VITA

Charles Wilmer Lepper

EDUCATION

2010   Indiana State University, Terre Haute, Indiana
            Ph.D., Educational Administration (Leadership in Higher Education
            Specialization)

1998   Grand Valley State University, Allendale, Michigan
            M.Ed., College Student Affairs Leadership

1996   Ball State University, Muncie, Indiana
            B.A., Human Resources and Personnel Management

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

2009 -   Ivy Tech Community College, Central Administration, Indianapolis, Indiana
            Assistant Vice Provost for Student Development Services

2007 - 2009 Ivy Tech Community College, Central Administration, Indianapolis, Indiana
            Director of Faculty Development and Student Life Initiatives

2004 - 2007 Ivy Tech Community College, Anderson Campus, Anderson, Indiana
            Associate Dean of Student Affairs

2002 - 2003 Slippery Rock University, Slippery Rock, Pennsylvania
            Associate Director of Housing and Residence Education

2000 - 2002 Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana
            Residence Manager

1999 - 2000 Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana
            Assistant Residence Manager

1998 - 1999 Western Michigan University, Kalamazoo, Michigan
            Residence Hall Director

THE INFLUENCE OF A LILLY ENDOWMENT GRANT TO RECRUIT

AND RETAIN PART-TIME FACULY IN A

COMMUNITY COLLEGE SYSTEM

_____

A dissertation

Presented to

The College of Graduate and Professional Studies

Department of Educational Leadership, Administration, and Foundations

Indiana State University

Terre Haute, Indiana

_____

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Doctor of Philosophy

_____

by

Charles Wilmer Lepper

May 2010

© Charles Wilmer Lepper 2010

Keywords: Adjunct, Faculty, Community, College, Retention

COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Committee Chair: Kandace G. Hinton, Ph.D.

Associate Professor of Educational Leadership, Administration, and Foundations

Indiana State University, Terre Haute, Indiana

Committee Member: Mary F. Howard-Hamilton, Ed.D.

Professor of Educational Leadership, Administration, and Foundations

Indiana State University, Terre Haute, Indiana

Committee Member: Rebecca A. Nickoli, Ed.D.

Vice President of Workforce and Economic Development

Ivy Tech Community College of Indiana, Indianapolis, Indiana

ABSTRACT

This qualitative study examines the influence of a grant from the Lilly Endowment to recruit and retain intellectual capital of part-time faculty in a community college system. Through the use of grant funds, the college used in this study developed and implemented nine college-wide initiatives. This study examined adjunct faculty members' awareness of the grant and the nine initiatives, as well as examined the influence the grant had on their experience. Qualitative data on the lived experiences of adjunct faculty were collected and analyzed. Based upon the analysis of data, five themes emerged in this study: (a) limited awareness of the grant; (b) limited knowledge of the nine initiatives developed and implemented under the grant; (c) lack of formal communication regarding the grant and its initiatives; (d) the adjunct faculty experience was significantly influenced by orientation to the position; and (e) mentoring had a significant influence on their experience. The findings of this study resulted in implications for institutions of higher education, as well as generated recommendations for future practice and research.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

First, I would like to acknowledge the Lilly Endowment, Inc. for its award of a grant to recruit and retain intellectual capital that served as the foundation for this study. Through the endowment's generosity, the lives of participants in this study have been made better. I would also like to acknowledge my employer, Ivy Tech Community College of Indiana for their financial support to pursue my Doctor of Philosophy degree at Indiana State University. I would like to especially acknowledge my friends and colleagues, Dr. Marnia Kennon, Dr. Patricia Dolly, and Dr. Rebecca Nickoli, who were my advocates when I needed them the most. I would also like to acknowledge the endless support, concern, and encouragement of my supervisor, Dr. Benjamin F. Young. Additionally, I would like to recognize and thank my dissertation committee, Dr. Kandace G. Hinton, Dr. Mary F. Howard-Hamilton, and Dr. Rebecca Nickoli, for their support, guidance, and work in conducting my research. Thank you all so much!

On a personal note, working full-time and pursuing my doctorate full-time over the past four years has not been without challenge. I would like to acknowledge the support and understanding of my family and friends. Finally and most importantly, I want to acknowledge my parents, Margaret and Charles Lepper, for their support to pursue my dreams and their belief that I could achieve them.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER 1

Statement of the Problem

Over the past three decades, the landscape of American higher education has changed drastically. Faculty who provide instruction to students enrolled in colleges and universities have not been immune to the changes that have swept throughout the academy. Among the many changes that have occurred is the increased reliance on adjunct faculty who provide instruction to students. In 2005, approximately 615,000 individuals were employed as adjunct faculty in American colleges and universities (National Center for Education Statistics [NCES], 2007).

Since the 1970s, institutions of higher education have employed increasingly larger numbers of adjunct faculty on college and university campuses. In 1970 approximately 104,000 adjunct faculty were employed in institutions of higher education and accounted for approximately 22% of all faculty (NCES, 2007). However, by 2005 the number of adjunct faculty working in higher education accounted for approximately 48% of all faculty (NCES, 2007). It is worth noting that a disproportional number of adjunct faculty exist by institution type. According to research conducted by Wallin (2005), nearly 66% of adjunct faculty are concentrated in the nation's two year community colleges, with the highest percentage of adjunct faculty being employed in the Far West (22.30%), followed by the Southeast (19.48%), Great

Lakes (17.59%), Southwest (14.96%), Mideast (8.63%), Plains (7.51%), Rocky Mountain

(6.31%), and New England (2.51%) regions of the United States.

Environmental Factors

As colleges and universities continue to employ increasingly larger numbers of adjunct

faculty, they have struggled to finds ways to integrate them into the cultural fabric of their

institutions. It is widely acknowledged that limited research has been conducted in the area of

adjunct faculty integration into the academy (McLaughlin, 2005). However, based upon the

limited research that has been conducted, it can be concluded that adjunct faculty typically

experience marginalization and exclusion at the institutions they serve, which can be linked to

factors such as low pay and lack of benefits (McLaughlin, 2005). It has also been concluded that

adjuncts who feel "part of a collaborative faculty seem to have more positive feelings about work

and about their involvement with the institution" (Gappa & Leslie, 1993, p. 186).

In addition to experiencing marginalization and exclusion, adjunct faculty are also likely

to enter the classroom inadequately prepared to teach. According to LaRocco and Bruns (2006),

although many adjunct faculty are well skilled and knowledgeable in their field or profession

outside of the academy, they often lack exposure to effective teaching methods to meet the needs

of today's student. Therefore, it is vital for institutions of higher education to create structured

professional development opportunities for adjunct faculty in a supportive environment that

provides exposure to pedagogical approaches, assessment processes, and teaching strategies

(Murray, 1999). According to research conducted by Gappa and Leslie (1993), the future of

colleges and universities is largely the future of its faculty, and part-time faculty will play at least

as substantial a role in most institutions over the next decade as they do today. According to

Leslie and Gappa (1993), "Institutions that employ part-time faculty strengthen themselves when

they adopt a positive, fair, and investment-oriented stance toward their part-time faculty" (p. 284).

With a number of complex issues surrounding the employment of adjunct faculty, it is critical for institutions of higher education to address the challenges that may lead to adjunct faculty feeling marginalized, excluded, and unprepared to meet the needs of the institutions and students they serve. This study examined the influence of an adjunct faculty management program developed and implemented at a single institution with 23 campuses under a grant provided by the Lilly Endowment.

Purpose of Study

The purpose of this study was to examine the influence of policy changes supported by a Lilly Endowment grant to recruit and retain part-time faculty in a Midwestern community college system. Specifically, the study focused on the influence of nine college-wide initiatives developed by an Adjunct Faculty Development Committee for its 23 campuses and implemented by the institution regarding adjunct faculty perceptions about pay and benefits, access to workspace and storage space for teaching-related items, and overall experience at the institution.

Research Questions

The overreaching research question for this study examined the influence on satisfaction and inclusion the nine college-wide initiatives developed under the grant to recruit and retain adjunct faculty had on part-time faculty in the community college utilized in this study. The following questions helped guide the research.

1. To what extent were adjunct faculty aware of the goals and objectives of the grant?

2. To what degree were adjunct faculty informed of the policy changes and the potential influence they had on their employment and status within the college?

Significance of Study

This study on adjunct faculty was significant for several reasons. The grant providing for the policies affecting adjunct faculty was the largest single grant ever received by the institution. Therefore, this study assisted the institution in being able to evaluate and report the influence of the grant. The significance of this study was underscored by the fact that adjunct faculty are the single largest employee group at the college, with 3,373 individuals employed on its 23 campuses during the 2008 spring semester (Ivy Tech Community College, 2008).

This study was also significant to the higher education community at large because it provides additional research and insight into the experiences of adjunct faculty. The broader higher education community also gained additional insight into positive experiences of adjunct faculty that help to integrate them into the cultural fabric of the academy through different programs.

Definitions of Terms. The following terms used in this study require definition:

Adjunct Faculty are individuals who teach on a part-time or non-permanent contract basis, generally hired on a course-by-course or semester-by-semester basis without fringe benefits, such as health care, paid vacation, retirement, et cetera.

Campus refers to the single location where students may enroll, complete coursework, and earn a degree. For the purposes of this study, the community college used in this study has 23 individual, associate degree-granting campuses.

Cultural Fabric is the social, professional, and academic network of an institution that helps define its identity, values, and purpose (Fogg, 2002; Frost & Jean, 2000; Schein, 2004).

.

Exclusion is the degree to which one feels removed or distanced from particular activities, such as campus events, training, or celebrations, particularly those that may be considered relevant to an institution's cultural fabric or identity (Burnstad, 2002; McLaughlin, 2005; Roueche, Roueche, & Milliron, 1996).

Inclusion is the degree to which one feels involved in particular activities, such as campus events, training, or celebrations, particularly those that may be considered relevant to an institution's cultural fabric or identity (Burnstad, 2002; McLaughlin, 2005; Roueche et al., 1996).

Integration is the process by which one is incorporated into a larger community and develops a sense of belonging, connection, and identity (Burnstad, 2002; McLaughlin, 2005; Roueche et al., 1996).

Liminality refers to the period of assimilation that individuals experience while transitioning from one identity to another. This period often contains elements of reflection and uncertainty (Austin, 2002; Bettis, Millis, Williams, & Nolan, 2005; Eckel & Kezar, 2003; Kezar, Carducci, & McGavin-Contreras, 2006; Turner, 1967).

Marginalization is the condition of being considered a second-class citizen of the campus or academic community (Burnstad, 2002; Evans, Forney, Guido, Patton, & Renn, 2010; McLaughlin, 2005; Roueche et al., 1996; Schlossberg, 1989).

Mattering is the degree to which one feels connected or sense of belonging to another individual, group, or organization (Evans et al., 2010; Schlossberg, 1989).

Region refers to the community college used in this study. It is organized into 14 administrative regions that may contain one or more associate degree-granting campuses and

multiple non-degree-granting educational sites. Each region is led by a chancellor who acts as the chief operating officer of that region.

Sensemaking is the process individuals engage in to better understand their environment. During this process, individuals seek to understand culture, values, and attitudes of their environment (Austin, 2002; Bettis et al., 2005; Eckel & Kezar, 2003; Kezar et al., 2006; Schein, 2004; Tuner, 1967; Weick, 1995).

Researcher's Involvement

As the individual who conducted the research for this study, it is important to note that I am employed at the community college utilized in this study. During the course of the study, I held two separate roles. In my first role, I served as the Director of Faculty Development and Student Life Initiatives. In that position, I was responsible for the overall planning, direction, and day-to-day implementation of the Lilly Endowment's grant to recruit and retain intellectual capital. Additionally, I served as the chair of the Adjunct Faculty Development Committee and was responsible for the development and implementation of college-wide policies that influenced the experiences of adjunct faculty.

In my current role, I serve as the Assistant Vice Provost for Student Development Services and am responsible for providing leadership to seven functional areas within the college. Those areas of responsibility include academic advising, disability support services, career services, judicial affairs, multicultural affairs, student retention, and student life. During the course of this study, I continued to assist with the coordination of grant to recruit and continued to chair the Adjunct Faculty Development Committee. However, in January 2010, the responsibilities for the adjunct faculty management program and its related activities were transitioned to the Assistant Vice Provost for Academic Policy and Assessment at the college.

Organization of Study

      This study is organized into seven chapters. Chapter 2 provides a comprehensive review of relevant literature regarding adjunct faculty and their experiences in higher education. Chapter 3 provides a detailed discussion of the methodology used for collecting data. Chapter 4 and Chapter 5 report the findings of the data from the study. Chapter 6 provides a detailed discussion of the study's findings. Finally, Chapter 7 concludes and summarizes the study and makes additional recommendations for how to continue to successfully integrate adjunct faculty into higher education.

CHAPTER 2

Literature Review

Over the past few decades, a limited amount of research has been conducted regarding

the experiences of adjunct faculty, their integration into higher education, and the evaluation of

effective programs that lead to their increased recruitment and retention. The following literature

review examined the experiences of adjunct faculty in higher education and factors that lead to

higher levels of retention. The chapter unfoldd in the following manner: first, the chapter

provides an overview of legal aspects followed by some general guidelines, demographics,

teaching experiences, salaries, and use of time regarding adjunct faculty. Next, the chapter

focuses on research related to types of adjunct faculty, teaching motivations, and their influence

on higher education. Finally, the chapter provides a discussion of adjunct faculty experiences,

job satisfaction, and theoretical frames related to their experiences. A keyword search was

conducted using various related terms such as adjunct faculty, job satisfaction, and retention via

the Indiana State University and Indiana University-Purdue University libraries' electronic data

systems.

The use of adjunct faculty over the past several years has increased at an exponential rate

(Charfauros & Tierney, 1999). In 1968, researchers estimated that adjunct faculty comprised

only 20% of all faculty in higher education. However, over a 30-year period, the percentage of

adjunct faculty teaching on college and university campuses had risen to nearly 40% (Feldman &

Turnley, 2001). In 2005, the number of adjunct faculty working in all types of higher education institutions increased to 615,000 individuals or approximately 48% of all faculty (NCES, 2007). The use of adjunct faculty is more predominant at community colleges throughout the nation (Brewster, 2000; Grusin & Reed, 1994). In 2005, the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) reported that nearly 69% of faculty teaching in the nation's community college were classified as temporary, part-time, or adjunct (NCES, 2005).

Legal Aspects

With the increased use of adjunct faculty in higher education, growing discontent among adjunct faculty has been observed across the United States, evidenced by the number of adjunct faculty who have organized against and successfully sued the institutions for which they work. For example, in 1998 two adjunct faculty at separate community colleges in the state of Washington sued the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges claiming they were illegally denied retirement benefits by their institutions (Magner, 1998). In 2002, the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) called a decision at Western Michigan University a "historic breakthrough" (Fogg, 2002, p. A15) when some adjunct faculty won the right to become eligible for tenure. In 2004, adjunct faculty again sued the state of Washington under a class action lawsuit and won an $11 million settlement over health care insurance benefits that had been denied to adjunct faculty who had taught at least halftime during summer months (Anonymous, 2004). In 2006, adjunct faculty at Suffolk University in New York petitioned the National Labor Relations Board asking for recognition of the Suffolk Affiliated Faculty/AAUP as their official collective bargaining unit (Flower, 2006).

Guidelines

Due to the growing concerns surrounding adjunct faculty employment, the AAUP and the American Federation of Teachers (AFT) established guidelines for the fair employment and compensation of adjunct faculty. The AAUP's *Statement from the Conference on the Growing Use of Part-Time and Adjunct Faculty* (AAUP, 1997) provided 16 guidelines for colleges and universities to follow in the employment of adjunct faculty.

1. "Long–term planning whenever possible, to provide for extended terms of appointment consistent with institutional needs, thereby also providing sufficient job security to encourage and support continuing involvement with students and colleges" (AAUP, 1997, p. 10).

2. Provisions for "orientation, mentoring, and professional support and development opportunities (including campus grants programs, access to sabbatical opportunities, support for travel for research, and support to present work at professional conferences)" (AAUP, 1997, p. 10).

3. Provisions for "appropriate working conditions essential to perform assigned responsibilities, ranging from office space, supplies, support services, equipment (for example, telephone and computer access), parking permits, library access, after-hours access to buildings, e-mail accounts, and the like" (AAUP, 1997, p. 10).

4. "Access to fringe benefits (especially health and life insurance, sick leave, and retirement plans)" (AAUP, 1997, p. 11).

5. "Access to all regular departmental communications" (AAUP, 1997, p. 11).

Similarly, the American Federation of Teachers's (AFT) *Standards of Good Practice in the Employment of Part-Time/Adjunct Faculty* (AFT, 2002) also developed guidelines for

colleges and universities to follow. However, AFT sought fairness and equity for adjunct faculty through increased compensation and improved benefits. The AFT guidelines specifically called for adjunct faculty to be compensated on a proportional basis compared to full-time faculty, be provided proportional sick leave and pay for break periods and holidays, and be provided proportional healthcare and retirement benefits (AFT, 2002). Additionally, the guidelines also recommended that adjunct faculty should be paid for office hours, participation in committee work, and be provided unemployment benefits when not employed by the institution (AFT, 2002).

While adjunct faculty have organized and sought equity within higher education, a dearth of basic research regarding adjunct faculty and the issues central to their experiences has been conducted (Gappa & Leslie, 1993). Most of the research that has been conducted regarding adjunct faculty "has focused on pay inequities, lack of advancement opportunities" (Feldman & Turnley, 2001, p. 2) and the "perceived mistreatment of adjunct faculty" (Feldman & Turnley, 2001, p. 2). To better understand and appreciate the issues regarding adjunct faculty and their experiences within higher education, one must first have a clearer understanding of who adjunct faculty are and their influence on higher education.

Demographics

Nationally, adjunct faculty are comprised of diverse, varied, and typically highly educated individuals. In 2002, NCES conducted further analysis of data from the 1993 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty and published their findings regarding who adjunct faculty were, how they spent their time, and their attitudes with regards to their position. According to data from the 1993 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty 52% of all adjunct faculty hold at least a master's degree (NCES, 2002) and an additional 11% hold a doctorate or some other

professional credential (Leslie & Gappa, 2002; Pearch & Marutz, 2005). In general, community college adjunct faculty have completed lower levels of education than their full-time counterparts (Leslie & Gappa, 2002). However, it should be noted that community college adjunct faculty are more likely to teach in professional or technical academic programs, areas for which a doctorate is typically not needed (Leslie & Gappa, 2002).

Gender. Data from the 1993 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty (NCES, 2002), showed males hold the majority of all faculty positions at all types of higher education institutions In community colleges, males account for approximately 54% of all full-time faculty positions (NCES, 2002). This approximately 50-50 distribution of males and females in full-time positions is also consistent for adjunct faculty: 55% of all adjunct faculty employed at the nation's two year colleges are males and 45% of all adjunct faculty are females (NCES, 2002). Based upon these data, the likelihood for females to be adjunct faculty is not significantly different from their male counterparts (NCES, 2002). However, this pattern of gender distribution only holds true for two year colleges.

Data from four year institutions revealed that males hold a disproportionate number of full-time positions compared to females. Specifically, males hold approximately 70% of all full-time positions at four year institutions (NCES, 2002). Exploring possible reasons for these statistics, Lundy and Warme (1990) found that gender influences an individual's employment status and asserted that females are held to a different standard in employment and during the tenure process. Therefore, as a result they concluded that many females are forced to accept temporary or part-time employment as adjunct faculty, often in two year colleges (Gappa & Leslie, 1993).

This assertion by Lundy and Warme (1990) is supported by data analysis from the 1993 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty (NCES, 2002) which indicated that female faculty were underrepresented in a number of academic programs and disciplines. Results showed that females comprised only 34% of all full-time faculty in "business, law, and communication, and 25% of those in natural sciences and engineering" (NCES, 2002, p. vi). However, data from the 1993 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty (NCES, 2002) and a 1992 survey conducted by the Center for the Study of Community Colleges (Pearch & Marutz, 2005) revealed that female faculty were more likely to teach "English and literature and foreign languages" (NCES, 2002, p. vii) or other humanities courses.

Over the past 25 years, graduate programs have produced an overabundance of individuals with graduate degrees, including doctorates, in the humanities (Austin, 2002). As a result, approximately 60% of all adjunct faculty who taught in the humanities were likely doing so because of an oversupply of credentialed individuals and an undersupply of full-time employment opportunities (NCES, 2002). Coupled together, these circumstances have led to a predetermined career destination for a significant number of full-time and adjunct female faculty and data analysis supports Lundy and Warme's (1990) assertion that females are tracked into adjunct faculty positions at both four year and two year institutions.

In addition to being underrepresented in faculty positions, females have a substantial set of circumstances that differentiate their experience in American higher education from their male counterparts. Historically, females have experienced a high degree of discrimination in the workplace and educational setting (Gardner, 2007). In 1972, the Federal government passed Title IX, legislation that prohibited discrimination based upon gender in education (Gardner, 2007). Since its passage, the number of females earning doctoral degrees has surpassed the

number earned by males. In 2007, females accounted for approximately 53% of doctoral degrees

earned in the United States, yet females continue to be underrepresented in full-time faculty

positions, tenure-track positions, and the rank of full professor (Gardner, 2007). A 2006 report

from the AAUP reported the average salary for female faculty was 19% lower than their male

counterparts (Gardner, 2007).

