- Zhang, L. (2010). The use of panel data models in higher education policy studies. In J. C. Smart (Ed.), *Higher education: Handbook of theory and research* (pp. 307–349). Netherlands: Springer. doi:10.1007/978-90-481-8598-6_8
- Zobel, G. (2009). The adjuncts' mandate. *Insider Higher Ed*, 91–123. Retrieved from <http://www.insidehighered.com/views/2009/01/05/zobel>

Appendix A: Survey Instrument

Adjunct Faculty Job Satisfaction Survey

Demographics (5 questions)

1. Please select your gender.
 - Male
 - Female
2. Please select your age range:
 - 18-25
 - 26-35
 - 36-45
 - 46-55
 - 56+
3. Please select one or more of the following choices to best describe your racial/ethnic background.
 - Alaska Native
 - Asian
 - Black or African American
 - Latino, Hispanic
 - Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
 - White, Non Hispanic
 - Other (please indicate)
4. What is your primary language? Please be specific.
5. During the most recent academic year, your marital status was?
 - Single
 - Married/Living with partner or significant other
 - Separated, divorced or widowed

Academic Background (4 questions)

1. Were you ever enrolled in a community college as a student?
 - Yes
 - No
2. What is the highest degree you have completed? Do not include honorary degrees. (If you have none of the degrees or awards, select —Not Applicable)
 - Doctorate (Ph.D., M.D., Ed.D., J.D., etc.)
 - Education Specialist (Ed.S.)
 - Master's Degree (M.A., M.S., M.Ed., etc.)
 - Bachelor's Degree
 - Associate's Degree

- Diploma
- Certificate
- High School Diploma/GED
- Less than High School Diploma/GED
- Other
- Not applicable

3. In what field or discipline is your most advanced degree? (Sociology, Information Technology, Education, Management, Nursing, etc.)

4. Indicate the number of years of teaching experience you have in each of the following:

Number of years	Type of Institution
	K–12 Public and/or Private
	2-Year Public Community College
	2-year Private Community College
	4-Year Public College/University

Instructional Tasks and Workload

1. Indicate the number of years you have been teaching at this institution
2. What is your principal field or discipline at this institution? (I.E., HIST, BSAD, ENGL, MATH, etc.)
3. Which methods of delivery are you teaching in during your most recent academic term at this institution? Check all that apply.
 - Face-to-Face/In Classroom
 - Online
 - Course Conferencing
 - Hybrid
 - Other (please specify)
 - Not currently teaching

4. If you indicated that you are teaching in two or more delivery methods, please indicate the percentage of your teaching load devoted to each.

% of teaching load	Teaching method
	Face-to-Face/In Classroom
	Online
	Hybrid
	Other

Current Employment

1. While employed at this institution, during the most recent academic year, how many other jobs did you hold?
 - 0
 - 1
 - 2
 - 3
 - 4
 - 5 or more

2. How many of these other jobs involved full-time or adjunct instruction at another postsecondary institution?
 - 0
 - 1
 - 2
 - 3
 - 4
 - 5 or more

3. Were you employed full-time at any of these other jobs during the year?
 - Yes
 - No

4. Would you have preferred a full-time teaching position for the most recent academic year at this institution?
- Yes
 - No
5. What is the primary reason you choose to teach at this postsecondary institution? Check all that apply.
- Need the extra money
 - Enjoy the students
 - Enjoy the experience
 - Plan to use this experience as a career ladder
 - Other (please describe below)

Instructional Resources

1. Mark all institutional resources available to you during the most recent academic year as an adjunct faculty member at this institution.
- Use of private office
 - Shared office space
 - A personal computer
 - An email account
 - A phone/voice mail
 - Clerical support
 - Faculty mentor
 - Other
2. How often do you spend time with the following members of this institution?

	Hardly Ever	Sometimes	Often	Very Often
Part-time faculty				
Full-time faculty				
Department Management				
Administrators				
Students				

3. In which ways do you communicate with students outside of the classroom? Check all that apply.
- Phone
 - Email
 - Office hours
 - Before/After class

- Online venues (chat, Skype, Twitter, Facebook, etc.)
- Other

Time Management

During the Academic Year, on average, how many hours per week do you actually spend on each of the following activities in relation to your position as an adjunct instructor at this institution? Mark on response for each activity.