Individuals from outside higher education may assume colleges and universities are

welcoming and ideal places for females to assume careers. This assumption is based upon the

perceived autonomy and flexible work schedule of faculty members (Marcus, 2007). Such

autonomy and flexibility can be perceived as a benefit to educated females seeking to have

children and raise a family. However, studies have found such benefits are rarely true, and in

most cases the demands of faculty positions frequently have a negative influence on females and

their ability to balance both work and family (Marcus, 2007).

The tenure process for faculty typically occurs during an academic's child-bearing years

and often serves as a barrier for females in balancing both academics and family (Gardner,

2007). Marcus (2007) has concluded that a small number of females successfully complete the

tenure process due to the conflict between work and family. In 2007, females accounted for only

24% of "tenured faculty at four year colleges and universities, including just 10% in engineering

and 16% in physics" (p. 29). With a decreasing number of full-time and tenured tracked

positions in higher education, the AAUP reports "women face more obstacles as faculty in

higher education than they do as managers and directors in corporate America" (Marcus, 2007,

p. 29).

In 2003, the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation in conjunction with faculty from The

Pennsylvania State University conducted a faculty survey involving 507 colleges and universities

across the nation (Drago & Colbeck, 2003). Data from the survey demonstrated that approximately 25% of all female respondents indicated having fewer children or delayed having children until completing the tenure process. Additionally, the survey revealed approximately 66% of tenured female faculty members were childless, compared to approximately 33% of tenured male faculty members.

Faculty age. According to data from the 1993 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty, the average age of community college adjunct faculty is 45.8 years (NCES, 2002). When compared to the average age of full-time community college faculty (48 years), adjunct faculty are slightly younger (Leslie & Gappa, 2002). However, "variance of age is greater among part-timers, with over twice as many (proportionally) in the over 65 bracket and nearly twice as many in the 25-34 bracket," compared with community college full-time faculty (Leslie & Gappa, 2002, p. 60). Based upon these data, community college adjunct faculty are simultaneously older and younger than their community college full-time counterparts (Pearch & Marutz, 2005).

Marital status. Data regarding the marital status of adjunct faculty were extremely limited. Based upon research using data from the 1988 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty and interviews conducted with 240 adjunct faculty, Gappa and Leslie (1993) found adjunct faculty were slightly different from their full-time counterparts in marital status: 88% of male full-time faculty and approximately 63% of female full-time faculty reported being married, while approximately 78% of male adjunct faculty and approximately 71% of female adjunct faculty members reported they were married at the time of the study. Gappa and Leslie also noted that a substantial number of adjunct faculty were part of dual-career marriages, with one spouse teaching full-time.

Based upon the separate interviews conducted as part of their study, Gappa and Leslie (1993) concluded that "marriage and family commitments" (p. 26) were closely tied with geographic mobility and flexibility for a significant number of the study's participants. They also found that being married, whether to an individual who taught or had a position outside of teaching, had a disproportionately negative influence on females in the study. Female adjunct faculty who participated in the study frequently expressed they were conflicted between pursuing a more challenging, full-time academic career and family responsibilities, including child rearing (Gappa & Leslie, 1993). Additionally, female adjunct faculty who participated in the interviews conducted by Gappa and Leslie expressed feelings that their decision to accept part-time employment had limited their "future potential and opportunities for professional growth" (p. 27) in higher education.

Racial composition. According to data from the 1993 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty, slightly, if any, racial or ethnic differences between adjunct faculty and full-time faculty existed across all types of institutions (NCES, 2002). While no significant differences were found between adjunct and full-time faculty in the 1993 study, it is important to note that over 88.3% of adjunct faculty identified as being White. At the time of the 1993 study, Blacks were the largest racial minority group, accounting for 4.8% of the population, followed by Asians (3.2%), Hispanics (3.0%), and American Indians (0.6%) (NCES, 2002). This pattern of racial group representation was similar for full-time faculty as well. The only exception to this pattern was Asians who accounted for the same percentage of full-time faculty as Blacks; both races accounted for 5.2% of the population (NCES, 2002).

Similar results regarding racial representation among adjunct faculty at two year colleges were found in the 2004 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty (NCES, 2005). Based upon

data from the 2004 survey, Whites were the largest racial group, accounting for approximately

84% of the total adjunct faculty population. Similar to data from the 1993 National Study of

Postsecondary Faculty, Blacks represented the largest racial minority group with approximately

7% of the two year faculty ranks. Other racial minorities were represented in the study with

Hispanics, who accounted for 4% of adjunct faculty at two year colleges and Asians, who

accounted for approximately 3% (NCES, 2005). When compared to the 1993 National Study of

Postsecondary Faculty similar results were found at two year colleges, which also indicated full-

time faculty were also primarily composed of Whites. Whites accounted for approximately 81%

of the surveyed population of total full-time faculty at two year colleges, followed by Blacks

(7%), Hispanics (6%), and Asians (4%) (NCES, 2005).

Based upon these data, it should be noted the pattern of minority representation for

adjunct faculty at two year colleges differed between the 1993 and 2004 National Study of

Postsecondary Faculty reports. While Whites remained the largest racial group among part-time

faculty in both studies, their overall representation declined approximately 5% during the 11-

year time period. Additionally, Blacks increased in adjunct faculty representation by 2%,

followed by a 1.4% increase in Hispanic adjunct faculty. Although initially it appears that the

national adjunct faculty population is becoming more diverse at two year colleges, it is important

to note that during the same time period examined, the number of adjunct faculty who identified

as Asian at two year colleges declined by 0.5%. In conclusion, a disproportionate number of

adjunct faculty at two-year colleges continued to be identified as White, and racial minorities

continued to be under-represented in these roles.

Demographics provide a quantitative reporting of the racial composition of faculty in

American higher education. In order to more fully understand the experiences of adjunct faculty

who identified as a member of a racial minority, a literature search was conducted. The search

did not produce any usable literature and the search was expanded to include full-time faculty.

Literature regarding the experiences of full-time faculty who identified as a member of a racial

minority, particularly those who taught at predominately White institutions, was rare (Stanley,

2006).

One usable qualitative study was identified that provided insight into the experiences of

minority faculty. The study was conducted using an auto-ethnographic approach in which 27

faculty members were asked to write about their experiences teaching at a predominately White

institution, as well as provide recommendations for future improvement (Stanley, 2006).

Participants of the study were comprised of individuals who self-identified as "African, African

American, American Indian, Asian, Asian American, Black, Chamorro, Indian, Jamaican,

Jewish, Latina/o, Mexican American, Muslim, Native Pacific Islander, Puerto Rican, and South

African" (Stanley, 2006, p. 708).

Six central themes regarding minority faculty experiences teaching at predominately

White institutions emerged from Stanley's (2006) research: teaching, mentoring, collegiality,

identity, service, and racism. Data from the study indicated that minority faculty experienced

challenges associated with teaching and activities outside the classroom. Specifically, minority

faculty reported challenges with student attitudes and behaviors that related to the questioning of

"their authority and credibility in the classroom" (p. 709). Additionally, minority faculty also

reported being challenged to incorporate diversity into classroom materials and experienced

resistance to multi-culturalism from non-minority students. Such behaviors and attitudes from

students often left minority faculty feeling their work inside and outside the classroom was not

validated (Stanley, 2006).

The second theme to emerge in Stanley's (2006) research was the importance of mentoring relationships for minority faculty members. Study participants indicated that mentoring played a key role in their experience, leading to increased retention and satisfaction at their institution. Minority faculty indicated benefits from multiple mentoring relationships within their institutions, including cross-cultural mentoring, and same-race mentoring relationships (Stanley, 2006).

The third theme in Stanley's (2006) research focused on the collegial nature often associated with higher education, specifically faculty relationships. Minority faculty members described both positive and negative experiences with collegiality within their predominately White institutions. In both instances, collegiality, or the absence of it, served as the determining factor of the minority faculty to either continue their employment with the institution or to seek employment at a different institution. Regardless of whether their experience with collegiality was positive or negative, minority faculty reported feeling they were held to a higher expectation of collegiality than their non-racial minority peers. Minority faculty also noted that due to the culture associated with predominately White institutions, they were continually forced to examine their environment through multiple lenses to seek understanding and clarity of the world around them. Participants of this study also reported feelings of being invisible within their institution due to isolation from other racial minorities or individuals from their race, while feeling the need to prove their worth academically to their institution (Stanley, 2006).

The fourth theme to emerge from Stanley's (2006) work centered on identity. Minority faculty members indicated one of the challenges they experienced working at a predominately White institution was their ability to separate themselves from commonly held stereotypes of their racial group. Specifically, minority faculty reported feelings of being "perceived in terms

of attributes salient to their gender, race, ethnicity, nationality, sexual orientation, religion, culture, and socioeconomic status" (p. 716) and reported feelings of continuously having to negotiate their environment to establish their identity as an individual and as a member of racial minority group (Stanley, 2006).

The fifth theme identified in Stanley's (2006) research was service. Minority faculty reported feelings of being burdened with heavy service loads because of their race. Specifically, minority faculty indicated active involvement in the following types of service:

> (a) mentoring students of color, (b) serving on university and national recruitment and retention committees focusing on diversity, (c) helping local communities in their educational efforts, (d) mentoring faculty of color, (e) educating majority White faculty, administrators, students and staff about diversity. (p. 718)

Although service typically plays a role in the tenure and promotion process of faculty, minority faculty are often expected to be more actively involved in service activities than their non-minority peers. This expectation often detracts from the amount of time minority faculty have to develop course materials, conduct research, and publish. As a result of expectations different from their non-minority counterparts, service can have a detrimental influence on tenure and promotion for minority faculty (Stanley, 2006).

The final theme that emerged from Stanley's (2006) research was racism. Minority faculty members described incidents of both individual and institutional racism that were covert and overt in nature. In her study, Stanley described institutional racism as policies and practices that discriminated against individuals or groups of individuals based upon their "racial group, nationality, gender, or sexual orientation" (p. 721). As a result of both individual and

institutional racism, minority faculty expressed feelings of being silenced and oppressed within the institutions they served (Stanley, 2006).

Summary of demographics. In summary, adjunct faculty are a diverse group of individuals who occupy a significant role within higher education. Adjunct faculty are generally well qualified, typically hold a master's degree, doctorate, or some other professional credential that qualifies them to teach at the higher education level. While a disproportionate number of males hold full-time faculty positions in all types of higher education institutions, the most significant difference between full-time faculty positions by gender can be found in four year institutions. The difference in full-time faculty by gender is significantly lower in full-time community college faculty, with males accounting for slightly more than half. National data show similar gender patterns for adjunct faculty in two year colleges, where an adjunct faculty is equally likely to be either male or female. Studies report that female faculty members continue to experience discrimination in higher education and due to the demands of tenure process; many females are negatively affected in their profession when trying to balance work and family life.

Data demonstrated the average age of community college adjunct faculty is 45.8 years old (NCES, 2002), which is slightly younger than the age of the average community college full-time faculty, who is 48 years old (Leslie & Gappa, 2002). Due to the number of adjunct faculty employed in higher education, they are also proportionally over represented than their full-time counterparts in the over 65-year-old bracket and in the 25-34 year-old-bracket (Leslie & Gappa, 2002). Nationally 88% of community college full-time male faculty were married, compared to 78% of male adjunct faculty; and 63% of community college full-time female faculty were married compared to 71% of female adjunct faculty (Leslie & Gappa, 2002). Although these findings alone were not significant, research found that marital status had a disproportionately

negative impact on female adjunct faculty who were often conflicted in their role as wife and mother versus the desire to pursue a more challenging career, including a full-time faculty position (Leslie & Gappa, 2002).

While adjunct faculty appear to be diverse based upon their experience, education, age, and marital status, they are less racially diverse. Whites account for approximately 84% of adjunct faculty in the nation's community colleges (NCES, 2005). Blacks account for the largest minority group followed by Hispanics and Asians. Over the past decade, minorities as a whole have accounted for a larger percentage of adjunct faculty. However, as the number of Black and Hispanic adjunct faculty have increased, the number of Asians in adjunct positions have declined during the past several years (NCES, 2005).

Research conducted at predominately White institutions revealed that minority faculty members reported often experiencing challenges in teaching that negatively affected their credibility and authority due to their race. Minority faculty described how the higher expectations to engage in service often negatively influenced their tenure and promotion process and how they were held to a higher standard of collegiality than their non-minority counterpart. Additionally, minority faculty reported instances of individual and institutional racism that set their experience in higher education apart from non-minority peers. However, the development of a mentoring relationship, either same race or cross-racial, emerged as a key element in minority faculties' decision to continue employment or search for another position beyond their current institution (Stanley, 2006).

Teaching Experience, Pay, and Use of Time

This section of the chapter focused on the teaching experiences adjunct faculty bring to higher education, as well as provides an overview of data regarding the average length of service

adjunct faculty provide in their role. Information regarding compensation and average income of

full-time and adjunct faculty, in four year and two year institutions is compared. Finally, this

section provided insight into the similarities and differences among full-time and adjunct faculty

and the use of their time as it relates to their position within higher education.

Teaching experience. Data from the 1999 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty,

revealed community college adjunct faculty had an average of six years of teaching experience

and over 50% of those who participated in the survey possessed five years or more of teaching

experience (Leslie & Gappa, 2002; Pearch & Marutz, 2005). Using data from the same survey, it

was revealed that community college full-time faculty possessed an average of 12 years of

teaching experience (Leslie & Gappa, 2002). Based upon these data, full-time community

college faculty on average had over twice as many years of teaching experience compared to

adjunct faculty (Leslie & Gappa, 2002).

A commonly held perception of adjunct faculty is they tend to teach for short periods of

time and migrate among multiple institutions. However, data from a 1992 survey conducted by

the Center for the Study of Community Colleges revealed that over 30% of community college

adjunct faculty reported teaching 10 years or more at their current institution (Pearch & Marutz,

2005). Based upon these findings, it was concluded that adjunct faculty demonstrated a "higher

level of employment stability at single institutions than is commonly assumed for part-time

faculty" (Leslie & Gappa, 2002, p. 61).

While the number of adjunct faculty teaching appears to be stable, data indicated that

approximately 72% of adjuncts hold primary positions of employment outside their institution,

and 13% have retired from previously held positions outside higher education (Wallin, 2005).

Data from the 1993 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty indicated more than 50% of adjunct

faculty preferred to teach part-time (NCES, 2002). However, it should be noted that a slight difference between genders was found with 52% of females and 42% of males teaching part-time due to the lack of full-time teaching opportunities (Leslie & Gappa, 2002). Nearly 66% of all adjunct faculty reported they teach on a part-time or contractual basis as a means to satisfy their desire to be engaged in an academic environment (Leslie & Gappa, 2002). And finally, the study found approximately 36% of all adjunct faculty sought part-time positions as a mechanism to increase their level of income (Leslie & Gappa, 2002).

However, in 1993 Gappa and Leslie conducted research using data from the 1988 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty and interviewed 240 part-time faculty. Their analysis of data conflicted directly with data analyzed from the 1993 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty (NCES, 2002). Specifically, Gappa and Leslie found that only 16% of adjunct faculty sought full-time positions within higher education. In doing so, Gappa and Leslie's acknowledged their research not only conflicted with previous research findings, but was also a "stark contrast to the commonly accepted perception of adjunct faculty" (p. 46) and their desire for full-time employment.

Salaries. Historically, salaries for faculty were more similar than different across academic programs and faculty were generally viewed as being equal regardless of discipline (Schuster & Finkelstein, 2006). However, by the mid-1970s the stability of equal pay among faculty in various disciplines began to erode and faculty in professional programs such as "medicine and law" (Schuster & Finkelstein, 2006, p. 258) began to receive higher levels of compensation due to their market-driven nature. By the end of the 1970s, more and more academic disciplines had become market driven, including "engineering and natural science fields, computer science, accounting, and finance" (Schuster & Finkelstein, 2006, p. 258). As

colleges and universities started to recruit and hire faculty based upon market demands, they ceased hiring faculty at the union or institutional scale that had been previously established and followed.

With the development of the new market-driven salary practices, institutions of higher education began to reallocate resources. In most cases, institutions utilized money from academic disciplines that were less market driven and reallocated them to pay faculty in more market-driven fields (Schuster & Finkelstein, 2006). As a result of these practices, salary disparity across academic disciplines came into existence and had a significant influence on colleges' and universities' ability to recruit and hire full-time faculty.

As enrollments continued to grow within higher education, institutions began to hire more part-time and adjunct faculty to fill the void due to the reduction of funds available to hire full-time faculty in less market-driven disciplines (Schuster & Finkelstein, 2006). As a result, the use of part-time employees became one measure institutions implemented to control salary cost. However, while the use of part-time employees grew within higher education, the use of different types of part-time employees varied. Specifically, the use of part-time employees in non-instructional activities was significantly less than the use of part-time instructional employees or adjunct faculty. In 2001, nearly 45% of all faculty were employed on a part-time or adjunct basis, compared to "4% of the executive/administrative/managerial staff and less than 15% of other (nonfaculty) professionals" (Schuster & Finkelstein, 2006, p. 263) within higher education.

Data from the 2004 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty found the average salary for all full-time faculty, regardless of institution type, was $81,200 (NCES, 2005). This amount included full-time faculty's institutional base salary of $67,400, plus income from other

institutions of $5,000, income generated from outside consulting of $2,200, and $6,600 from

other sources of outside income (NCES, 2005). In comparison, the average salary of full-time

community college faculty was significantly less when compared to all full-time faculty. Full-

time faculty teaching in community colleges earned an average of $63,900 per year (NCES,

2005). This amount included an institutional base salary of $52,600, plus income from other

institutions of $4,900, income generated from outside consulting of $1,100, and $5,200 from

other sources of outside income (NCES, 2005).

While the differences between all full-time faculty and full-time community college

faculty appear significant, the disparity among part-time or adjunct faculty is far greater. Data

from the 2004 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty indicated all adjunct faculty had an

average salary of $52,500 (NCES, 2005). This amount included a salary of $11,200 from their

primary institution, followed by $900 of additional income from a secondary institution, $2,900

from outside consulting that was not necessarily connected to their role as an adjunct faculty, and

$37,500 in other income outside their teaching position (NCES, 2005). In comparison,

according to the same study, adjunct faculty at community colleges earned an average of $43,800

per year. This amount included $9,000 earned at their primary institution, $700 from a

secondary institution, $2,200 from outside consulting that was not necessarily connected to their

adjunct faculty position, and $31,900 in other income earned outside their teaching position

(NCES, 2005).

In summary, the overall adjunct faculty average annual salaries at two year colleges are

$20,100 less than their full-time community college counterparts' annual salaries. However,

greater differences occur when comparing income earned from their primary institution of

employment. When comparing the base salary of the average full-time community college

faculty with the amount of income earned at their primary institution of employment to the average community college adjunct faculty, the difference in income grows to $43,600.

Use of time. While the roles and scope of positions vary between adjunct faculty and full-time faculty, data collected through the 1999 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty, show similarities between the two groups (Wallin, 2005). According to these data, adjunct and full-time faculty spent a similar amount of time responding to student emails. Full-time faculty spent an average of 2.8 hours a week responding to student emails, while adjunct faculty spent an average of 2.9 hours a week completing the same task (Wallin, 2005). These findings support the notion that adjunct faculty and full-time faculty spend approximately the same amount of time communicating with students through an electronic format.

A number of differences between full-time and adjunct faculty use of time were also found using data from the 1999 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty (Wallin 2005). Full-time faculty spent an average of 4.6 hours per week providing "individual instruction to undergraduates" (Wallin, 2005, p. 31) compared to 2.2 hours per week for adjunct faculty, a difference of 2.4 hours per week. Full-time faculty spent an average of 7.0 hours per week holding office hours, compared to 1.6 hours per week for adjunct faculty, a difference of 5.4 hours per week. Further, full-time faculty spent an average of 2.8 hours per week working on committees compared to 0.5 hours spent by adjunct faculty, a difference of 2.3 hours per week (Wallin, 2005).

Beyond specific tasks associated with their employment within higher education, differences in the amount of time spent working each week were also found. Full-time faculty reported spending an average of 48.8 hours working per week compared to an average of 35.7 hours per week by adjunct faculty, a difference of 13.1 hours less per week (Wallin, 2005).

Through the use of a t-test on data from the 1999 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty,

Wallin (2005) found the differences between the amount of hours worked per week by full-time

and adjunct faculty were statistically different.

Data from the 1999 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty found differences in the

average amount of time spent providing instruction, the average number of hours spent holding

office hours, and the average number of hours spent on committee work were statistically

significant. As previously mentioned, the survey revealed that full-time and adjunct faculty

communicated with students through email approximately the same number of hours per week.

However, based upon the overall data from the survey, it was concluded that adjunct faculty, as a

whole, spent less time interacting and communicating face-to-face with students and were less

involved in committee work and curriculum development at their institutions.

Summary of teaching experiences, salaries, and use of time. In summary, data

indicated that adjunct faculty are generally less experienced than their full-time community

college counterparts. According to data collected as part of the 1999 National Student of

Postsecondary Faculty, the average adjunct faculty teaching in a community college has

approximately six years of experience, which is less than half the teaching experience of full-

time community college who have at approximately 12 years of experience (Leslie & Gappa,

2002; Pearch & Marutz, 2005).

Frequently, adjunct faculty are perceived as a transient population that migrates from one

institution to another. However, a survey conducted by the Center for the Study of Community

Colleges found that approximately 30% of all adjunct faculty teaching at a community college

had been employed by the same institution for 10 years or more (Pearch & Marutz, 2005). Such

findings help debunk the myth that most adjunct faculty seek employment at alternate institutions after short periods of time.

Although adjunct faculty and tenure at the same institution is longer than generally assumed, the vast majority hold positions in addition to their adjunct positions. Over 70% of adjunct faculty held positions outside their adjunct role (Wallin, 2005). One of the commonly held beliefs about adjunct faculty is that most desire full-time academic positions. However, data indicated that nearly half of all adjunct faculty preferred their adjunct faculty position over a full-time position and nearly two thirds indicated they taught part-time to fulfill their desire to be involved in the academic setting (Leslie & Gappa, 2002). Finally, it was found that only 16% of adjunct faculty sought full-time positions within higher education (Gappa & Leslie, 1993).

Over the past several years, institutions of higher education have become more market driven and have begun to compensate faculty based upon availability and demand. As a result of this practice, a growing inequity has occurred among full-time faculty within the academy. While this inequity exists among full-time faculty from various disciplines, the disparity in pay between full-time and adjunct faculty is far greater. As a result of the market forces described earlier in this chapter, institutions of higher education have utilized adjunct faculty as a mechanism to contain escalating costs.

Based upon survey data collected from the 2004 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty, it was concluded the average salary for full-time faculty across institution type was $81,200 (NCES, 2005). However, full-time faculty teaching exclusively in a community college earned less, approximately $63,900 per year (NCES, 2005). While the difference between the earnings of full-time faculty across institution type and those at community colleges appears to be significant, the difference between earnings of adjunct faculty across institution type and

those at community colleges is much greater. Data from the study found that adjunct faculty across institution type earned an average annual salary of $52,000, including $11,200 in income from their adjunct position (NCES, 2005). However, adjunct faculty at community colleges had an average annual salary of $43,800, including $9,000 in income from their adjunct position (NCES, 2005). Based upon data, adjunct faculty teaching in a community college earned an average $20,100 less than their full-time counterparts and an average $43,600 less when comparing total income earned from their teaching positions.

The review of literature also revealed differences and similarities in how adjunct faculty utilized their time compared to full-time faculty. Based upon data analyzed from the 1999 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty, adjunct and full-time faculty interacted with students via email approximately the same number of hours per week (Wallin, 2005). However, data from the same study concluded that adjunct faculty provided less individualized instruction, held fewer office hours, served less time on committees, and overall worked fewer hours than full-time faculty (Wallin, 2005). Based upon these findings, it was concluded that adjunct faculty, in general, spend less time interacting with students, are less available, and spend less time engaged in the campus environment (Wallin, 2005).

Categories of Adjunct Faculty, Motivations, and Impact

This section of the chapter is divided into three sections. The first section focuses on and provides information regarding the categories of adjunct faculty found teaching in higher education. The next section provides information, including results of research conducted, regarding the motivations of faculty, specifically adjunct faculty, teaching in higher education. The third and final section within this chapter provides insight into the impact adjunct faculty have on higher education, including financial and student learning.

Categories of adjunct faculty. Adjunct faculty choose to teach for a variety of reasons which are as diverse as their demographics. In 1978, Tuckman conducted an analysis of data from a stratified list of institutions based upon information collected during the 1972-73 academic year and provided to the NCES. Through the stratification process, 594 institutions were eliminated from the sample because they did not employ adjunct faculty, grant degrees, or did not provide sufficient information (Tuckman, 1978). In total, data from 128 institutions and over 3,700 adjuncts were analyzed in the study (Tuckman, 1978).

While Tuckman's (1978) study did not have a formal purpose statement and research questions, the study alluded to developing categories to fit the types of adjunct faculty found in higher education. Tuckman developed the following categories of adjunct faculty: semi-retireds, graduate students, hopeful full-timers, full-mooners, homeworkers, part-mooners, and part-unknowners.

According to Tuckman (1978) the semi-retired category of adjunct faculty was comprised of "former full-time academic or professionals" (as cited in Gappa & Leslie, 1993, p. 46) who generally were less concerned with the number of courses they taught or about the prospects of future teaching positions than other adjunct faculty. The second category was graduate students, comprised of individuals who were "usually employed as part-timers in institutions other than the ones in which they were pursuing a graduate degree" (Gappa & Leslie, 1993, p. 46). Hopeful full-timers were the third category of adjunct faculty asserted by Tuckman and they were defined as individuals who were unable to secure a full-time teaching position and included individuals who taught part-time at multiple institutions "to constitute full-time employment but under several contracts" (as cited in Gappa & Leslie, 1993, p. 46).

The fourth category provided by Tuckman (1978), was full-mooners, who were comprised of individuals who held full-time positions outside their adjunct faculty position. Tuckman described these individuals as "spending relatively little time preparing lectures and other teaching activities and limiting the number of hours they taught" (as cited in Gappa & Leslie, 1993, p. 46).

Similar to full-mooners, the fifth category described by Tuckman (1978) was part-mooners. This category of adjunct faculty consisted of individuals who held part-time employment outside their part-time teaching employment and who were often motivated by "economic necessity, psychic rewards not obtainable from one job only, concerns about future employment prospects, and highly specialized skills that could be used by one employer only to a limited extent" (as cited in Gappa & Leslie, 1993, p. 46).

Tuckman's (1978) sixth category was homeworkers, individuals who "worked part-time because they cared for children or other relatives. Part-time employment might be a sole source of support for the home-worker's household or it might supplement the income of a spouse" (as cited in Gappa & Leslie, 1993, p. 46). The final category of adjunct faculty was the part-unknowners. This category of adjunct faculty was comprised of individuals whose part-time status was "unknown, transitory, or highly subjective" (as cited in Gappa & Leslie, 1993, p. 47).

Since developing his framework in 1978, Tuckman's work continues to be widely accepted by scholars and serves as the primary framework for which adjunct faculty are categorized (as cited in Gappa & Leslie, 1993). However, Tuckman and Pickerill (1988) asserted that sufficient data had not been collected since the time of the original study to support any further research or revision to the original categories. In 1993, Gappa and Leslie conducted research, based upon Tuckman's original work, which sought to develop an alternative

framework that allowed for adjunct faculty to be more broadly classified. Based upon their

research, the following categories were developed: career-enders; specialists, experts, and

professionals; aspiring academics; and freelancers.

Based upon Gappa and Leslie's (1993) work, career-enders included individuals who had

retired, either from higher education teaching positions or other positions outside academe.

Specialists, experts, and professionals were individuals who possessed advanced knowledge in a

particular field, profession, or discipline and taught for the love of teaching; income had little

influence on their participation in higher education. Aspiring academics were those who sought

a full-time faculty position within an institution of higher education, but had not been hired in a

full-time capacity. Finally, freelancers were described as individuals who pursued adjunct

employment for a variety of reasons (Charfauros & Tiereny, 1999).

Teaching motivations. Fugate and Amey (2000) conducted research on full-time

community college faculty and the career paths that led them to their positions. With this

purpose in mind, Fugate and Amey conducted a qualitative study at Midwest Community

College (MCC), a pseudonym for a large, suburban, comprehensive community college.

Participants of the study were purposefully selected based upon the "following criteria: (a) they

were in their first six years of full-time teaching at a community college; (b) they represented

diversity between liberal arts and technical-vocational programs; and (c) the sample included

both gender and cultural diversity" (p. 2). Participants of the study were interviewed using a

semi-structured protocol and the study was guided by questions that sought to understand faculty

career paths, faculty career stages, and the role of professional development in their career

(Fugate & Amey, 2000).

Based upon their research, Fugate and Amey (2000) found full-time community college faculty, in general, did not intend to pursue a career in higher education. Additionally, individuals who participated in the study indicated they "did not follow a predetermined path" (p. 5) to their academic position. Most of the individuals who participated in the study revealed they began teaching at a community college simply because a position had become available and was offered to them through various means. It was also found that the vast majority of study participants had departed from previous employment or diverted from prior career paths to teaching because they enjoyed the experience and decided an academic career was a good fit (Fugate & Amey, 2000).

Results of the study also revealed faculty expressed a preference to teach in a community college over a four year college or university due to the absence of the tenure process. Further, full-time community college faculty indicated teaching in a community college was more desirable due to the focus on teaching and that employment was not dependent upon the completion of a doctoral, terminal, or professional degree (Fugate & Amey, 2000).

Fugate and Amey's (2000) research focused on examining full-time community college faculty and their career paths. Research that examined adjunct faculty and their careers paths could not be found in the review of literature. However, Fugate and Amey's research is significant and provides insight into the possible career paths and motivations of many current adjunct faculty teaching at institutions of higher education. The data from the 1993 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty also underpins the significance of Fugate and Amey's research.

The 2002 NCES report that analyzed data from 1993 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty survey was the first study to examine the motivations of adjunct faculty and their rationale for pursing employment in higher education. Data from the survey revealed nearly

70% of adjunct faculty were motivated and sought employment in higher education due to their desire to be part of an academic environment (NCES, 2002). Of those adjuncts who actively sought employment in higher education, approximately 50% reported a preference for part-time teaching in a community college (NCES, 2002). Although direct links cannot be made between the two studies, it can be concluded there is some evidence that full-time faculty's decision to seek employment is based upon fit and adjunct faculty's desire to work part-time is based upon a desire to be part of an academic environment. Therefore, the motivations to teach are closely related between full-time and adjunct faculty.

This conclusion is supported by similar findings based upon research conducted by Morton and Rittenburg (1986). Morton and Rittenburg conducted a two-phase study with the purpose of identifying teaching motivations for adjunct faculty. Participants were randomly selected based upon criteria that included adjunct faculty who taught at least one course, credit or non-credit, at a comprehensive community college located in Nebraska. Based upon these criteria, 294 adjunct faculty participated in the first phase of the study; during the second phase of the study, an expanded survey was administered to an additional 1,200 adjunct faculty who taught non-credit courses at the participating institution (Morton & Rittenburg, 1986).

Using a factor analysis methodology, Morton and Rittenburg (1986) found adjunct faculty were motivated to teach by six principal reasons. The most significant motivating factor identified was the pursuit of professional growth, followed by the desire to earn additional income (Gappa & Leslie, 1993; Morton & Rittenburg, 1986). The remaining motives to teach part-time were divided by Morton and Rittenburg (1986) into two categories: intrinsic and extrinsic.

According to Gappa and Leslie (1993), intrinsic motivations to teach included "personal development, social interaction, and community or professional service" (p. 37) which served as the primary motivating factors for adjunct faculty. Based on their research, Morton and Rittenburg (1986) found adjunct faculty who taught primarily for intrinsic satisfaction were likely to hold employment positions outside of their teaching role and were "motivated to teach part-time because of the satisfaction the work itself brings" (as cited in Gappa & Leslie, 1993, p. 37). It was also found that extrinsic factors such as money, status, and the prospect of full-time employment were secondary motivations for adjunct faculty (Morton & Rittenburg, 1986). However, Morton and Rittenburg found that extrinsic motivations increased in importance with adjunct faculty in large metropolitan areas, where the cost of living was typically higher, but also noted that financial gain alone was not reason enough for the majority of adjunct faculty.

Impact on higher education. The impact of adjunct faculty on higher education has been widely debated within and outside academe. Given the number of adjunct faculty teaching within higher education, their significance cannot be denied. Due to shrinking budgets, more community colleges have become dependent on adjunct faculty to teach a number of basic courses, particularly general education courses that help them fulfill their mission (Maynard & Joseph, 2006).

Student learning. One of the most commonly cited concerns regarding adjunct faculty is their lack of preparedness and experience to teach college-level coursework. As noted in an earlier section of this chapter, adjunct faculty generally have less teaching experience and possess slightly lower levels of education compared to their full-time counterparts. However, according to Nutting (2003), in some cases adjunct faculty may be better prepared and more qualified to teach college-level courses than full-time faculty. For example, Nutting asserts that

many institutions have begun to utilize full-time faculty in areas outside their discipline in order to achieve some cost savings. However, full-time faculty who teach outside their field may be less experienced and less well prepared than adjunct faculty who hold appropriate credentials. Nutting posits the likelihood of such occurrences may be more predominant in large metropolitan areas that tend to attract well-educated professionals at higher rates than rural communities.

Nutting's (2003) assertion is anecdotal and not based upon research. As a result, Nutting's work cannot be viewed as scientifically valid, but may hold some value. Based upon research using data from the 1988 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty and interviews conducted with 240 adjunct faculty, Gappa and Leslie (1993) found that adjunct faculty were generally better prepared to teach college-level coursework than typically assumed. However, additional research concluded that students generally rated adjunct faculty lower than full-time faculty in the areas of "knowledge of subject, presentation of materials, and other key issues" (Fagan-Wilen, Springer, Ambrosino, & White, 2006, p. 42).

Klein, Weisman, and Smith (1996) conducted research to examine the effectiveness of adjunct faculty in the classroom from a student's point of view. The purpose of the study was to examine the "benefits and problems of having adjunct faculty" (p. 255). The research consisted of a pilot study where 175 social work students from 10 different institutions were surveyed using a questionnaire (Klein et al., 1996).

Through quantitative data analysis, results of the research found that adjunct faculty played "a significant role" (Klein et al., 1996, p. 262) in student learning. Additionally, based upon data from student questionnaires, adjunct faculty were rated as being less effective than

full-time faculty. However, it should be noted that students still rated the effectiveness of

adjunct faculty in the classroom as positive (Klein et al., 1996).

Several similar studies have been conducted to measure the influence of adjunct faculty

on student learning and the effectiveness of their teaching. Schuetz (2002) conducted a study of

the Center for the Study of Community College's (CSCC) survey that was administered in 2000.

The sample consisted of more than "1,500 faculty respondents from over 100 community

colleges nationwide" (p. 39). Of the 1,500 respondents in the survey, full-time faculty accounted

for 71% and adjunct faculty the remaining 29%. Whereas full-time faculty accounted for the

vast majority of survey respondents, the proportion of adjunct faculty was similar to national

norms. The purpose of the study was to examine the pedagogy employed by adjunct faculty and

to determine if the use of adjunct faculty in higher education undermined or contributed "to

teaching effectiveness and student learning" (p. 39). Using selected questions from the CSCC's

survey, cross tabulations and t-tests were conducted to measure if any significant differences

between full-time and adjunct faculty occurred.

Based upon the results of the data, it was found that "adjunct faculty were more

significantly different than full-time faculty and were less likely to collaborate with colleagues,

co-teach, use innovative teaching styles, or utilize technology in the classroom" (Schuetz, 2002,

p. 44). Data revealed adjunct faculty were also less likely to have revised a syllabus or learning

objectives, interacted with students outside the classroom, and possess knowledge about campus

services or extracurricular student activities when compared to full-time faculty (Schuetz, 2002).

Schuetz's (2002) research concluded adjunct faculty utilized different pedagogical

approaches than full-time faculty. The types of pedagogy typically utilized by adjunct faculty

were generally less interactive and more based upon traditional lecturing styles. Additionally,

Schuetz found that adjunct faculty were generally less informed about campus resources and services and therefore were less able to communicate that information to their students. Based upon these types of pedagogical approaches and deficiencies in knowledge regarding campus resources, adjunct faculty tended to be less connected to students and their learning process and less able to provide direction and guidance to students outside the classroom (Schuetz, 2002).

Umbach (2007) conducted additional research to further examine the effectiveness of adjunct faculty. Umbach's study sought to understand the extent adjunct faculty engaged students compared to full-time faculty and the influence the proportion of adjunct faculty had on engaging students in good practices. Umbach also sought to examine the influence of adjunct faculty on various institutions.

The study consisted of data from 132 institutions that used adjunct faculty in undergraduate education and was limited to faculty who taught at least one course during the 2002-2003 spring term. Based upon these criteria, data from 17,914 faculty were used in the study (Umbach, 2007). The instrument used "was designed to measure faculty expectations for student engagement in educational practices known to be linked with high levels of learning and development" (Umbach, 2007, p. 96), as well as "how faculty members structured their classroom and out-of-class work" (Umbach, 2007, p. 96). A "series of hierarchical linear models (HLM)" (Umbach, 2007, p. 97) was used to "examine institutional and individual characteristics related to the outcomes of interest" (Umbach, 2007, p. 97).

Results from this study indicated that part-time teaching appointments had a negative influence on adjunct faculty's job performance with undergraduate education (Umbach, 2007). Data also indicated adjunct faculty were outperformed by their full-time counterparts in the areas

of student interaction, active and collaborative teaching techniques, class preparation and planning, and generally had lowered academic expectations of students in their classes.

In additional analysis of nationwide surveys of community college faculty, adjunct faculty were also found to be less involved with the development of "curriculum, instruction, and scholarship" (Freeland, 1998, p. 8). While pedagogical differences between adjunct and full-time faculty existed, several studies concluded that student learning is not negatively affected by the use of adjunct faculty. Specifically, Kamps (as cited in Capiro, Dubowsky, Warasila, Cheatwood, & Costa, 1998) administered pre- and post-tests and compared the mean results of students who were taught by full-time faculty with those taught by adjunct faculty. Based upon the results of the pre- and post-tests, no significant differences were found between the two groups (Capiro et al., 1998). Similar research studies have found no significant negative influence on student learning in courses taught by adjunct faculty (Hom, 2001; Kamps, as cited in Parsons, 1998; Umbach, 2007; Wallin, 2004).

Although several studies have found no significant negative impact of adjunct faculty instruction on student learning, other research concluded a negative influence on student relationships with their institution when instructed by adjunct faculty (Umbach, 2007). Additionally, his research found that a negative relationship existed among the use of adjunct faculty, retention, and graduation, concluding the greater percentage of courses taught by adjunct faculty, the less likely a student would graduate (Umbach, 2007).

Johnson (2006) conducted a study to further "explore the extent of student exposure to part-time faculty and its relation to student retention at a single institution" (p. 3). The institution utilized in Johnson's study enrolled approximately 12,000 students and was a public research

university located in the Midwest. Data from the institution's faculty and students during the

2004-2005 academic year were utilized and allowed Johnson to assess:

> …demographic characteristics and education of part-time instructors and non-
>
> tenured/tenured track faculty compared to full-time tenure/tenure track faculty at the
>
> institution. The analysis of student data allowed examining exposure to part-time and
>
> non-tenure/tenure track faculty and its effect on student retention. (p. 4)

Data from the study were analyzed using a descriptive analysis process to "assess

demographic characteristics and education of part-time instructors as compared to full-time

faculty, the share of courses taught by part-timers across student classification and colleges, and

the relation between the share of courses taught by part-timers and student retention" (Johnson,

2006, p. 5). Previously conducted research concluded exposure to adjunct faculty instruction in

50% or more of a student's course load resulted in a negative influence on retention, persistence,

and ultimately graduation (Kehrberg & Turpin as cited in Johnson, 2006; Schibik & Harrington,

2004). However, according to Johnson (2006), the likelihood of taking 50% or more courses

from adjunct faculty decreased as the overall number of courses completed increased (Johnson,

2006). Therefore, accounting for student enrollment status, Johnson concluded the effects of

being taught by an adjunct faculty on student retention "is marginal and disappears after

controlling for other student characteristics" (p. 12).

Finances. Historically, adjunct faculty have served as the "relief valve" for institutions

when faced with financial challenges or difficulty in mobilizing assets to support and sustain

growth. According to Noble (2000), the use of adjunct faculty has been critical to the survival of

many institutions, particularly community colleges. As the number of students attending

community colleges continues to grow, adjunct faculty have been used as a mechanism to

support enrollment growth by allowing institutions to quickly add or drop courses based upon

demand (Gappa & Leslie, 1993). Institutions of higher education have begun to recognize the

many benefits associated with employing adjunct faculty (Gappa & Leslie, 1993). Two of the

key benefits are the ability to hire individuals with specialization in areas from outside

professions or industries and the flexibility to employ, terminate, and rehire individuals to meet

the needs of the institution (Wallin, 2005).

It has been stated the use of adjunct faculty in higher education is similar to the use of

temporary employees or migrant workers in business and industry. In recent years, institutions

of higher education have experienced "declines in public trust, decreases in governmental

funding, and sharp increases in student enrollments" (Umbach, 2007, p. 92). As a result,

institutions of higher education have sought to use adjunct faculty to build a more flexible and

lower cost workforce (Klein et al., 1996; Umbach, 2007). In keeping this perspective, Wyles

(1998) maintains:

> This situation for part-time faculty is simply a microcosm of our national economy in
>
> which one in three workers is a contingent worker. Nationally, from 1969-1992 the
>
> number of part-time workers has increased by 88.9% and approximately 75% of new
>
> teaching jobs are filled by part-time faculty…The shift to increasing the numbers of part-
>
> time hires is part of the wide employment pattern of downsizing, subcontracting, and
>
> outsourcing. (p. 90)

Over the past several years, the use of adjunct faculty has become commonplace and is

expected to continue for the next several years. According to Valadez and Anthony (2001), the

use of adjunct faculty will continue due to rising instructional costs, the need for institutions to

have flexible staffing, the availability of credentialed individuals who are unable to secure a full-time academic appointment, and the continued growth of American community colleges.