	0 hours per week	1-4 hours per week	5-8 hours per week	9-12 hours per week	13-16 hours per week	17-20 hours per week	21-34 hours per week	35-45 hours per week
Scheduled teaching (give actual, not credit hours)								
Preparing for teaching (including reading student papers and grading)								
Advising and/or counseling of students								
Committee work and meetings								
Community or public service								
Outside consulting/freelance work								
Household/childcare duties								
Commuting to campus								
Other employment								
Research and scholarly writing								
Other								

Job Satisfaction

How satisfied are you with the following aspects of your adjunct teaching job at this institution?

Mark one response for each item.

	Very satisfied	Satisfied	Not satisfied	Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied	Not Applicable
Salary					
Benefits available					
Teaching load					
Quality of students					
Office/lab space					
Equipment and facilities available for classroom instruction					
Institutional support for teaching improvement and professional development					
Autonomy and independence					
Professional relationships with full-time faculty					
Professional relationships with other adjunct faculty					
Social relationships with full-time faculty					
Social relationships with other adjunct faculty					
Competency of colleagues					
Job security					
Relationship with administrators					

Departmental leadership					
Course assignments					
Freedom to determine course content					
Prospects for career advancement					

Opinion

Please indicate your agreement with the following statements. Mark one for each item.

Adjunct instructors at this institution:

	Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't Know
Are given specific training before teaching.					
Are encouraged to attend orientation.					
Are provided course competencies and/or standards.					
Are given opportunities to participate in professional development activities.					
Rarely get hired into full-time positions.					
Receive respect from students.					
Are primarily responsible for introductory classes.					
Have no guarantee of employment.					
Are provided support in the classroom.					

Are provided support outside the classroom.					
Are required to attend meetings.					
Have good working relationships with Administration.					
Are respected by full-time faculty.					

Below are some statements about your adjunct experience at this institution. Indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each of the following statements. Mark one response for each item.

	Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't Know
It is easy for students to see adjunct faculty outside of regular office hours.					
Adjunct faculty and administration work together to achieve common goals.					
Students are provided individual attention and support.					
Adjunct faculty are regarded as good teachers.					
Adjunct faculty are rewarded for their efforts.					
Adjunct faculty are rewarded for their efforts to work with underprepared students.					
Administration consider adjunct faculty concerns when making policy.					

The administration is open about its policies.					
I am compensated fairly for the hours I work.					

Rouche, Rouche, & Milliron (1995), published a taxonomy of part-time faculty. Please classify yourself. Choose all that apply.

- Semi-Retired
- Student (currently working part-time while pursuing further education)
- Hopeful Full-timer (currently would like to secure a full-time college teaching position)
- Full Mooner (currently working 35 or more hours per week elsewhere)
- Part-Mooner (currently holding two or more part-time jobs of less than 35 hours per week)
- Full-Time Part-Timer (currently holding two or more adjunct teaching positions at two or more post-secondary institutions)
- Onliner (currently teaching strictly online courses at a post-secondary institution)
- Homeworker (working part-time to allow time to care for children and/or other relatives)

Open Ended

If you were given the opportunity to provide advice to the administration at this college, what advice would you give for improving experiences of adjunct faculty?

If there was one thing you could change regarding your adjunct faculty experience, what would it be?

What do you most value most about your teaching experience at this institution?

Appendix B: Email Request for Participants

January 14, 2018

Dear Administrator,

I would like to start by introducing myself. My name is Erin Walton and I am a currently a doctoral student at Concordia University–Portland. My focus is on higher education and adult educational leadership and I am in the process of conducting research for dissertation. My research emphasis is on adjunct faculty job satisfaction as it relates to student outcomes.