Reductions in state contributions to higher education have resulted in institutions becoming more dependent on adjunct faculty (Banachowski, 1997; Wallin, 2005), and administrators cite the financial benefits of using adjunct faculty as the primary rationale for their employment (Charfauros & Tierney, 1999; Gorse, 2004; Klein et al., 1996). Additionally, a number of scholars have asserted that adjunct faculty should not be utilized purely for financial gain, but rather should be used to enhance the overall learning experience of students by utilizing their skills, experiences, and expertise (Styne, 1997).

Over the past several years, state financial support for higher education has declined, as an increased need for state social services and other programs has occurred. Therefore, "as state support declines and there is more competition for the public dollar from Medicare, social security, and other mandated social programs, state legislatures have increasingly turned to higher education, including community colleges, for assistance in trimming state budgets" (Wallin, 2005, p. 5). The growth in higher education participation, as well as the number and size of institutions in the twentieth century, has been phenomenal and is due in large part to the 1944 Serviceman's Readjustment Act and the launching of Sputnik in 1957 (Brewster, 2000; Thelin, 2004).

Since its birth in 1636 at Harvard University, American higher education has developed into a mature industry (Rudolph, 1990). As a whole, higher education displays many of the characteristics associated with a mature industry, including marginal growth over the next several years (Brewster, 2000). Typically, mature industries are less attractive to the public at

large and often experience increased governmental regulation and decreased financial support

(Levine, 1997).

In an effort to balance institutional budgets, colleges and university have utilized adjunct

faculty as a cost-savings measure. Recent estimates place the use of adjunct faculty in the

classroom at nearly 52% (AFT, 2002). According to data collected from the 1988 National

Survey of Postsecondary Faculty, adjunct faculty are:

> most commonly found in the fine arts (40% of the total faculty), business (30%), and
>
> education and the humanities (26%). They are less commonly found in agriculture and
>
> home economics (14%), the social sciences (19%), and the natural and health sciences
>
> and engineering (all averaging about 22%). (Gappa & Leslie, 1993, p. 111)

It is widely recognized that one of the benefits of hiring adjunct faculty is the lower cost

associated with their employment, including cost-saving measures that exclude participation in

health care and retirement programs (Wallin, 2005). It is estimated that courses taught by

adjunct faculty in community colleges cost only between 50% and 80% of a course taught by a

full-time faculty, resulting in a significant instructional cost savings for institutions (Charfauros

& Tierney, 1999). According to Frakt and Castagnera (2000), adjunct faculty earn on average

about $2,500 per course or approximately 40% of the cost of a full-time faculty across all

disciplines (Klein et al., 1996).

Institutions of higher education have been able to maintain a relatively low amount of

compensation for adjunct faculty due to the high availability of qualified individuals, which

includes an oversupply of individuals with doctorates in the humanities for the past 25 years

(Austin, 2002; Will, 1999). Additionally, through the hiring of adjunct faculty locally,

institutions have been able to negate market forces (Twombly, 2005) and retain the ability to hire

and fire adjunct faculty at any time, resulting in a buyer's market for colleges and universities (Brewster, 2000; Grusin & Reed, 1994). To further underscore the cost efficiency of utilizing adjunct faculty in the classroom, the AAUP (1997) indicated "one study of community college salaries estimated that a teaching load that would require $35,000 - $40,000 for a full-time appointment would cost only $15,000 if taught by several part-time faculty members" (p. 4).

While one of the commonly held assumptions of adjunct faculty is their desire to teach full-time, it should be noted that several recent studies, including those conducted by the U.S. Department of Education and the National Education Association (Fulton, 2000), indicated approximately one-third of adjunct faculty attempted to make a living wage on their teaching salary and the remaining two-thirds were fully employed outside their adjunct teaching position (Fulton, 2000). These findings are underpinned by the demographical information discussed earlier in the chapter regarding adjunct faculty salaries which averaged $43,800 with only $9,000 coming from their adjunct faculty appointment (NCES, 2005).

Summary of Categories of Adjunct Faculty, Motivations, and Impact

In 1978, Tuckman developed eight categories, based upon research, to help better understand adjunct faculty working in higher education. Those categories were: semi-retired, graduate students, hopeful full-timers, full-mooners, homeworkers, part-mooners, and part-time unknowners. Since his original work, little research has been conducted to further examine the types of individuals who are adjunct faculty. However, building upon Tuckman's work, Gappa and Leslie (1993) developed a new system of categorizing adjunct faculty using broader definitions. According to Gappa and Leslie, adjunct faculty could be categorized as career-enders, specialists, experts and professionals, aspiring academics, and freelancers.

A great deal is unknown about the types of individuals who hold adjunct faculty positions within higher education, and additional research should be conducted to understand their motivations. As part of the process to understand adjunct faculty motivations, this review of literature also examined the paths that led adjunct faculty to their employment. Although specific research regarding adjunct faculty career paths could not be found, a relevant study conducted by Fugate and Amey (2000) which examined full-time faculty provided some insight. Based upon their research, Fugate and Amey concluded full-time faculty, in general, did not seek teaching positions within community colleges. Data indicated that full-time faculty frequently left previous career paths to pursue a teaching position or accepted a teaching position simply because one had been offered to them (Fugate & Amey, 2000).

Although little is known about the paths that led individuals to adjunct faculty positions, a greater understanding of their motivations exists. Several research studies have been conducted to provide insight. Morton and Rittenburg (1986) concluded that adjunct faculty were motivated to teach based upon six principle reasons. The primary reasons were the pursuit of professional growth and the ability to earn more income (Gappa & Leslie, 1993; Morton & Rittenburg, 1986). The remaining motivating reasons were divided into two categories: intrinsic and extrinsic. Intrinsic motivations included "personal development, social interaction, and community or professional service" (Gappa & Leslie, 199, p. 37); and extrinsic motivations included things such as status and the prospect of securing a full-time teaching position (Morton & Rittenburg, 1986). Morton and Rittenburg concluded adjunct faculty taught more for intrinsic reward, and extrinsic reward, including the ability to increase one's income level, was a secondary motivating factor.

Debate about the influence of adjunct faculty on student learning and higher education as a whole continues. One of the concerns often expressed is the level of preparedness of adjunct faculty prior to entering the classroom. Using data from the 1988 National Study of Postsecondary Education, Gappa and Leslie (1993) concluded that adjunct faculty were generally better prepared for the classroom than typically assumed. However, research revealed that from a student point of view, adjunct faculty were rated lower than full-time faculty in the areas of "knowledge of subject, presentation of materials, and other key issues" (Fagan-Wilen et al., 2006, p. 42). Further research conducted by Klein et al. (1996) concluded that students rated adjunct faculty as overall less effective than full-time faculty.

Additional research was conducted to examine if any difference between pedagogical approaches exists between full-time and adjunct faculty. Using data from a survey administered in 2000 by the Center for the Study of Community Colleges, it was concluded that significant differences between the types of pedagogy utilized does exist. Specifically, it was found that adjunct faculty were likely to "never use (1) guest lecturers, (2) tapes and videos, (3) laboratory experiments, and (4) computers and the Internet" (Wallin, 2004, p. 381).

Although adjunct faculty are perceived as less effective and more likely to use traditional pedagogical approaches, several research studies have been conducted to examine their effect on student learning. Umbach's (2007) study concluded the use of adjunct faculty did not have a negative impact on student learning. However, Umbach's (2007) research also revealed that adjunct faculty were outperformed by their full-time counterparts in the areas of student interaction, active and collaborative teaching techniques, class preparation and planning. Adjunct faculty, in general, also had lower academic expectations of their students. Additional research was conducted by Kamps (as cited in Capiro et al., 1998) to further examine the influence of

adjunct faculty on student learning. Using data from pre- and post-tests, Kamps found that no

significant difference existed in student learning based upon the status of the faculty, full-time or

adjunct. Kamps' research supports Umbach's findings.

While no research exists to support the belief that student learning is negatively affected

by the use of adjunct faculty, other research has been conducted to examine the effects of adjunct

faculty and their influence on student persistence and retention. According to research

conducted by Johnson (2006), it was concluded that being taught by adjunct faculty did not

negatively influence student persistence and retention. However, the number of courses taken

that were taught by adjunct faculty did have a negative influence on student retention and

persistence. Johnson found that when 50% or more of a student's courses were taught by adjunct

faculty, a significant negative influence on persistence and retention occurred.

Adjunct faculty not only play a pivotal role in learning and other student outcomes within

higher education, they also have a significant role within the financial arena of higher education.

As previously mentioned, adjunct faculty have served as a relief valve for financial pressures in

higher education and their use has continued to grow over the past 30 years. According to Noble

(2000), the continued use of adjunct faculty in higher education is vital, and in many instances,

they allow community colleges to fulfill their mission. As American higher education matured,

institutions collectively began to demonstrate several characteristics associated with a mature

industry. As a mature industry, higher education has experienced increased governmental

intervention, decreased financial support from state and Federal governments, and has been

viewed less favorably by the public at large (Levine, 1997).

Based upon data collected from the 1988 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty, it was

found that adjunct faculty provided 52% of all coursework instruction (AFT, 2002). The same

data revealed adjunct faculty were more concentrated in the areas of fine arts, business, education, and the humanities. Lower levels of concentration of adjunct faculty were found in the academic areas of agriculture and home economics, social sciences, natural and health sciences, and engineering (Gappa & Leslie, 1993).

The use of adjunct faculty has two primary benefits for institutions of higher education: the ability to maintain a flexible workforce and to control instructional cost by paying adjunct faculty less than full-time faculty, as well as not extending employee benefits to adjunct faculty and their families. Because adjunct faculty are typically employed on a course, semester, or academic year basis, institutions can adjust the size of their workforce to match student enrollment and course demand and can experience considerable savings with payroll and employee benefits. On average, adjunct faculty earned about $2,500 per course or approximately 40% of what full-time faculty earned (Klein et al., 1996). Further, the AAUP (1997) stated the employment of one full-time faculty would cost an institution on average $35,000 to $40,000 per year, whereas an adjunct faculty would only cost $15,000.

Adjunct faculty experiences. This section of the chapter is divided into two categories. The first focuses on the environmental conditions that many adjunct faculty experience working in higher education. In the environmental section, issues such as access to appropriate equipment, supplies, and other resources are discussed. The second section focuses on the availability of professional development opportunities for both full-time and adjunct faculty.

Environmental. For over 20 years, adjunct faculty have been utilized in institutions of higher education (Gappa & Leslie, 1993). However, institutions have struggled to integrate adjunct faculty into the cultural fabric of higher education. The lack of adjunct faculty integration is widely acknowledged and little research beyond doctoral dissertations has been

conducted and published. Most researchers have found that institutions marginalize and exclude adjunct faculty from active involvement in the institution (McLaughlin, 2005). According to Evans et al. (2010), individuals who experience feelings of marginalization may also experience "a sense of not fitting in and can lead to self-consciousness, irritability, and depression" (p. 31). In her research on marginality and mattering, Schlossberg (1989) asserted that feelings of marginalization often occur when individuals make substantial life changes that transition the individual from one identity to another and that such transitions often results in a lack of clarity or confusion regarding newly assumed identities.

Scholarly research conducted by Burnstad (2002) also documented the feelings of adjunct faculty who indicate "they were [*sic*] not 'connected' to or 'integrated' into campus life. For the most part, they feel powerless, alienated, invisible, and second class" (p. 17). In an interview, a senior-level academic administrator described adjunct faculty as "fine wine at discount prices" (Gappa & Leslie, 1993, p. 141). During the interview, he further elaborated that adjunct faculty:

> …are often very fine teachers, and our money goes much further than when we put all into full-time faculty. Furthermore, we can "pour it down the drain" if they have any flaws at all. We have made no big investment in part-time faculty. (Gappa & Leslie, 1993, p. 141)

Schlossberg's (1989) research also revealed that individuals who feel marginalized also often feel that "they do not matter" (p. 6). Schlossberg (1989) stated in her research that "mattering refers to our belief, weather right or wrong, that we matter someone else" (p. 9) and the sense of mattering is important throughout one's life cycle. Schlossberg (1989) further stated that when individuals feel that they belong or are connected to either an organization or

individual, they develop a sense of mattering, which in turns eliminates feelings of marginalization.

It should be recognized adjunct faculty's transition to higher education can be a complex and often difficult process due to their "limited knowledge about the inner workings, culture, and language of academia" (Fogg, 2002, p. A15). Organizational culture plays an important role in any organization and higher education is no exception.

According to Schein (2004), culture is not a tangible singular entity but rather an abstraction that is complex and hidden below the superficial layers of an organization. Culture is not what is merely seen or observed on the surface. Rather, culture is much deeper and is found within an organization's actions and is communicated through individuals or groups based upon their own personal experiences (Frost & Jean, 2000; Schein, 2004). Institutions of higher education have done little to help transition adjunct faculty into the academic world and have made little effort to connect adjunct faculty with institutional values, culture, and mission (Alfred, 2003). According to Pearch and Marutz (2005), these connections and transmission of culture cannot be effectively done through the use of faculty handbooks and other printed materials. In order for adjunct faculty to become integrated into the environment of higher education, purposeful interaction and activity must occur.

In spite of their significance to higher education, adjunct faculty frequently experience strained relationships with full-time faculty due to role confusion and "unclear administrative policies for the hiring, retention, and management of part-timers" (Pearch & Marutz, 2005, p. 32). Strained relationships with full-time faculty coupled with other factors often result in adjunct faculty feeling like second-class citizens within the academy or part of an invisible faculty altogether (Gappa & Leslie, 1993; McLaughlin, 2005; Roueche et al., 1996). Such

results are ironic given the purpose and mission of community colleges who "claim (a) to be of and about building community, (b) to promote egalitarian and inclusive values, and (c) to provide access while simultaneously achieving excellence in higher education" (Roueche et al., 1996, p. 107). Gappa and Leslie (1993) found that where there is universal dissatisfaction with pay, benefits, and other tangible support, adjunct faculty who feel as if they are part of a collaborative and singular faculty express more positive feelings about their work and their involvement with the campus and greater institutional community than adjunct faculty who feel excluded and marginalized.

As noted earlier in this chapter, adjunct faculty are paid significantly less than their full-time faculty counterparts and generally are ineligible for employment benefits, including health care and retirement (Wallin, 2005). Additionally, adjunct faculty also are promoted less frequently, have fewer opportunities for professional development, and are less involved in the development of curriculum and scholarship than their full-time counterparts (Gaillard-Kenney, 2006). Based upon these realities, adjunct faculty often perceive their status and are viewed by others within higher education as being inferior (McLaughlin, 2005).

Resources. In addition to the environmental issues described above, the higher education community may perceive that adjunct faculty often lack the necessary resources to fulfill their job responsibilities and perform duties. During a conference in 1997, the AAUP attempted to bring issues regarding the availability of resources, or the lack thereof, into the forefront of higher education. As part of the conference, AAUP (1997) issued the *Statement from the Conference on the Growing Use of Part-Time and Adjunct Faculty*, which included a provision that sought to provide adjunct faculty with appropriate resources, equipment, and support.

In 2002, Townsend and Hauss conducted a survey in collaboration with the American Historical Association (AHA) and the Organization of American Historians (OAH) to collect data on adjunct faculty and their experiences. A multiple-choice survey was developed and distributed via AHA and OAH newsletters. Two hundred and seventy-six completed surveys were returned and 256 participants indicated they were currently employed as adjunct faculty in an institution of higher education (Townsend & Hauss, 2002). Data collected from the surveys were analyzed and reported as percentages. It was revealed approximately 27% of adjunct faculty did not have access to office space, 26% did not have access to a college-supplied telephone, and 42% lacked access to computers on campus (Townsend & Hauss, 2002). Additionally, it was found that 8% of adjunct faculty did not have access to photocopiers or photocopying services and 8% had no access to library resources (Townsend & Hauss, 2002).

The research conducted by Townsend and Hauss (2002) provided some insight into lack of resources provided for adjunct faculty. Yet, their work cannot be considered scientifically valid due in part to the basic analysis and reporting of data that were conducted. However, limited research in this area appears to exist. One additional research study was identified in the review of literature for this study.

In 2004, Akroyd, Jeager, Jackowski, and Jones conducted research using data from the 1999 National Student of Postsecondary Faculty to "compare access to the Internet and use of the Web for instructional purposes between full-time and part-time community college faculty" (p. 41). Their research was guided by questions that sought to understand if a relationship between faculty status and the availability of the Internet existed, if a relationship existed between faculty status and the use of the Internet to provide additional instructional information to students, if the use of the Internet varied by discipline type for full-time and adjunct faculty,

and to examine if a relationship "between use of email to communicate with students and faculty status" (p. 41) existed.

Data collected from the sample were "a two-stage stratified clustered probability design" (Akroyd et al., 2004, p. 41) and additional filters were used to include only faculty who taught at two year colleges. Through this process, the final sample consisted of 3,195 participants whose primary role within their institution was instruction (Akroyd et al., 2004). Based upon the analysis of data, it was found that 93% of community college full-time faculty and 84% of adjunct faculty had some type of Internet access (Akroyd et al., 2004). However, the research revealed that while a relatively high number of both full-time and adjunct faculty were able to access the Internet, approximately 40% of adjunct faculty did not have Internet access on the campus where they taught (Akroyd et al., 2004). The use of the Internet by full-time and adjunct faculty was only slightly different, with 28% of full-time faculty and 23% of adjunct faculty indicating its use to communicate information to students (Akroyd et al., 2004). Additionally, it was found that a statistically significant higher number of full-time faculty, approximately 48%, used email to communicate with students, whereas only 34% of adjunct faculty did (Akroyd et al., 2004). In conclusion, Akroyd et al. (2004), found that by not having Internet access on the campus where they taught was a significant factor in the use of Internet by adjunct faculty in community colleges.

Professional development. Although literature stresses the importance of professional development in higher education, adjunct faculty frequently lack the opportunity to participate in institutional professional development workshops, programs, and other opportunities provided to full-time faculty (Murray, 1999). Yet, according to Schuster, Wheeler, and Associates (1990), institutions of higher education have not sufficiently adjusted to meet the changing needs of full-

time and adjunct faculty, nor provided sufficient resources for appropriate professional

development. Additionally, Schuster et al., stated "it is indeed striking how much has been

written about faculty growth and renewal and how few campuses have seen fit to develop

comprehensive systematic programs" (p. 3).

In 1999, Murray conducted research to determine the extent that community colleges

were meeting the professional development needs of adjunct faculty. In order to determine this,

a 65-item survey was distributed to 250 randomly selected institutions across the nation.

Approximately 54% of the surveys were completed and returned, with seven of the surveys

being determined as unusable; the remaining 130 were included in the study.

An analysis of data from the survey was conducted by dividing the survey into four parts:

The first part queried respondents regarding institutional demographics, the office or

person responsible for faculty development, and the scope of this [sic] person's

responsibilities. The second part inquired about the existence and the extent of support

for faculty development programming. The third part probed the connections between

participation in faculty development and the reward structure of the institution. The final

part quizzed those responsible for faculty development to determine their beliefs about

the importance and the effects of faculty development activities. (Murray, 1999, p. 50)

Based upon the 130 responses received in the study, only three institutions indicated

having an individual solely dedicated to providing faculty development throughout the college

(Murray, 1999). In the remaining 127 responses, survey participants indicated an individual who

had other primary administrative or teaching responsibilities or both provided the vast majority

of faculty development. Of the 127 participants who indicated primary duties besides

professional development, 43% indicated they spent less than 10% of their time working on

professional development activities (Murray, 1999). However, it should be noted 19 survey

participants indicated professional development opportunities were not open to adjunct faculty in

their institution, while the remaining 108 participating institutions indicated that some, but not

all, professional development activities were open and accessible to adjunct faculty (Murray,

1999).

Based upon these research findings, Murray (1999) asserted that most faculty

development programs lacked cohesion and were little more than "collections of loosely

connected efforts" (p. 48) implemented by colleges and universities. Murray went on to state

that institutions of higher education should develop programs that consist of more than a single

program or a series of programs offered to faculty, both full-time and adjunct. When developing

a comprehensive professional development model, Murray indicated institutions must develop a

framework that supports the mission of the institution and be "systematic, demonstrable, and

highly regarded the improvement of teaching" (p. 48). Based upon the analysis of data from his

study, Murray concluded that effective faculty development programs at community colleges

must consist of:

> …institutional support, that is, a climate that fosters and encourages faculty development;
>
> a formalized, structured, and goal-directed development program; a connection between
>
> faculty development and the reward structure; faculty ownership; support for colleagues
>
> for investments in teaching; and a belief that good teaching is valued by administrators.
>
> (p. 48)

Job satisfaction. Over the past several years, community colleges have been described

by scholars as complex and bureaucratic organizations that are dominated by administrators and

usually lack faculty involvement (Kim, Twombly & Wolf-Wendel., 2008). According to

Birnbaum (1988), bureaucratic organizations exist to achieve clearly defined goals and focus on the standardization of behavior, "activities and processes…so that the organization can become more efficient and effective" (p. 107). Using this definition, Bolman and Deal (2003) characterized a bureaucratic organization as one that focuses on being efficient by clearly delineating the division of labor within the organization, relying on rationality in making decisions, and structuring the organizational design to meet its needs. Due to the bureaucratic tendencies of community colleges, some scholars have asserted that faculty, both full-time and adjunct, have become managed professionals within the academy and lack the ability to be autonomous (Kim et al., 2008).

Huber (1998) utilized data from the Carnegie Foundation's 1997 National Survey of Faculty to examine faculty trends within community colleges, as well as the attitudes of faculty who teach at two year institutions. The 1997 National Survey of Faculty consisted of a 68-item survey with many items with multiple parts. In total, participants were asked to respond to over 250 questions that focused on demographics, "working conditions of faculty, scholarly activities, institutional governance, goals of higher education, campus community, higher education and society, and the international dimensions of higher education" (p. 39). In total, "306 colleges and universities were randomly selected" (p. 39) to participate in the research study, with approximately 34 institutions coming from each of the nine Carnegie Foundation's classifications and approximately 10,000 faculty (Huber, 1998). In order to narrow the sample size, a "two-stage, stratified random sample design was used. In the first stage, universities and colleges (both four year and two year) were selected; in the second stage, faculty recipients were designated" (p. 39) which resulted in 5,151 usable surveys.

Based upon the analysis of the data, it was revealed that "80% of community college faculty were satisfied with their job situation as a whole. However, 66% were satisfied with their department and only 38% were satisfied with their institution" (Kim et al., 2008, p. 161). While Huber's (1998) research focused on all community college faculty, prior to 2001, little was known about adjunct faculty satisfaction (Valadez & Anthony, 2001).

Valadez and Anthony (2001) conducted research whose purpose "was to examine the accuracy" (p. 98) of the perception that adjunct faculty were frustrated members of the academy and to explore "the satisfaction and commitment" (p. 98) of adjunct faculty in their role as professionals. Based upon their review of literature, Valadez and Anthony found "virtually no literature" (p. 99) existed.

Data for their research were collected from the 1992 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty, which included data from 974 institutions and 31,354 faculty at participating institutions (Valadez & Anthony, 2001). They established criteria that narrowed the sample size and only utilized data from individuals who indicated their primary role within higher education was as faculty and again applied additional filters for part-time faculty. With these criteria, the sample excluded faculty who indicated research or administrative responsibilities as their primary role. As a result of these criteria, the final sample included data from 6,811 adjunct faculty (Valadez & Anthony, 2001).

The researchers identified 15 items on the questionnaire developed by the NCES and administered as part of the 1992 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty. All 15 questions "addressed how satisfied individuals were with various aspects of their jobs" (Valadez & Anthony, 2001, p. 100). Valadez and Anthony (2001) grouped the questions into three categories: satisfaction with autonomy, satisfaction with students, and satisfaction with demands

and rewards. A factor analysis was conducted on 14 of the 15 questions and "the remaining item, overall job satisfaction, was allowed to remain a standalone variable representing a global measure of satisfaction" (p. 100).

Based upon the analysis of data, Valadez and Anthony (2001) found the vast majority of adjunct faculty were satisfied with their jobs. However, the research was unable to measure if individual participants would pursue their positions within higher education again, if given the opportunity. But, according to Valadez and Anthony, participants indicated their experiences as adjunct faculty had not "discouraged them from pursuing academic careers" (p. 103). With regard to their commitment to their adjunct faculty position, results based upon an analysis of data concluded that:

> In comparison with four year college part-time faculty members, two year
>
> college faculty members indicated more frequently that higher salary, benefits,
>
> job security, tenure-track or tenured position, opportunities for advancement,
>
> greater opportunity to teach, good instructional facilities, and greater opportunity
>
> for administrative responsibilities would influence their decision to continue in their
>
> current role or pursue other employment opportunities. Additionally, it was found that
>
> adjunct faculty's decision to seek employment outside their current position was
>
> influenced by the ability to access "state-of–the-art classrooms, up-to-date audiovisual
>
> equipment, computer facilities, and sufficient resources to support teaching. (p. 104)

Further, analysis of data noted significant differences with job satisfaction existed between four year and two year colleges, with two year college faculty being slightly less satisfied than four year college faculty, and community college adjunct faculty being less satisfied than community college full-time faculty (Valadez & Anthony, 2001). Valadez and

Anthony (2001) also found adjunct faculty were less satisfied with their position due to a lack of autonomy in the choice of which courses they taught and the lack of freedom to determine the content of their courses. To further support these findings, similar research conducted by Outcalt (2002) found that community college full-time faculty were slightly more satisfied with their positions than community college adjunct faculty.

In 2005, Jacoby (2005) conducted research using data from a survey conducted at a single community college in the state of Washington. In his research, Jacoby sought to identify and understand the characteristics and behaviors of adjunct faculty who were most likely to seek full-time employment within higher education. In this research study, 234 faculty at a single institution were identified and sent surveys that contained "41 questions covering current and recent employment conditions, preferences for hours of work, experiences, current income and sources, perceptions of teaching environment and conditions, and personal data" (p. 140). Out of the 234 distributed to adjunct faculty, only 116 (50%) completed surveys were deemed usable for the purposes of the study. Data from the surveys were analyzed first by documenting basic characteristic variables of the participants and a logistic regression was conducted "to demonstrate which variables significantly change [sic] the odds that a part-time faculty person desires full-time work" (p. 140).

Based upon data collected and analyzed in Jacoby's (2005) research, it was concluded that nearly "76% of the faculty reported working at least 3 quarters at the surveyed institution during the past year" (p. 141) and approximately 50% of the study participants indicated being employed as adjunct faculty in at least one additional campus. Of those teaching in an adjunct capacity, 54% of the study participants indicated a preference for teaching full-time over part-time or as adjunct faculty. However, participants indicated a preference for full-time

employment teaching at a community college. Yet, only 35 of the 116 participants in the study indicated "they expect eventually to attain full-time" (p. 141) employment at their current community college.

In general, Jacoby's (2005) research found that adjunct faculty were generally satisfied with their employment. However, some areas of dissatisfaction were revealed, but were primarily limited to concerns regarding compensation and benefits. Specifically, Jacoby found that adjunct faculty were largely dissatisfied with "employment security" (p. 138) which was directly linked to their part-time or adjunct status within the institution. Although dissatisfied with some facets of their employment, Jacoby also found that younger adjunct faculty were more likely to "establish traditional" (p. 138) careers in higher education. But as younger adjunct faculty become older, many choose to drop out of academia and pursue other careers due to the lack of full-time employment opportunities. However, according to Jacoby, a small portion of adjunct faculty may learn to navigate the process and eventually secure full-time faculty positions, but many continue in their adjunct roles and eventually develop "satisfactory long-term ties with a single institution" (p. 138).

To further examine the link between job satisfaction and autonomy, Kim et al. (2008), conducted a study in 2008 to examine "personal and institutional factors that predict faculty satisfaction with autonomy at community colleges" (p. 160). Using data from the 2004 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty, Kim et al., explored job satisfaction among community college full-time and adjunct faculty by looking at all faculty's satisfaction with autonomy. Specifically, the researchers "examined personal and institutional factors to predict faculty satisfaction with autonomy at community colleges" (Kim et al., 2008, p. 160).

Based upon their research, Kim et al. (2008), found that among all community college faculty, both full-time and adjunct, were generally less satisfied with autonomy than their four year counterparts. However, the analysis of data simultaneously revealed there were no significant differences between adjunct and full-time faculty with regards to overall job satisfaction. Additionally, data found that faculty in a unionized environment reported lower levels of satisfaction with their level of autonomy than their counterparts who taught in a non-unionized environment (Kim et al., 2008).

The research also produced data that identified other factors that influenced job satisfaction among adjunct faculty beyond autonomy (Kim et al., 2008). Specifically, it was concluded through data analysis that adjunct faculty who perceived fair institutional treatment of females and racial minorities were significantly more satisfied with their jobs than those who perceived unfair treatment of females and racial minorities. Other factors that were identified as significant predictors of adjunct faculty job satisfaction included satisfaction with salary, the ability to serve on committees and participate in other administrative duties, and opportunities for professional development that support teaching (Kim et al., 2008).

Data from the 1999 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty support the findings of Kim et al. (2008). In research conducted using the 1999 survey, Akroyd and Caison (2005) sought to examine if any significant differences of job satisfaction occurred between adjunct faculty and full-time faculty. As part of the 1999 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty, participants were asked to complete an instrument that assessed "overall rating of their job" (Wallin, 2005, p. 31). It was a 15-item survey using a Likert Scale with 1 = Very Dissatisfied and 4 = Very Satisfied (Wallin, 2005).

Akroyd and Caison's (2005) research found significant differences among adjunct faculty and full-time faculty in 13 of the 15 areas examined. Findings in Akroyd and Caison's research revealed adjunct faculty were significantly less satisfied with their workload, their perceived level of job security compared to full-time faculty, their ability to advance within the institution, and the lack of benefits provided in comparison to their full-time faculty counterparts. The study also concluded, through the use of a t-test, that adjunct faculty were overall significantly less satisfied with their jobs in comparison to their full-time faculty counterparts (Akroyd & Caison, 2005).

Murray and Cunningham (2004) conducted research on job satisfaction of rural community college faculty and sought to examine the characteristics that attracted individuals to institutions situated in rural communities. Using a qualitative case study approach, Murray and Cunningham conducted semi-structured interviews with 45 faculty who taught at a rural community college a total of less than four years. Data from the interviews were analyzed using qualitative methods, primarily "QSR N5 (NUD*IST)" (p. 23). Data were analyzed using a two-step process: The first step consisted of "unitizing" (p. 23) the data into "units of meaning" (p. 23) and the second step consisted of coding data into "meaningful categories" (p. 23).

Through data analysis, Murray and Cunningham (2004) found that males and females based their level of satisfaction, in part, on their ability to work with and interact with students. However, males and females used different frames of reference in defining their ability to work with and interact with students. According to the research findings, male faculty, in general, reported higher levels of job satisfaction when they felt an ability to experience student academic success and accomplishment. Male faculty also perceived student academic success and accomplishment differently based upon the type of course they taught. Specifically,

The difference between male faculty teaching in transfer disciplines and male faculty

teaching in career programs was that male faculty in career programs never spoke of

students' success in the particular course but rather only of their success in their future

careers. (p. 29)

It was also revealed male faculty who taught transfer courses focused on the students' mastery of

subject matter as their definition of success.

In comparison, female community college faculty reported higher levels of job

satisfaction when they were able to build a relationship with students or witness students achieve

personal success (Murray & Cunningham, 2004). Although female faculty indicated student

success was an important factor, "it was in the context of relationships with students. Female

faculty seemed to take pride in assisting students in developing self-esteem; that is, they seemed

more concerned with the inner state of the students than with actual accomplishment" (p. 30).

Although student interaction, ability to build relationships, and academic success were

key factors in determining rural community college faculty's job satisfaction, Murray and

Cunningham's (2004) research concluded that a faculty's ability to cope with rural life was the

most significant predictor of job satisfaction.

Summary of adjunct faculty experiences. In summary, colleges and universities have

not integrated adjunct faculty into the cultural environment of higher education, evidenced by the

lack of connection and lack of resources provided to adjunct faculty in the performance of their

role. Adjunct faculty report feelings of exclusion and marginalization, which contributes to the

belief that adjunct faculty are second-class citizens or part of an invisible faculty (Gappa &

Leslie, 1993; McLaughlin, 2005; Roueche et al., 1996). While guidelines have been

recommended by the AAUP (1997) to support adjunct faculty, findings from a survey conducted

in 2002 by Townsend and Hauss found a significant percent of adjunct faculty lacked basic

resources to perform their duties.

Data from the survey revealed that 27% of adjunct faculty did not have access to office

space, 26% did not have access to a college-supplied telephone, 42% lacked access to computers

on their campus, 8% lacked access to photocopiers, and 8% were not able to access library

resources (Townsend & Hauss, 2002). Additional research conducted by Akroyd et al. (2004)

concluded that 84% of adjunct faculty had some type of Internet access, only 23% of adjunct

faculty utilized the Internet to provide information or course materials to students, and only 34%

utilized email to communicate with students.

Literature reviewed as part of this research stressed the importance of professional

development for faculty. However, little research regarding professional development was

found. The first comprehensive research into professional development for faculty appears to

have been conducted by Murray in 1999, when he sought to examine the extent to which

colleges and universities were meeting the professional development needs of faculty. Murray

found only three out of 130 institutions surveyed had positions whose primary function was to

provide professional development for faculty. The remaining 127 participating institutions

indicated that someone was responsible for professional development on their campus, but

professional development was not their primary responsibility.

Of the 127 participants who indicated having individuals on their campus responsible for

professional development but not as a primary function, 43% indicated spending less than 10%

of their time on professional development functions (Murray, 1999). Further, it was revealed

where professional development opportunities existed, activities were not always open to adjunct

faculty. Nineteen survey participants indicated professional development activities were not

available to adjunct faculty and 104 of the survey participants indicated that only some

professional development activities were available to adjuncts (Murray, 1999).

Although little has been done to provide professional development opportunities to

faculty, research has been conducted to examine levels of faculty job satisfaction. In 1998,

Huber utilized data from the Carnegie Foundation's 1997 National Survey of Faculty and

concluded "80% of community college faculty were satisfied with their job situation as a whole.

However, 66% were satisfied with their department and only 38% were satisfied with their

institution" (Kim et al., 2008, p. 161).

In 2001, Valadez and Anthony also examined job satisfaction and commitment among

adjunct faculty. Prior to their research, Valadez and Anthony stated that "virtually no literature"

(p. 99) existed on adjunct faculty job satisfaction. Utilizing data from the 1992 National Study

of Postsecondary Faculty, Valadez and Anthony concluded the vast majority of adjunct faculty

were satisfied with their job and also found that their experience as adjunct faculty would not

"discourage them from pursuing academic careers" (p. 103). However, the data revealed that

faculty teaching in four year institutions were slightly more satisfied than faculty teaching in two

year institutions and full-time faculty were slightly more satisfied than adjunct faculty in the

community college setting (Valadez & Anthony, 2001). Specifically, data found adjunct faculty

were less satisfied with their level of autonomy and lack of freedom in determining which

courses they taught and course content (Valadez & Anthony, 2001).

In 2005, Jacoby sought to specifically examine characteristics and behaviors of adjunct

faculty who were most likely to pursue full-time faculty positions. Using data from surveys

conducted at a single community college in the state of Washington, Jacoby (2005) found that

54% of adjunct faculty expressed a preference to teach full-time over part-time, but only 35 of

the 116 individuals who participated in the survey believed they would eventually be hired as full-time faculty (Jacoby, 2005). Jacoby also concluded adjunct faculty were generally satisfied with their employment but expressed dissatisfaction with compensation and benefits.

To further examine issues related to adjunct faculty autonomy, Kim et al. (2008) conducted research utilizing data from the 2004 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty. Their research "examined personal and institutional factors to predict faculty satisfaction with autonomy at community colleges" (p. 160). They concluded that faculty at two year colleges were generally less satisfied than faculty at four year institutions, but found no significant differences between full-time and adjunct faculty at community colleges (Kim et al., 2008).

Additionally, Kim et al. (2008) found that faculty who taught in unionized environments were less satisfied with their level of autonomy than those who did not. Their research also produced data that identified other factors that led to job satisfaction among adjunct faculty. Specifically, data indicated adjunct faculty reported higher levels of job satisfaction when fair treatment of females and racial minorities were perceived, as well as satisfaction with pay, ability to participate in committees, and professional development opportunities (Kim et al., 2008).

In 2004, Murray and Cunningham conducted research on rural community college faculty and examined characteristics associated with their job satisfaction. Based upon an analysis of data collected using semi-structured interviews, Murray and Cunningham found faculty's ability to work and interact with students influenced job satisfaction. However, males and females defined the ability to work and interact with students differently.

Based upon their findings, Murray and Cunningham (2004) found levels of job satisfaction among male faculty were influenced by student academic success and accomplishment, and levels of job satisfaction among female faculty were influenced by the

ability to build a relationship or witness a student achieve personal success. However, they also

concluded the most significant factor in job satisfaction among faculty who taught in rural

locations was the ability of the individual to cope with living in a rural environment (Murray &

Cunningham, 2004).

Theoretical Frames

Based upon the review of current and relevant literature, a number of theoretical frames

can be used to examine the lived experiences of adjunct faculty in higher education. In this

study, two theoretical frames will be used to examine the influence of the adjunct faculty

management program on individual adjunct faculty in the community college system utilized in

this study.

Drawing from research conducted in two year community colleges and four year colleges

and universities, it can be concluded that institutions have struggled to integrate adjunct faculty

into the cultural fabric of higher education. By doing so, colleges and universities have created a

void in adjunct faculty's transition to their respective institutions, leaving individuals with a lack

of clear understanding of the institution's culture, their role and identity within the institution,

and job expectations. As a result, adjunct faculty often feel excluded and marginalized and fail

to connect with the institution and its students (McLaughlin, 2005).

Liminality and sensemaking. In 1967, Turner conducted an anthropological study and

first coined the term "liminality" (Bettis et al., 2005, p. 48). Turner used the term liminality to

describe a period of adolescence in which individuals are in the process of giving up their current

identity and adopting or developing a new identity that assists with assimilating to their

environment. Liminality is also frequently referred to as the process of sensemaking. According

to Turner, the transition from one identity to another is not seamless and individuals typically

experience a time when they are "betwixt and between" (Bettis et al., 2005, p. 48) identities, which often results in a time of reflection, also known as the "interstructural stage" (Bettis et al., 2005, p. 48).

To better understand liminality or sensemaking, the social constructivism paradigm is useful. According to Kezar et al. (2006), the social constructivism paradigm is based upon "the belief that reality is developed through one's interpretation of the world and denial of essences or universal qualities" (p. 19). The social constructivist paradigm, which includes the theory of liminality, is based upon interpretations and the process of understanding environmental factors, including cultural values, beliefs, and norms. Therefore, the process of sensemaking or liminality is based upon comparing current environmental and cultural interactions with one's previously lived experiences and making sense of both (Kezar et al., 2006).

In research conducted by Bettis et al. (2005), it was found that both adjunct and full-time faculty experience a period of liminality or a period of sensemaking during the critical first few months of their teaching and employment experience at an institution of higher education. Reviewed literature also indicated that the "socialization to an organization and a role begins with an anticipatory learning period during which the perspective members begin to assume the values and attitudes of the group they wish to join" (Austin, 2002, p. 96). Therefore, the process of sensemaking can be described as an individual's progress toward understanding and appreciating the "values, attitudes, and expectations" (Austin, 2002, p. 96) of the group or organization.

Using the definition of sensemaking as a framework, one can accept that the process is dynamic and has various meanings for individuals. Therefore, the processes used in sensemaking involve spending "time gathering information, interpreting meaning, negotiating

importance, and evoking symbols to create organizational realities" (Eckel & Kezar, 2003, p. 40). The process of sensemaking is based upon "what people do" (Eckel & Kezar, 2003, p. 41) and participating in activities assists individuals to "create interpretations and meaning" (Eckel & Kezar, 2003, p. 41) of their environment. Based upon this concept, Eckel and Kezar (2003) assert that during times of change, participating in activities helps individuals to understand their surroundings, including organizational culture, and helps create "new meanings" (p. 41) for the individual.

According to Schein (2004), organizational culture is comprised of multiple layers. The first layer is comprised of artifacts, which includes such things as physical structures, language, common understanding, myths, and stories, as well as organizational rituals and ceremonies (Schein. 2004). Additionally, organizational cultural artifacts also include "the process by which behavior is made routine and structural elements such as charters, formal descriptions of how the organization works, and organizational charts" (p. 26).

The second level of organizational culture asserted by Schein (2004) is espoused beliefs and values. An organization's culture "ultimately reflects someone's original beliefs and values, their sense of what ought to be" (p. 28). Typically, espoused beliefs and values become integrated into the organizational culture and become shared by all group members and serve as a touchstone for decision making, action, and future direction of the organization (Schein, 2004).

The third level of organizational culture focuses on the underlying assumptions of the organization. These underlying assumptions are typically not viewed on the surface, but are generally embedded deeper into the functions of the organization. Specifically, underlying assumptions can be described as preferable actions that take place within an organization without conscious or formalized processes. In many ways, the underlying assumptions of an

organization serve as the source of values, beliefs, and actions which leads to the development of organizational culture (Schein, 2004).

Organizational culture plays a key role within the theory of liminality and the process of sensemaking. In order to better understand the process, Weick (1995) developed a template based upon seven properties that identified sensemaking activities. The following descriptions were provided by Eckel and Kezar (2003) for each property of Weick's template. The first property identified was identity construction, which "occurs at the individual and the institutional level, where people redefine who they are collectively" (Eckel & Kezar, 2003, p. 41). Therefore, individuals who are in a liminal state, seek to understand who they are and what role they play within a larger community.