I am conducting research to gain a better understanding of adjunct faculty job satisfaction; I want to explore the factors that lead to adjunct faculty job satisfaction and factors that deter job satisfaction. I am hoping that your access to adjunct faculty will help bring depth and breadth to this research. Would you be willing to forward the following survey link to your adjunct faculty?

https://cuportland.co1.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_egkw7tW2IYHQPFb

Your assistance and participation in this survey is appreciated, but completely voluntary. If you feel there is a question you are uncomfortable answering you may skip that question. This survey is confidential, and no names are requested. While there are no associated risks with this survey, by clicking on the ‘Start Survey’ button, you are consenting that your responses may be compiled with others. You will not be individually identified with your questionnaire or responses. Please understand that the use of this data will be limited to this research, as authorized by Concordia University–Portland, although results may ultimately be presented in formats other than the dissertation, such as journal articles or conference presentations. If you complete the survey, and later wish to withdraw your participation, you may do this by contacting the researcher.

I greatly appreciate your participation in this research. The survey will take approximately 15 minutes to complete.

Thank you in advance for your assistance!

Erin M. Walton, M.Ed.
Concordia University–Portland

Appendix C: Email Reminder Notice

February 7, 2018

Dear Administrator,

A few weeks ago, you received an email invitation to participate in a dissertation research project. This specific research topic is focused on the job satisfaction of adjunct faculty and your input is greatly desired. I would like to invite you again to share the survey link below with adjunct faculty on your staff, and to provide data concerning experiences as adjunct faculty members.

https://cuportland.co1.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_egkw7tW2IYHQPFb

Any participation in this survey is appreciated, but completely voluntary. If you feel there is a question you are uncomfortable answering you may skip that question. This survey is confidential and no names are asked for. While there are no associated risks with this survey, by clicking on the 'Start Survey' button, you are consenting that your responses may be compiled with others. You will not be individually identified with your questionnaire or responses. Please understand that the use of this data will be limited to this research, as authorized by Concordia University–Portland, although results may ultimately be presented in formats other than the dissertation, such as journal articles or conference presentations. If you complete the survey, and later wish to withdraw your participation, you may do this by contacting the researcher.

I greatly appreciate your participation in this research. The survey will take approximately 15 minutes to complete.

Thank you in advance for completing this survey.

Erin M. Walton, M.Ed
Concordia University–Portland

Appendix D: Statement of Original Work

The Concordia University Doctorate of Education Program is a collaborative community of scholar-practitioners, who seek to transform society by pursuing ethically-informed, rigorously- researched, inquiry-based projects that benefit professional, institutional, and local educational contexts. Each member of the community affirms throughout their program of study, adherence to the principles and standards outlined in the Concordia University Academic Integrity Policy. This policy states the following:

Statement of academic integrity.

As a member of the Concordia University community, I will neither engage in fraudulent or unauthorized behaviors in the presentation and completion of my work, nor will I provide unauthorized assistance to others.

Explanations:

What does “fraudulent” mean?

“Fraudulent” work is any material submitted for evaluation that is falsely or improperly presented as one’s own. This includes, but is not limited to texts, graphics and other multi-media files appropriated from any source, including another individual, that are intentionally presented as all or part of a candidate’s final work without full and complete documentation.

What is “unauthorized” assistance?

“Unauthorized assistance” refers to any support candidates solicit in the completion of their work, that has not been either explicitly specified as appropriate by the instructor, or any assistance that is understood in the class context as inappropriate. This can include, but is not limited to:

- Use of unauthorized notes or another’s work during an online test
- Use of unauthorized notes or personal assistance in an online exam setting
- Inappropriate collaboration in preparation and/or completion of a project
- Unauthorized solicitation of professional resources for the completion of the work.

Appendix D: Statement of Original Work (Continued)

I attest that:

1. I have read, understood, and complied with all aspects of the Concordia University-Portland Academic Integrity Policy during the development and writing of this dissertation.
2. Where information and/or materials from outside sources has been used in the production of this dissertation, all information and/or materials from outside sources has been properly referenced and all permissions required for use of the information and/or materials have been obtained, in accordance with research standards outlined in the *Publication Manual of The American Psychological Association*



Digital Signature

Erin M. Walton
Name (Typed)