The second property of Weick's (1995) template is retrospection. According to Eckel and Kezar (2003), the process of sensemaking is "retrospective because people can only make sense from what has already occurred" (p. 41). Therefore, the process of sensemaking is influenced by the lived experiences of individuals experiencing liminality and previous experiences influence how they view and make sense of the world around them. As part of the process of sensemaking, individuals use previous experiences to "bracket and segment" (Eckel & Kezar, 2003, p. 41) their current environment. Weick identified bracketing as the third property in his template, noting that sensemaking "is influenced by the noticing, manipulation, interpretation, and framing of the changing and uncertain environment" (Eckel & Kezar, 2003, p. 41).

The fourth property identified by Weick (1995) is based upon the concept of socialization. Weick asserts the process of socialization assists individuals to integrate into their new environment through social interactions; helping individuals to better make meaning and

sense of the environment. In essence, the process of socialization supports the acquisition of

values, beliefs, and norms held by the larger community (Eckel & Kezar, 2003, p. 41). The fifth

property identified in Weick's template is based upon the belief that sensemaking is a continuous

process. The continuation of the sensemaking process assists in the continued development of

individual integration and acquisition of cultural values, norms, and beliefs. As part of the

continuation of sensemaking, individuals repeatedly compare current conditions to previously

lived experiences. This process of comparison is referred to as the extraction phase of

sensemaking and was identified as the sixth property of Weick's template (Eckel & Kezar,

2003).

The final property identified by Weick (1995) is plausibility. Weick asserts that once

individuals have begun to integrate and assimilate to their new environment, continued

understanding of their environment is based upon plausibility or reasonability. In this phase of

sensemaking, the individual does not focus on what is correct, but rather focuses on what is

acceptable and credible within their newly adopted environment (Eckel & Kezar, 2004).

In studies conducted using liminality or sensemaking as a framework, researchers have

found adjunct and full-time faculty who self-identified as going through periods of liminality or

sensemaking, "experienced anxiety and uncertainty because they had difficulty reconciling"

(Bettis et al., 2005, p. 55). The transition to the new and unfamiliar culture of higher education

is often a struggle for individuals. Due to the absence of familiarity with higher education

culture, individuals also lacked a clear understanding of expectations in their new environment

(Bettis et al., 2005).

Theory of work adjustment. The second theoretical frame used in this study is the

theory of work adjustment. The theory is based upon the belief that an individual's level of

overall job satisfaction is linked to the fit or congruence with the organization. Using this as a foundation, the theory of work adjustment asserts that "individuals and environments impose requirements on one another and that successful work relations are the result of adjustments intended to create a state of correspondence between individual and environmental characteristics" (Bretz & Judge, 1994, p. 32).

According to the theory of work adjustment, individuals' levels of overall job satisfaction are based upon their perception of the organization or employer's ability to meet their needs as they relate to their employment (Bretz & Judge, 1994). As a result, the theory of work adjustment asserts that "job tenure is the most basic indicator of satisfaction because it purportedly represents a state in which the individual finds the work environment to be acceptable (satisfaction), and the environment finds the individual to be acceptable (satisfactoriness)" (Bretz & Judge, 1994, p. 33).

In studies conducted using the theory of work adjustment, data have demonstrated links between individual and organizational fit and job involvement (Blau, 1987), commitment to the employing organization (Meglino, Ravlin, & Adkins, 1989), employment performance (Caldwell & O'Reilly, 1990), and attitudes toward employment (Smart, Elton, & McLaughlin, 1986). Based upon the findings of the work adjustment theory, individuals who experienced higher levels of fit or congruence between their individual and environmental characteristics were "more likely to be attracted to the organization, be favorably evaluated by established organizational members, display greater work motivation, and perform better than those who do not" (Bretz & Judge, 1994, p. 33).

The research findings discussed above and the conceptual framework of the work adjustment theory "suggest that individuals will seek out, find comfort, and flourish in

environments that support" (Bretz & Judge, 1994, p. 33) their specific personal and professional needs as they relate to their employment. Therefore, the theory of work adjustment posits that individuals who find fit or congruence within their work environments are more likely to be successful in their positions, continue their employment, perform at higher levels, and be overall more satisfied with their positions than those who do not. This assertion is supported by research conducted on "attraction-selection-attrition" (Bretz & Judge, 1994, p. 34) which also found a positive correlation between "fit, satisfaction, and tenure" (Bretz & Judge, 1994, p. 34).

Summary of theoretical frames. The review of literature produced a number of theoretical frames to consider when examining adjunct faculty and their role in higher education. The purpose of this study is to examine the experiences of adjunct faculty from their perspective. Therefore, two theoretical frames have been identified that allow an examination of adjunct faculty experiences at the community college utilized in this study and the influence of the Lilly Endowment's grant to recruit and retain adjunct faculty. The theoretical frames identified for this study are liminality and work adjustment.

Liminality or sensemaking is a dynamic process that occurs when an individual transitions from one identity to another. Because the process is dynamic, there is a period of time when an individual possesses characteristics associated with both identities. According to Bettis et al. (2005), this period of "betwixt and between" (p. 48) encourages reflection and is more formally known as an "interstructural stage" (p. 48). Based upon research conducted by Bettis et al. (2005), adjunct faculty experience liminality or a period of sensemaking during the first few months of employment.

Therefore, it can be important that adjunct faculty be engaged in activities that allow them to progress toward an understanding of their new identity that is heavily influenced by their

new environment. In order to better understand liminality and the sensemaking process, Weick (1995) developed a template that describes properties that identify liminal or sensemaking activities.

The theory of work adjustment is founded upon the belief that individuals levels of job satisfaction are directly influenced by the level of fit or congruence the individual experiences with the organization. Additionally, the theory posits that individuals' perception of their employer are based upon the employer's ability to meet their work-related needs (Bretz & Judge, 1994). Based upon research, it has been concluded that fit or congruence between the individual and their employing organization directly influences job involvement, commitment, performance, and attitude toward employment (Blau, 1987; Caldwell, & O'Reilly, 1996; Meglino et al., 1989; Smart et al., 1986). Therefore, the theory of work adjustment hypothesizes individuals will seek out organizations that best fit or align with their personal and professional desires.

Summary of Literature

In summary, this review of literature regarding adjunct faculty in higher education revealed several findings regarding the demographic composition of adjunct faculty. Adjunct faculty were less educated than full-time faculty; equally likely to be male or female; slightly younger than their full-time counterparts; and females were negatively influenced based upon their marital status, often feeling conflicted between their roles as wife and mother and as an academic (Leslie & Gappa, 2002).

Demographics also revealed adjunct faculty are less racially diverse than the students they teach, with Whites accounting for about 81% of the total population (NCES, 2005). Generally, adjunct faculty have less than half the teaching experience of full-time faculty (Leslie

& Gappa, 2002; Pearch & Marutz, 2005) and approximately 30% have been employed at the same institution for 10 years or more (Pearch & Marutz, 2005). Additionally, adjunct faculty are compensated significantly less than their full-time community college counterparts (NCES, 2005). Also, based upon research, it was concluded that adjunct faculty interact with students less; provide less individualized instruction to students; and on average, work fewer hours per week than their full-time counterparts (Wallin, 2005). Finally, contrary to popular belief, only about 16% of adjunct faculty seek full-time employment and more than 50% prefer adjunct faculty appointments to full-time (Gappa & Leslie, 1993).

Based upon research conducted by Tuckman (1978), eight types or categories of adjunct faculty were established. Since Tuckman's germinal work was conducted, insufficient data have been collected to verify or further examine the types of individuals who hold adjunct positions. However, in 1993, Gappa and Leslie built upon Tuckman's work and condensed the adjunct faculty categories to career-enders; specialist, experts, and professionals; aspiring academics; and freelancers.

The review of literature also revealed that faculty teaching in community colleges did not have a predetermined career path, but rather departed from previous career paths in order to be part of an academic environment (Fugate & Amey, 2000). Additionally, 70% of community college faculty indicated a preference for teaching in a two year environment over a four year institution, because the tenure process could be avoided and usually there was no requirement for a terminal degree (Fugate & Amey, 2000). Researcher also found adjunct faculty were motivated by the opportunity for professional growth followed by the ability to earn additional income (Morton & Rittenburg, 1986). Morton and Rittenburg (1986) concluded that adjunct

faculty were motivated by intrinsic rewards, such as professional development and community service, over extrinsic rewards, such as status and ability to secure full-time employment.

Frequently, the use of adjunct faculty in higher education is viewed negatively based upon the belief their use diminishes student learning. Research indicated that adjunct faculty are: rated as being less effective by students (Klein et al., 1996); outperformed by full-time faculty in the areas of student interaction, active and collaborative teaching techniques, and class preparation and planning (Umbach, 2007); and are more likely to use traditional pedagogy in the classroom (Schuetz, 2002). Yet several studies have demonstrated there is no significant negative influence on student learning due to receiving instruction from adjunct faculty (Hom, 2001; Kamps, as cited in Parsons, 1998; Umbach, 2007; Wallin, 2004). However, the use of adjunct faculty in 50% or more of students' courses has been linked to lower rates of persistence and graduation (Johnson, 2006).

The use of adjunct faculty provides institutions of higher education with significant cost savings. On average, adjunct faculty earn approximately $2,500 per course (Frakt & Castagnera, 2000), resulting in an approximate cost savings of 60% per course when compared to the compensation of a full-time faculty (Klein et al., 1996). Institutions of higher education have been able to maintain relatively low wage levels for adjunct faculty because of the availability of qualified individuals (Austin, 2005; Will, 1999). Therefore, institutions are able to hire several adjunct faculty at a cost of approximately $15,000 to teach the same number of courses that a full-time faulty would, requiring a salary of between $35,000 and $40,000 per academic year (AAUP, 1997). Although compensation for adjunct faculty is low in comparison to their full-time counterparts, data indicated that nearly two-thirds of adjunct faculty held full-time positions outside their adjunct role (Fulton, 2000).

The review of literature also revealed that adjunct faculty experienced marginalization and exclusion from the institutions where they teach. This can be evidenced by the lack of access to basic resources, including office space, telephones, computers, and the Internet (Akroyd et al., 2004; Townsend & Hauss, 2002). Additionally, research concluded that all faculty within institutions of higher education lacked access to professional development activities (Murray, 1999). Moreover, in a research study conducted to examine the extent institutions were meeting the professional development needs of faculty, 19 out of 127 institutions indicated activities were not available to adjunct faculty and 108 institutions indicated that some, but not all, professional development activities were open to adjuncts (Murray, 1999).

Literature reviewed for this study indicated adjunct faculty, in general, were satisfied with their overall employment (Huber, 1998; Jacoby, 2005; Valadez & Anthony, 2001), but adjunct faculty expressed dissatisfaction with low compensation, lack of benefits, and the lack of job security (Jacoby, 2005). Research also concluded that faculty who were employed at four year institutions were generally more satisfied with their employment, when compared to faculty who taught at a community college (Kim et al., 2008; Outcalt, 2002; Valadez & Anthony, 2001).

Research also revealed that males and females based part of their level of job satisfaction on the ability to work with and interact with students (Murray & Cunningham, 2004). However, males and female had separate definitions for working with and interacting with students. Generally, male faculty placed greater value on student accomplishment and achievement and female faculty placed greater value on the ability to build relationships and observe personal success (Murray & Cunningham, 2004).

Finally, the review of literature produced two theoretical frames to be used in this research. Specifically, the theory of liminality (Bettis et al., 2005; Weick, 1995) and the theory of work adjustment (Bretz & Judge, 1994) is used to examine the influence of The Lilly Endowment's grant to recruit and retain intellectual capital from an adjunct faculty point of view. The theory of liminality is used to examine the process adjunct faculty undergo as they make the transition to their role and seek to understand their new environment and the institution's culture. The theory of work adjustment is used to examine the extent of fit or congruence between the individual and the organization.

CHAPTER 3

Methodology

The purpose of this study was to examine the influence of an adjunct faculty management program developed and implemented through grant funds received from the Lilly Endowment at a Midwestern community college. Specifically, the study sought to examine the influence of nine college-wide initiatives developed to recruit and retain adjunct faculty at the college and within the state.

Three research questions guided this study. The first two sought to examine the extent to which adjunct faculty were aware of the goals and objectives of the grant and the degree to which they were informed of policy changes at the college. The remaining question sought to examine the perceptions of exclusion and marginalization within the institution and the extent that adjunct faculty felt more included because of the adjunct faculty management program. The following research questions were used to guide this study:

1. To what extent were adjunct faculty aware of the goals and objectives of the grant?

2. To what degree were adjunct faculty informed of policy changes and the potential influence they had on their employment and status within the college?

This chapter describes the methods used to examine the influence of the adjunct faculty management program at the college. The first section of this chapter describes the qualitative

research design followed by a description of the institution and how participants were selected in this study.

Research Design

Research design begins with first identifying a topic that will be the focus of the research (Creswell, 2007). In this research, the focus was on the influence of the Lilly Endowment's grant to recruit and retain intellectual capital on adjunct faculty. Specifically, this research focused on the influence of the nine initiatives implemented as part of the adjunct faculty management program funded by the grant. Based upon the statement of the problem and the research questions that guided this study, this research is descriptive in nature and seeks to develop an understanding of adjunct faculty's experiences. Therefore, a qualitative phenomenological approach was used to describe the lived experiences of adjunct faculty and to examine the influence of the adjunct faculty management program.

By definition, phenomenological research is used to describe the experiences of several individuals who possess some type of commonality (Creswell, 2007). In this research, adjunct faculty employed at the institution were subject to the same opportunities provided by the adjunct faculty management program and serves as the point of commonality. By utilizing a phenomenological approach, I was able to synthesize the individual experiences of adjunct faculty and use their experiences collectively to develop a universal description or "essence" (p. 58) of adjunct faculty experiences at the college. According to Creswell (2007), a qualitative phenomenological approach to research allows for the emergence, collection, analysis, and interpretation of themes into meaning. Therefore, in this study, the responses provided by participants to the research questions produced common themes that were interpreted into meaning following the procedures for conducting phenomenological research.

Within phenomenological research, two main approaches exist. These approaches are known as the hermeneutical and transcendental approaches (Creswell, 2007). The hermeneutical approach focuses on describing the lived experiences of others and research interprets their experiences into meaning (van Manen, 1990). The transcendental approach focuses "less on the interpretations of the researchers and more on the description of the experiences of participants" (Creswell, 2007, p. 59). Based upon the questions that guided this research, a transcendental approach was used to analyze the influence of the adjunct faculty management program on adjunct faculty at the college. Therefore, data were analyzed and reported from adjunct faculty's perspectives and used to describe their experiences within the institution.

Moustakas (1994) outlined eight major steps that should be conducted when using a phenomenological approach to research. The first three steps in phenomenological research include determining the problem, describing the phenomenon of the problem, and identifying the assumptions of the phenomenon. These steps have been satisfied through the statement of the problem and the review of literature of this study and may be found in the previous two chapters.

The remaining steps followed those recommended by Creswell (2007), Moustakas (1994), and Polkinghorne (1989). Specifically, data were collected through semi-structured interviews conducted with adjunct faculty. According to Polkinghorne, phenomenological research that involves the use of interviews to collect data from individuals who have experienced the phenomena should consist of approximately five to 25 interviews. In this study, one adjunct faculty was purposefully selected to be interviewed from one of seven geographical areas developed for this study and included two of the college's 14 administrative regions. The process of selecting participants and the instrument used to guide the interviews are discussed later in this chapter.

The semi-structured interviews with participants were transcribed verbatim and data were analyzed by reviewing statements from each interview. Significant statements were identified "that provide an understanding of how participants experienced the phenomenon" (Creswell, 2007, p. 61). Following their identification, the significant statements were reviewed and grouped into clusters of meaning that helped identify common themes among the participants (Creswell, 2007). Upon collecting and categorizing the significant statements into clusters of meaning, data were used to write "textural descriptions" (Creswell, 2007, p. 61) of the experiences of adjunct faculty participating in the research. The significant statements and clusters of meaning were then used to develop and write "structural descriptions" (Creswell, 2007, p. 61) that describe the setting and environment of the college and its connection to the experience of adjunct faculty.

I have written about my own experiences as an adjunct faculty member at multiple four year institutions and have also written about my experience as the former Director of Faculty Development and Student Life Initiatives and current Assistant Vice Provost for Student Development Services at the college. This has be done to ensure the results of the data were not influenced by my experiences or professional roles, and bracketing or "epoche" (Creswell, 2007, p. 59) will be used to set aside my possible biases.

The final step used in the research design included reviewing both the textural and structural descriptions that describe the significant statements and clusters of meaning (Creswell, 2007). This review of the textural and structural descriptions resulted in a "composite description" (Creswell, 2007, p. 62) that ultimately provided the "essence" (Creswell, 2007, p. 62) of the phenomena experienced by the participants of the study.

Participants

Participants for this study were selected using a purposeful sampling approach (McMillan & Schumacher, 2001). According to McMillan and Schumacher (2001), a purposeful sampling approach is used when researchers seek to have a broad understanding of experiences or cases "without need or desire to generalize all such cases" (p. 400). However, purposeful selection is done to increase the richness and understanding of small sample sizes and is most frequently conducted with individuals who are "knowledgeable and informative" (p. 401) about the area of study.

In order to identify and select participants, two approaches of purposeful sampling were used in this research. The college is comprised of 14 administrative regions. These regions collectively comprise the statewide community college system for the state. In order to include data from across the college, a site selection approach was used as the first criterion in this study. The participant sample included one adjunct faculty from one of seven geographical regions that were comprised of two of the college's 14 administrative regions. This was conducted in an effort to provide a broad representation of adjunct faculty from across the college and state. Additionally, this approach served as a mechanism to more fully understand the influence, if any, of the adjunct faculty management program and the experiences of adjunct faculty from across the college without limiting the data collection process to a single or group of administrative regions.

The second purposeful sampling approach used in this research was conducted by utilizing a criterion-based approach (Creswell, 2007). The second criterion used in this study was based upon a faculty's length of service with the college. Since this research sought to examine the influence of the adjunct faculty management program on adjunct faculty who taught

at the college prior to the implementation of the grant, only adjunct faculty who taught prior to the fall 2005 semester were utilized. Any adjunct faculty who began employment during the fall 2005 semester or after was excluded from the study. The study sought to interview a proportional number of males and females, as well as racial minorities.

Based upon data collected from the college's 2007 adjunct faculty survey (Ivy Tech Community College, 2007b), which included 1,505 participants, the adjunct faculty population was comprised of 57% males and 43% females. The same survey found that Whites comprised 83.5% of the adjunct faculty population, followed by Blacks (5.1%), Native Americans (1.8%), Asians (1.6%), and Hispanics (1.3%) (Ivy Tech Community College, 2007b). It should be noted that 6.6% of survey respondents did not identify a race or ethnic background (Ivy Tech Community College, 2007b).

Each of the administrative regions of the college employs an adjunct faculty coordinator who is responsible for the development and coordination of adjunct faculty activities within his or her region. Coordination with each adjunct faculty coordinator occurred and a snowball approach to identify potential adjunct faculty was utilized (Creswell, 2007). Based upon this approach, the adjunct faculty coordinators were relied upon to identify individuals who would provide rich information regarding their experiences as adjunct faculty at the college and the influence of the adjunct faculty management program.

Through electronic communication, all adjunct faculty coordinators responded with a total of 41 names and contact information of adjunct faculty members they believed could provide rich data for the purposes of this study. From the list provided by the adjunct faculty coordinators, the recommended adjunct faculty by personalized email to investigate his or her willingness to participate in the study (Appendix A). Based upon responses received from the

prospective interviewees, the list of participants was narrowed based upon location and gender to reflect a cross-section of the college. Interviews were scheduled on the campuses of individuals who indicated a willingness to participate in this study. During the course of the interview, additional demographically data regarding study participants were collected. Table 1 provides demographical data of the adjunct faculty who participated in this study.

Table 1

Demographics of Adjunct Faculty

Pseudonyms	Location	Race	Age	Gender
Trina	Northwest	Black	47-50	Female
Dusty	West Central	White	50-55	Female
Dr. Massey	Northeast	White	65+	Male
Marie	East Central	White	35-40	Female
Mary	Southeast	White	65+	Female
Adolph	Central	Black	65+	Male
Dale	Southwest	White	55-60	Female

In addition to representing a cross-section of the college's adjunct faculty based upon location, race, age, and gender, participants of the study also represented various academic backgrounds, degree obtainment, and years of service. Data regarding academic discipline, degree obtainment, and years of services of study participants are shown in Table 2.

Table 2

Participants' Academic Discipline, Degree Obtainment, and Years of Service

Pseudonyms	Location	Academic Discipline	Degree Obtained	Years of Service
Trina	Northwest	Business	Bachelors	8
Dusty	West Central	Mathematics	Bachelors	5
Dr. Massey	Northeast	History	Doctorate	7
Marie	East Central	Science	Masters	5
Mary	Southeast	English	Bachelors	8
Adolph	Central	Political Science	Masters	11
Dale	Southwest	English	Bachelors	9

Setting

In July 2004, the college submitted a grant proposal to the Lilly Endowment as part of a competitive grant process. The purpose of the grant was to support initiatives to recruit and retain intellectual capital within the state. As part of the college's grant proposal, the college identified as one of its two primary goals the need to strengthen its adjunct faculty base (Ivy Tech Community College of Indiana, 2004). The college proposed to achieve this goal by improving the support, compensation, professional development, and integration of adjunct faculty into the institution under an adjunct faculty management program (Ivy Tech Community College of Indiana, 2004).

During the same year that the college submitted its proposal to the Lilly Endowment, the college was awarded $12.5 million dollars through the competitive grant process. The college allocated $6.25 million of the grant monies to be used to strengthen the college's adjunct faculty base. The remaining $6.25 million was allocated for the development of student life and activities, the second primary goal of the college's grant proposal.

During the process of implementing the grant's initiatives, the college's purpose and mission changed from being a two year technical and vocational college to that of a comprehensive community college. This change in purpose and mission was directed by the General Assembly of the state and was enacted into law (Indiana Public Law, 2005). Because of this legislation, the college was renamed with the words *community college* in its title.

By the middle of 2006, a college-wide committee, which became known as the Adjunct Faculty Development Committee, was formed. The committee was initially comprised of faculty and staff representatives from across the state, with one representative from each of the college's 14 administrative regions. The committee began meeting to discuss ways to improve adjunct faculty's experiences. Several subcommittees were formed and various ideas were generated. As part of the process of information gathering, the committee developed an Adjunct Faculty Survey and worked in collaboration with the college's Office of Institutional Research to electronically distribute the survey to over 3,000 adjunct faculty (Ivy Tech Community College, 2007b). The purpose of the survey was "to better understand the demographics, expectations, perspectives, and needs of Ivy Tech adjunct faculty" (Ivy Tech Community College, 2007b, p. 2).

The rate of responses to the 2007 Adjunct Faculty Survey was high, with a response rate of approximately 50% (Ivy Tech Community College, 2007b). Results from the 2007 Adjunct

Faculty Survey indicated adjunct faculty at the college were mostly dissatisfied with their rate of

pay and benefits at the college, access to workspace and storage of personal and teaching related

items on campus, and their lack of inclusion at the college (Ivy Tech Community College,

2007b). The committee used these results to develop a series of recommendations that were

presented and advanced through the college's management structures, which included the

Regional Academic Officers Committee and the Senior Leadership Council, which is comprised

of the college's 14 chancellors, vice-presidents, president, and other senior staff. In total, nine

college-wide initiatives were developed, proposed, and approved between August 2007 and

February 2008. Below are brief summaries of the policies and initiatives that were developed

and approved for implementation during that period:

1. *Introduction to Community College Instruction: Getting Results*. An on-line
    professional development tool was created using products developed by the League
    for Innovation in the Community College. A policy was approved that would make
    the tool available to adjunct faculty college-wide each semester.

2. *Adjunct Faculty Inclusion*. A policy was approved that required as a standard
    practice that adjunct faculty should be invited to participate in campus and regional
    activities including but not limited to commencement, committee meetings, and
    faculty meetings.

3. *Adjunct Faculty Mentoring Program*. A policy was approved that required each
    region to develop and implement an adjunct faculty mentoring program and make it
    available to all newly hired adjunct faculty. It was also recommended that each
    campus and region design a recognition plan for participation in the mentoring

program and could include such items as additional compensation, stipends, and
certificates.

4. *Faculty Network Plans.* A policy was approved that each region, where applicable,
   should, when possible, develop a faculty network plan with surrounding institutions,
   graduate programs, and other appropriate entities to facilitate the recruitment and
   sharing of adjunct faculty.

5. *Adjunct Faculty Orientation.* A policy was approved that required each campus and
   region on a yearly basis to provide all adjunct faculty with a face-to-face faculty
   orientation program on each campus. In addition, the Office of the Provost would be
   responsible for the development and maintenance of a broad-based, college-wide, on-
   line orientation experience that could be utilized as a resource or alternative in cases
   where adjunct faculty are unable to attend their campus face-to-face orientation.

6. *Access to Classroom Items.* A policy was approved that requires each campus to
   provide access to classroom items and supplies that support student success.
   Specifically, this policy serves as a mechanism to ensure adjunct faculty have access
   to dry-erase markers, chalk, paper, notebooks, and other classroom materials and
   supplies to support student learning.

7. *Adjunct Faculty Welcome Kits.* A policy was approved that requires each campus
   and region to provide all newly hired adjunct faculty, at the commencement of their
   initial employment, a "Welcome Kit." Some examples of items that could be included
   in the kit include such things as a coffee mug, water bottle, or college tee-shirt.

8. *Adjunct Faculty Limited Medical Plan.* A policy was approved that allowed adjunct
   faculty and other part-time employees the ability to access a limited medical plan

through a college-selected vendor. Individuals who elected to participate in the limited medical plan were responsible for all monthly fees (Ivy Tech Community College, 2007b).

The Adjunct Faculty Development Committee made one additional policy recommendation that at the time of initial presentation to the Senior Leadership Council was not approved: a proposal for up to six hours fee remission per adjunct faculty that could be utilized by the adjunct faculty, their spouses, or their dependent children. However, it was determined the administrative tracking involved in this process would be too complex, and it was also decided that additional research was needed before such a policy could be approved and implemented. Members from the Adjunct Faculty Development Committee continued to collect information and feedback on their proposal and again presented their recommendation along with supporting research through the college's management structures. In November 2008, the Senior Leadership Council approved a fee remission policy that included six credit hours of fee remission for each faculty, their spouses, and their dependent children after two semesters of employment. It should be noted the policy was amended by the Senior Leadership Council and resulted in more generous fee remission benefit for adjunct faculty and their eligible family members than what was originally proposed. The final approved adjunct faculty fee remission policy provided six credit hours of fee remission to adjunct faculty, their spouses, and their dependent children after two semesters of employment.

In the spring of 2008, the college surveyed adjunct faculty college-wide again to determine if any impact was being realized based upon the nine initiatives developed in partial response of data collected and analyzed from the 2007 Adjunct Faculty Survey. The Office of Institutional Research coordinated the survey in collaboration with the Director of Faculty

Development and Student Life Initiatives and made slight alterations to the questions asked.

However, the vast majority of questions remained the same as in 2007. The modifications to the

2008 Adjunct Faculty Survey were made to accommodate the expanded purpose and objectives

of the data being collected. In addition to the original purpose of the 2007 Adjunct Faculty

Survey, the 2008 survey included the purpose "to further explore the needs of Ivy Tech adjunct

faculty" (Ivy Tech Community College, 2008, p. 9) and "to obtain quantitative data to be used

for reporting" to the Lilly Endowment (Ivy Tech Community College, 2008, p. 9). The survey

was again electronically distributed to over 3,000 adjunct faculty and the response rate was

slightly over 50% (Ivy Tech Community College of Indiana, 2008).

Among the key findings of the 2008 Adjunct Faculty Survey were adjunct faculty

continued to be least satisfied with their rate of pay and benefits, as well as access to storage

space for personal and employment-related materials on campus (Ivy Tech Community College,

2008). When comparing the two surveys, adjunct faculty were significantly more satisfied with

their employment at the college in 2008 than in 2007 (Ivy Tech Community College, 2008).

However, based upon the survey's results, it remains unclear what influence, if any, the nine

college-wide initiatives supported by the Lilly grant to recruit and retain capital had on adjunct

faculty. The nine college-wide initiatives were developed based upon the data from the surveys

and this study examines the influence of the nine initiatives on adjunct faculty.

Procedures

Prior to conducting the semi-structured interviews, each participant was provided an

Informed Consent to review, sign, and returned (Appendix B). Data were collected from one to

two-hour, semi-structured interviews with the seven purposefully selected participants of the

study as described earlier. The interviews focused on collecting data regarding the influence of

the adjunct faculty management program at the college. According to McMillan and Schumacher (2001), the best approach in conducting qualitative phenomenological research is to conduct an "in-depth interview" (p. 445) to study the "essence" (p. 445) of the experiences lived by the individuals participating in the study.

Prior to beginning the interview, each participant was provided a summary of the eight original initiatives implemented as part of the adjunct faculty management program, as well as a summary of the adjunct faculty fee remission policy that was approved in November 2008 (Appendix C). Below are a few sample questions that were used to guide the semi-structured interviews with participants:

1. In your own words, would you describe your understanding of the purpose of the Lilly grant to recruit and retain intellectual capital?

2. How were the goals and objectives of the grant communicated to you?

3. What adjunct faculty management program initiatives were you aware of prior to today?

4. How were you made aware of the adjunct faculty management program initiatives?

5. Prior to the implementation of these initiatives, how would you describe your experience as an adjunct faculty at the college?

6. Did the implementation of the initiatives have an influence on your experience? If so, could you describe how?

7. Since the implementation of the adjunct faculty management program, how would you describe your connection to the college?

8. What recommendations would you make to improve adjunct faculty experiences at the college?

Data Analysis

Data in this study were analyzed using the steps and procedure recommended by Creswell (2007). In the first steps, data from the first two interview questions, which examined the extent of participant knowledge about the nine statewide initiatives created for adjunct faculty and the additional adjunct faculty fee remission policy, were reviewed and analyzed. This was done in order to provide an "understanding of the common experiences of the participants" (Creswell, 2007, p. 61). The second step in analyzing the data involved examining the remaining interview questions and highlighting "significant statements, sentences, or quotes" (Creswell, 2007, p. 61) that provided additional description and insight into the lived experiences of study participants. Those statements were then be used to texturalize or describe the experiences of participants in the study setting. The textural experiences of each participant were utilized to write a "composite description" (Creswell, 2007, p. 62) of the collective experiences shared by all study participants. This process is commonly referred to as describing the essence of the study (Creswell, 2007).

Finally, in order to help ensure "interpersonal subjectivity" (McMillan & Schumacher, 2001, p. 411), a peer debriefer strategy was used in this study (McMillan & Schumacher, 2001). Two individuals who were not involved in this research study or similar research involving adjunct faculty were used. Both individuals are employed as administrators at institutions of higher education and have an understanding of the greater higher education community. Each peer debriefer was sent a letter requesting a review of the research findings and sought feedback regarding those findings (Appendix D).

Personal Statement

Prior to conducting this research, I served as an adjunct faculty member at two previous institutions where I was employed. My first experience as an adjunct faculty member was at a medium sized university located in the Midwest. In my role, I taught a three-credit-hour freshman seminar course and also served as the primary academic advisor for students enrolled in that course. The primary mission of the institution was to serve as a teaching university where faculty focused on individual student learning.

My second experience as an adjunct faculty member was at a large university which was also located in the Midwest. In my role, I taught an undergraduate three-credit-hour Resident Assistant training course and also supervised a Teaching Assistant. The university's mission was focused on extensive research and graduate studies.

In both experiences as an adjunct faculty member, I often felt disconnected from the academic department for which I taught. At no time were there any attempts to provide mentoring to me or include me in any departmental communication or discussion. As a result, I felt isolated and marginalized within the academic department and relied on my full-time position with the university to serve as my connection to the institution. Through this connection, I was able to provide the students I taught with information about the institution and its resources.

Also, during part of this research study, I served as the Director of Faculty Development and Student Life Initiatives. In that role, I served as the project director of the college's grant from the Lilly Endowment to recruit and retain intellectual capital and also served as the chair of the Adjunct Faculty Development Committee. Prior to this role, my professional experiences were concentrated in the student affairs area of higher education. Although I have never taught

in a community college setting, through this experience, I gained tremendous insight into the experiences of adjunct faculty who teach at such institutions.

While conducting my research, I was intentional to bracket my previous experiences as an adjunct faculty member and as the grant's project director. By setting my own experiences aside, I was able to focus on the lived experiences of adjunct faculty and hear their voices through their lived experiences. Conducting my research with this intentionality assisted me in collecting, analyzing, and interpreting data without bias.

CHAPTER 4

Results

The purpose of this study was to examine the influence of an adjunct faculty management

program developed and implemented through grant funds received from the Lilly Endowment at

a Midwestern community college. Chapter 4 provides demographic information regarding the

study's participants and discusses participant awareness of the grant and emergent themes.

Using transcribed data from the semi-structured interviews and field notes, participants'

statements were reviewed and grouped into clusters of meaning that helped to identify common

themes among the study's participants. Once grouped into clusters, data were used to write

textural description and were also used to write structural statements that described their lived

experiences as adjunct faculty members at the college used in this study.

This chapter is divided into sections that highlight the emergent themes that were

revealed through data analysis. Each section includes discussions regarding the emergent themes

and a summary is provided at the end of this chapter.

Data analysis from this study provides insight into the lived experiences of adjunct

faculty and examines the influence of the Lilly Endowment's grant to recruit and retain

intellectual capital at the college. As noted throughout the chapter, adjunct faculty have multiple

prior experiences they bring with them to the institution, but also each individual has unique

experiences while employed as adjunct faculty. Participants of this study reflected the diversity

of experiences, education, gender, and race of adjunct faculty at the college. Yet, data revealed common experiences among the participants in this study.

Participants

The participants in this study are adjunct faculty members at the Midwestern community college previously described and were purposefully selected based upon the criteria described in Chapter 3 of this study. Demographical information, including age, race, gender, and educational background may also be found in Chapter 3. Through semi-structured interviews, the participants described their lived experiences as adjunct faculty members at the college and also described the influence of the adjunct faculty management program that was developed with funds made available through the Lilly Endowment's grant to recruit and retain intellectual capital.

Biographical information. Trina, a Black female, teaches business courses on one of the college's campuses located in the Northwest region of the state. Trina holds a bachelor's degree and has an interest in pursuing her master's degree. Prior to teaching at the college, Trina worked for a Fortune 500 company located in a major city outside the state. In that role, she worked in the industrial technology area, beginning her first experience with computers in 1969. As the use of the Internet became more prevalent, Trina enrolled in courses at the college to learn more about the Internet and webpage design. Upon completion of the courses, Trina was asked to lead one of the college's community programs. However, after leading the program for one year, funding for the position no longer existed and she began teaching business courses in the fall of 2002. Trina desires full-time employment with the college and has applied for a few positions in the industrial technology area. However, she has not been successful in obtaining full-time employment with the college.

Dusty, a White female, teaches mathematics on one of the college's campuses located in the West central region of the state. Dusty holds a bachelor's degree and began working at the college in 2003 as a math tutor. After holding that position for one year, she began teaching mathematics courses during the fall of 2004. Previous to her employment at the college, she worked for several years as a probation officer. Dusty is interested in full-time employment with the college; however, she recognizes obtaining a master's degree is needed. Presently, Dusty is unwilling to pursue her master's degree, but would like for the college to allow her to teach a full course load as an adjunct, without obtaining a master's degree.

Dr. Massey, a White male, teaches history on one of the campuses located in the Northeast region of the state. Dr. Massey holds a Doctorate of Philosophy in History and has over 40 years of higher education teaching experience, including six years as an adjunct faculty member at the community college used in this study. He has taught in many higher education institutions, including community colleges, four year universities, and doctoral degree-granting institutions within the United States and Canada. In addition to his work within higher education, Dr. Massey also has employment experience working as a hospital administrator. As a retired professor, Dr. Massey began teaching part-time for the college in the fall of 2002 and does not seek full-time employment.

Marie, a White female, teaches sciences courses on one of the college's campuses located in the East central region of the state. Marie holds a master's degree and began teaching for the college in the fall of 2004. She is employed full-time as a health professional and does not seek full-time employment at the college. However, it should be noted that Marie previously worked as an adjunct faculty member in the community college system in a neighboring state for 11 years prior to her employment at the college used in this study.

Mary, a White female, teaches English courses on one of the campuses located in the Southeast region of the state. Mary holds a bachelor's degree and has been employed as a secondary educator for 40 years. She began teaching at the college in 2001. Although currently employed full-time by the local school district, Mary would like to be employed full-time at the college after she retires from her high school teaching position in the next two or three years.

Adolph, a Black male, teaches political science courses on one of the college's campuses located in the central region of the state. Adolph holds a Master's degree in Political Science and has been employed at the college for 11 years. Prior to working at the college, he served in the military. Adolph is satisfied with his employment status as an adjunct faculty member and does not wish to seek full-time employment with the college.

Dale, a White female, teaches English courses on one of the campuses located in the Southwest region of the state. Dale holds a bachelor's degree and was a secondary educator for eight years in the Northeast region of the United States and also served as a substitute teacher for two years in the Southwest region of the United States. Dale has served as an adjunct faculty member since 2000 and does not seek full-time employment with the college.

Themes

After completing the semi-structured interviews and reviewing the interview transcripts and field notes, five themes emerged in this study. The first theme to emerge was that participants had limited awareness of the grant. The second theme to emerge was participants had limited knowledge of the nine initiatives developed and implemented under the grant. The third theme to emerge was the lack of formal communication with adjunct faculty regarding the grant. The fourth theme to emerge was orientation to the adjunct faculty position influenced

participants' experience at the college. The fifth and final theme to emerge was participants indicated that mentoring was also an important factor that influenced their experience.

Grant awareness. The majority of participants of the study indicated they had some awareness of the grant and its purpose. Adolph indicated that he believed the purpose of the grant was to:

> …try to attract adjunct faculty to the college and such, also not to only to attract and come in and teach and educate students, but also to retain adjunct faculty in some way, shape, or form to maintain the school's integrity, as well as their expertise.

Adolph indicated that he learned about the grant through informal communication from the college. He stated:

> It wasn't one of those things where we sat down and had a general meeting and this whole thing was laid out from A to Z. It probably came from conversations with our coordinator or somebody else that was talking about, "Have you heard about this program, have you heard about this grant?"

Marie also reported her awareness of the grant and its initiatives came through informal communication, mainly through conversation between staff members and adjunct faculty at her campus. She stated:

> I've not seen any formal documentation about it. It's all been downstream information coming to me. The push has been to make sure that we can keep faculty retained who aren't full-time…It's astronomical the amount of hours being taught and I knew that was an issue during our last review for accreditation. It was like "Hey, we got to do a better job at getting full-time people" and in this economy, there is no way. So, from my perspective, it's let's make sure we can keep what we have and try to get better quality

people on board who are not full-time. That was the purpose. How well it's been

implemented, I don't know.

Dale indicated that communication regarding the grant and its initiatives was virtually

nonexistent on her campus. Prior to participating in the semi-structured interview for this study

she was unaware the college had received the grant and stated, "Before today, I didn't know

anything about it."

Dr. Massey indicated that he was somewhat aware of the grant. He stated:

Even though I was an active participant, my knowledge of what the purpose of the grant

was, in the overall strategy concept of increasing intellectual capital, was simply

merchandised on this campus as stuff being thrown to adjuncts to make them happy. In

other words, there was never, to my knowledge, a document or a meeting where a person

high up in the food chain said "Hey, here is what we're going to do in the next four or

five years."

Dr. Massey further stated formal communication regarding the grant and how it was connected

to the college and adjunct faculty did not happen on his campus.

Trina indicated she believed the purpose of the grant was to "provide educational training

for students that would otherwise be unable to obtain an education." Trina shared that she

became aware of the grant through the bi-monthly electronic newsletter for adjunct faculty and

also through the college's website. Trina also indicated that she had served as her region's

representative on the college's Adjunct Faculty Development Committee. Regarding her

experience serving on the committee, Trina stated:

I must say, being an adjunct faculty representative was very helpful for me. As a matter

of fact, I would say maybe 40% of the things that I mentioned, I learned from being an

adjunct faculty representative. So that was very, very helpful in terms of identifying

resources that were available.

Trina indicated that her knowledge regarding the grant was directly linked to her participation on

the adjunct faculty development committee.

Although Trina indicated awareness of the grant, she stated that she "didn't really have a

clear understanding" of the grant's purpose. However, the majority of study participants were

able to describe their understanding of the grant's purpose. Mary described the purpose of the

grant as a way to:

> Basically to stop brain drain. I think that it was basically to attract and maintain teachers
>
> of quality, people who were interested in being committed to education, long-term or as
>
> long-term as people have need of their services.

Dusty indicated that she was aware of the grant and it had been discussed informally on

her campus. Dusty stated the purpose of the grant was to provide "adjuncts the opportunities that

wouldn't normally had been given to adjuncts through just state funding." She further stated,

"for example…the availability to go to conferences and pursue extended learning."

Awareness of grant initiatives. All participants of the study were aware of the majority

of initiatives developed through funds from the grant. However, several participants of the study

were unaware that some initiatives were connected with the grant. Upon reviewing the list of

initiatives, Dusty stated:

> As I went through the list, I was kind of chuckling because I think I have used every
>
> single one [of the initiatives], or I will have used every single one except for the faculty
>
> network plans, unless I just didn't realize what that was.

Dr. Massey also indicated he was familiar with the all the initiatives developed under the grant, except the faculty network plan. He stated, "The faculty network plan is one that I'm seeing for the first time, which leads me to believe that this campus may not be participating in that." Dr. Massey further stated:

> When we started initiating parts of the grant, I don't think it was generally perceived that what were doing was part of a larger program. Things were phased in ad hoc and it was kind of a general reference, "Oh this is from the Lilly Foundation." I don't remember seeing until today something like this piece of paper where it was all pulled together.

Other participants of the study indicated they were less familiar with the nine initiatives developed under the grant.

Trina indicated that she was familiar with some of the initiatives, but indicated that she was most familiar with the *Introduction to Community College Instruction: Getting Results* online activity. After reviewing the summary of nine initiatives developed under the grant, Trina indicated that she was also familiar with the adjunct faculty inclusion policy, the adjunct faculty orientation initiative, the policy regarding access to classroom items for adjunct faculty, the adjunct faculty limited medical plan, and the fee remission policy for adjunct faculty, their spouse, and their dependent children.

After reviewing of the summary of grant initiatives, Marie indicated that she became aware of some of the initiatives upon "us sitting down" and discussing the grant. She further stated:

> The mentoring program had been discussed, but never really pushed forward. The only faculty network plans that I've ever had even remotely brought up was, "Do you know anyone who might be willing to teach?" The orientation is a much shortened program,

but I think it's a work in progress and they are doing a better job. They've asked input

from us, particularly me, who's been through a different scenario where it was very well

planned.

Limited medical plan. As part of the adjunct faculty management program, the college

developed and implemented a limited medical plan available to adjunct faculty and their family

members. All participants of the study indicated they were familiar with the limited medical

plan. Dusty described her awareness of the limited medical plan and stated, "Even though I,

myself, am not a participant, I was aware of it and I thought it was a welcomed benefit" and went

on to further state, "I think it's very cool, especially for adjuncts." Marie also was familiar with

the limited medical plan, but was unsure of the benefit it had on her colleagues in the Health

Sciences division. Marie stated:

> The medical plan has helped a lot of people, and that's positive, because there are people
>
> who use it. I'm sure that doesn't necessarily happen here in the Sciences division. I
>
> know there have to be people who are working at multiple institutions, trying to put
>
> together a sustainable living. Having insurance offered is a tremendous benefit.

However, Dale expressed that while the addition of the limited medical plan was beneficial to

some, she felt that the plan did not provide sufficient coverage for adjunct faculty and their

families. She stated:

> There are a lot of young people here who can't afford this. And once you get it, it
>
> doesn't cover very much. If somebody had an accident, this wouldn't cover much. It just
>
> isn't adequate for a lot of things that would be necessary in a decent medical plan. I'm
>
> also sour on the plan because I don't see any of my money from the college. All of it

goes in my health insurance. I looked at the plan because it was fairly new and it's better than nothing. But, I just don't think it was worthwhile taking it.

Introduction to community college instruction: Getting results. Another initiative that was developed under the adjunct faculty management program was the *Introduction to Community College Instruction: Getting Results* online activity that was made available to adjuncts as a professional development opportunity. All participants of the study indicated an awareness of the activity and the majority of participants in the study had participated in the activity since it was first offered in the spring of 2008. Dr. Massey described how the online activity was helpful to him as an adjunct faculty member, even with 40 year of teaching experience in higher education. Dr. Massy stated:

> I took that course last spring. It was one of the best courses I've ever taken. And I wish that I had taken it in 1960. I learned so much from that. It was fantastic. In fact, I've volunteered to be a facilitator…I'm a lifelong learner and while there were some defects in the course, it focused a lot on the science and technology side. The whole course, in general, was just tremendous. So, I benefited from that.

Trina also described her experience in completing the course in the following manner:

> It offered some really good tools that I could use in my classroom. So, I can use those now because a lot of students are familiar with technology. The students now, come along and they are used to doing multiple things at once. So, you have to be able to keep them interested through multi-tasking. So where before, when I didn't have a resource available, it would be more of a lecture and handout-type thing. Now, I can include technology along with it. So, they have hands-on experience, which makes the learning experience to them a lot more fulfilling.

College fee remission. The third initiative that all participants of the study indicated

awareness of was the college's fee remission policy. The college's fee remission policy

provided each adjunct faculty member, their spouse, and their dependent children with up to six

credit hours at the college at no cost after the adjunct faculty member had been employed for at

least two semesters. All participants of the study described how the fee remission policy was

beneficial for adjunct faculty. Mary stated:

> I really feel that the fee remission, especially for teachers, is an encouragement to go
>
> back and to work on some of the things that you maybe need to work on, or classes you
>
> would like to take to keep you going, and to keep you refreshed and keep your mind
>
> going.

Adolph described his awareness of the fee remission and the potential influence it could have on

adjunct faculty and their family members. He stated:

> I thought it was very interesting. Fee remission for adjuncts, if you have kids who are
>
> coming into the college, I thought, to me it was long overdue. I've been here 10 years
>
> and I thought that should have been here from the get. I realize that sometimes
>
> institutions might want to pay their staff more, but they can't really do that. But, they can
>
> do other things to show their appreciation for their efforts. I could have used this a while
>
> back, but all my kids are grown now, so their education is up to them.

> Marie, who does not have children, described how other adjunct faculty on her campus

utilized the fee remission policy. She stated:

> I had a conversation with one of our psychology faculty and she didn't know about it.
>
> This was probably in February and I had made a comment to her that she should look into
>
> it for her children. It has been very beneficial for her to try to help get a jump on her just

recently graduated and her soon-to-be-senior children to get some credit hours out of the way. So, that has been helpful to her.

Communication. While the majority of participants of this study indicated awareness of the grant, its initiative, and its purpose, participants described a lack of formal communication regarding the grant and the process in which initiatives were developed and implemented. Mary's awareness of the grant came from informal communication on her campus. She stated, "A lot of the communication came through basically with conversations in teacher faculty meetings. Some of them through email, some of it was through conversation."

She further stated:

> We normally received emails and sometimes, as an adjunct faculty member, I will have to be very honest and it's my own personal whatever, I guess, but there's many times I look at "dates to remember" or "please come to this faculty meeting" and I'm back in school. So, I can't go to the faculty meetings and so I'm kind of out of the loop on some things. But many times, there are newsletters that are put in our mailboxes or there are emails sent out. They do make an attempt to communicate with us, which really is very nice. You don't feel like you are deliberately being left out of the loop.

Dusty described the communication regarding the grant as informal and indicated that she learned about the grant through interactions and communication with the assistant vice chancellor of academic affairs on her campus. She stated:

> [The assistant vice chancellor of academic affairs] was really good about always emailing information to us, and then we always received information from the state office and then of course, what they set up was the opportunity for us to go online through Campus Connect to our very own adjunct website, where we can go there to read anything that's

made available to us. Um, I remember back more specifically, I think a just a bunch of

emails were received. I don't remember if I ever got anything as far as hard copies that

came to us.

Dusty further stated:

I really would have to admit that I stay so current on these things that it's usually me that

spreads the word to my fellow colleagues. You know, "Did you see that such and such

came out for us?" because I am so worried that they don't look at this stuff. So, I guess

most of it comes to us, to me electronically. However, it's amazing to me, just as a side

note, how many adjuncts don't pay attention to their emails. They don't even realize

what's there for us. I don't know why they don't do that. It's disappointing, I guess, to

me.

Marie indicated that communication regarding the grant was informal on her campus

stating "Any information…has been second hand." She stated, "I found out about the fee

remission in an email. We sporadically get information from central office." Dr. Massey also

described an informal process of communicating about the grant on his campus. Dr. Massey

stated:

It would be discussed in what's called a roundtable. It would be the dean, who runs the

college on a day-to-day basis, who's now vice chancellor of academic affairs kind of

position, would meet periodically, every couple of weeks he would meet with department

heads and say, "This money is available. Inform your faculty." And then, we would get

an email from our line supervisor saying "Does anyone want to be a faculty mentor?

Does anyone want to be this, that, or the other thing? There's money available."

Orientation. The majority of participants in this study indicated orientation to their

position as an adjunct faculty member was a significant factor in their overall experience.

Participants of the study indicated the college provided minimal orientation to newly hired

adjunct faculty, often leading to feelings of exclusion from the greater campus community.

Dusty stated:

> I was disappointed, but I understood because I could see what they were dealing with as
>
> far as having no time… but, I just felt like they were just throwing me into this situation
>
> and you know, without a teaching degree. I felt like, "Boy, they are really giving me a lot
>
> of responsibility without having any clue what I am going to teach."

Dusty also expressed her frustration with how returning adjunct faculty were prevented from

attending adjunct faculty orientation at the beginning of each semester. Dusty stated:

> Now, even at the beginning of the orientation night, used to be everybody could come
>
> and I know it's probably a money thing, everybody could come and eat with the new
>
> adjuncts. Not anymore. All of us that have been here, we go straight to our meeting at
>
> seven or something, but if you are a new adjunct, you can come at five and eat first. How
>
> stupid is that? Just once a year, everybody is here at the same time. We all have to be
>
> here that night, so why not feed us? Even though that's not a big thing, but at least that's
>
> a way to say, "Hey we are recognizing you, have a meal with us." You know, share with
>
> everybody.

> Marie also expressed disappointment with the college's orientation process. She stated:
>
> You just kind of get thrown into a room and it's sink or swim and it's really unfortunate.
>
> I don't know if anybody has even really thought about what happens to the people who
>
> would need some shepherding. They just get lost.

Marie went on to further describe her orientation experience on the campus where she teaches.

She stated that orientation:

> …isn't even on anybody's radar because again, it's "Here's your contract, sign your
>
> contract, here's your book, you're gonna be given a division final, go for it" and we go
>
> for it. It's almost instead of being proactive, we end up so reactive in our behavior and
>
> some people don't respond well to that. And if you're not willing to change or adapt it
>
> becomes frustrating.

However, Marie also described her orientation experience within her academic department more

positively. She stated:

> They're doing a much better job about making sure it just doesn't just become a
>
> scheduling session. We can actually go in and have materials presented and talk. We've
>
> been trying to do more dynamic activities to try to streamline labs. That's something
>
> we've been doing.

> In addition to describing their experiences with adjunct faculty orientation, the majority

of participants in this study expressed a greater need to have an adjunct faculty handbook

provided. To underscore its importance, Adolph indicated that providing adjunct faculty with

policies and procedures was an important element to the orientation process. He stated:

> I know at one time there was an adjunct faculty handbook, because I worked on it. I
>
> worked on the committee and I also helped put it together and every now and then, we
>
> get a modified version of that, kind of like an updated version. Now, I don't know if the
>
> new people get that or not, I can't attest to that, but I am thinking that it would probably
>
> be something worthwhile to have because it took me, probably, when I first came on, the
>
> better part of a year to be able to find out that I needed so-and-so's phone number or

email account and address. So, I could have used something like that. So, I would

imagine newcomers coming in today that would help them out immensely.

Dusty also indicated the importance of having an adjunct faculty handbook available

during the orientation process. She described that when she started, such a handbook was not

available to adjunct faculty and stated, "Looking back, yeah, I wish that I had that."

Mary also stated:

I think that the adjunct faculty handbook…and being familiarized with those things have

really been a blessing. Especially because that really does tell you a lot about where the

resources are and to whom do you go to speak about whatever problem you've got.

Mentoring. The majority of participants in the study indicated that mentoring was an

important factor that influenced their experience as an adjunct faculty member at the college. As

part of the adjunct faculty management program, the college developed a mentoring program that

was to be offered to all newly hired adjunct faculty after the spring 2008 semester. Since all

participants of the study were hired prior to that time, they could only provide insight into their

own experience and make observations about the current status of the college's adjunct faculty

mentoring program. Mary indicated that she did not have the opportunity to participate in a

mentoring program when hired at the college. However, she indicated a need for such a program

existed. She stated:

I did not really get to go through the mentoring program simply because I think it has

been established since I started teaching, that's the reason why I really did not get to

participate. But, I think it's a great idea. I truly believe in a mentoring program…I think

adjunct faculty need a go-to person. I really do. But, that go-to person can't be the head

person on campus.

Mary continued to reflect on her own experience as a newly hired adjunct faculty member and the thought process she went through when seeking information from her supervisor. Mary stated:

> I would have felt better if I had been able to call somebody besides her, not that I didn't trust her, but simply because I know what she's got on her plate and I think that it would have been a wonderful step-up if I could have had a mentor.

Dale also reflected on her experience as a newly hired adjunct faculty member. She indicated that having a mentor would have been helpful in learning how to navigate the college. Dale stated:

> I'll tell you, when I first came, I had no idea whatsoever about policies. I got a book for my class and one book or little folder about the college itself, and what courses were offered, but you know, I didn't know about grading. Those things come as you go along and you get to each in the semester, but there were just a lot of other things to learn. For example, I was here for six years before somebody told me we were not allowed to touch a student and not allowed to give them a ride in the car. Now granted, I never gave anybody a ride, but I didn't know that. I was floored when I heard that and I am very demonstrative. I come along and touch them on the back and say "That's a great sentence, you're really improving." I'm touchy, I do encourage people. And then somebody told me that and I thought "Oh my God! I am gonna be fired! I'll be in front of a judge for sexual harassment." That never occurred to me. I didn't know that.

Dusty recalled that when she first started with the college, she did not have an opportunity to be mentored. She stated:

I was thrown into a situation I knew nothing about. And that was really stressful for me. But, I am not afraid to ask questions. So, I always asked questions and you know we didn't have the adjunct faculty mentoring then. That's why when it became available; I wanted to be part of that because I remembered how it was for me. So, I wanted to make sure that the new adjuncts knew what resources were available.

Adolph also indicated that an adjunct faculty mentoring program would have been valuable to him as a newly hired adjunct faculty member at the college. Adolph described how he created resources to pass along to newly hired adjunct faculty in the absence of a mentoring program. He stated:

When I came on board, there were no guidelines or nobody coming in and sitting me down and saying "Okay, this is where you go here, this is where you go there." You sort of had to learn that all on your own. So, I just starting jotting things down, making my own little operating manual so that when somebody else came in, I would have a guide to help them along so they didn't stumble along and get into bad habits like I did when I first came on board. I would have loved to have had a mentoring program like we have now when I first came on board, but that was not the case.

Marie also expressed a need for a formalized mentoring program for adjunct faculty. She stated:

We just throw people in and say "Sink or swim" and that's really not good. It's not good for the students, it's not good for the faculty, and it's not good for the morale because you see someone struggling and there is not a system in place to come in and try to help without them feeling threatened.

Marie went on to state:

> I started working here five years ago; this was my sixth year and I've transplanted into
> the community. I taught at a community college [in a neighboring state] for 11 years as
> an adjunct. They had a very strong mentoring program where I was assigned a person for
> two or three years. It wasn't formal, but from a resource standpoint it helped integrate
> people. It really made life a lot easier and this college is so fragmented all across the
> state, different you know, clusters of classrooms everywhere. It's even worse and we do
> such a bad job of assigning a body to take care of another body and I don't know if it's
> just because we are adjuncts and we're hired for 16 weeks at a time and treated kind of as
> disposable products or pieces in the puzzle that there just isn't enough time for the full-
> time people to do that sort of thing. And, if there were more full-time faculty, maybe we
> could do a better job at adjunct mentoring.

Marie further stated:

> I would really, really like the mentoring program to work. I think it could be
> phenomenal. I've seen a system work where you've been able to nurture people who are
> strong in subject matter but don't have a teaching background. It allowed them an
> opportunity to grow.

Summary of Results

The primary research question in this study was to determine what influence did the Lilly Endowment's grant to recruit and retain intellectual capital have on adjunct faculty teaching within a community college system. Through examination of the participants' statements during the semi-structured interviews and field notes, five themes emerged. The participants in this study indicated they were only somewhat aware of the grant and initiatives that were developed

and implemented with grant funds for the intent of improving the adjunct faculty experience at the college. While the majority of participants in the study had a clear understanding of the grant's purpose, the limited knowledge the majority of participants had regarding the grant was gained through informal communication at the campus level. Participants indicated the majority of communication regarding the grant occurred in one-on-one settings, through email announcements, or informally during the course of departmental meetings.

During the course of the interviews, all participants of the study indicated familiarity with three of the major initiatives developed under the grant. Participants of the study were familiar with the college's *Introduction to Community College Instruction: Getting Results*, an online course to assist adjunct faculty with pedagogy and classroom management; the college's limited medical plan that is accessible to all part-time faculty; and the college's fee remission plan made available to adjunct faculty, their spouse, and dependent children.

Participants of this study were first employed by the college prior to the development and implementation of many of the initiatives that were part of the adjunct faculty management program. Therefore, participants were only able to reflect on their experiences as newly hired adjunct faculty members regarding orientation and mentoring. The majority of participants indicated that upon employment at the college, mentoring was virtually nonexistent and frequently, individuals had to seek out information regarding policies and procedures. Participants also indicated that prior to the development of the adjunct faculty management program, orientation for adjuncts frequently turned into scheduling course sections, handing out course materials including books, and signing adjunct faculty contracts.

However, the majority of participants indicated that, based upon their observations, both mentoring and orientation had improved at the college and had become more interactive and

engaging for newly hired adjunct faculty. Participants also indicated they believed the handbook

and other adjunct faculty materials developed were helpful to the overall success and experience

of adjunct faculty members hired after the spring 2008 semester. All participants in this study

indicated that mentoring and orientation programs were critical to the success of adjunct faculty

at the college and believe that all newly hired adjunct faculty should be required to complete a

formalized mentoring program, as well as participate in orientation at the beginning of each

semester.

CHAPTER 5

Results II

Chapter 4 provided demographical information regarding the study's participants and discusses participants' awareness of the grant, its purpose, as well as the emergent themes related to participants' lived experiences as adjunct faculty at the community college used in this study. Chapter 4 also described how data were analyzed in this study. This chapter is divided into sections that highlight emergent sub-themes that were revealed as findings of the data analysis of the study.

Sub-Themes

In Chapter 4, five emergent themes were revealed based upon the conducted analysis of data from the semi-structured interviews. Through the process of analysis, four sub-themes emerged in this study. The first sub-theme to emerge was adjunct faculty are intrinsically motivated to teach. The second sub-theme to emerge was adjunct faculty continue to feel marginalized and excluded from the cultural fabric of the institution. The third sub-theme that emerged was that adjunct faculty place significant value on relationships and base their value and mattering upon those relationships. The fourth and final sub-theme to emerge was the ability to access resources, including but not limited to classroom supplies and professional development opportunities, influences the overall adjunct faculty experience at the college.

Motivations for teaching. The majority of participants in this study indicated their

motivations to serve and teach as an adjunct faculty member were based upon factors other than

monetary compensation. The majority of participants in the study indicated their motivation to

teach was based upon intrinsic factors and rewards. For example, Marie indicated her motivation

to teach was based upon the desire to contribute to her community. She stated:

> I am a philanthropist at heart and I decided if I can teach enough people to either be good
>
> students, or good medical professionals, or at least have half of a heart, my whole
>
> community's going to be better and that's really why I do it. I'm not going to lie to you, I
>
> would not do it if there wasn't a paycheck, but believe me, it's half of an hourly wage of
>
> what I make as a medical professional. I really, really want to move my community
>
> ahead. I don't want to be in an environment where it gets so stagnant and no one is doing
>
> anything to better themselves and that's why I can make a few better people that can save
>
> somebody's life in my community, that's why I am here.

Mary also described her motivation to teach based upon her desire to contribute to her

community. She stated, "I am a servant. My job is to work with students to get them to a place

so they can get wherever they want to get in life." Mary further stated, "I would like to continue

teaching for the college simply because I find it very fulfilling. I find it a rewarding situation."

Tina described her motivation to teach was based upon the desire to serve as a role

model. As an African American woman, Trina indicated that she felt a strong sense of

responsibility to her community, particularly to the youth in her community. Trina stated that she

felt an obligation to serve as a role model and give others hope. She explained:

> When people of my community see me going to work, they don't see me with the
>
> Kentucky Fried Chicken hat. They don't see me with the blue shirt from the KFC. They

see me walking out as a professional. So, by them seeing me, they see, "Well, she's

doing that. I see her here on the weekends working in her yard when she has on a t-shirt,

some blue jeans, and gym shoes. But now, I see her going to work in this other role as a

professional."

Dale indicated her ability to work with other people was her motivation to serve as an

adjunct faculty member. She stated, "I like my job. I really do. That's what I will tell you

overwhelmingly. I love the people, it gives me a reason to get of bed in the morning and come

here." Dale further described her motivation for teaching as an adjunct faculty member was

based upon the ability to make a difference in individual students' lives by providing a greater

world perspective. She stated:

> My daughter always tells me, "Mom, teach them a paragraph and go home." And I think
>
> a lot more happens in the classroom than just English and history…the things people
>
> don't know just shock me sometimes. There's a lot of home-schooling that goes on
>
> within religious frameworks and those people are so poorly educated when they try to
>
> come here. I had a girl in class; she had no frame of reference to the things that you and I
>
> know, you know, just things everybody should know. And I said to her, "How did you
>
> know when the president was elected?" There's no television, no newspapers, no *Time*
>
> magazine, nothing in her home. And they go to church and they go home. She came
>
> here and then went to the store and that was it. And she said, "Well, I went to the store
>
> and somebody told me that Bush had been elected president." And you know, I like
>
> taking people like that and opening up the doors for them. I like doing that, I really do. I
>
> always laugh at them when I tell them I am full of useless information…but, I try to be as

humorous as I can when I do these things and not preachy. But, I just really like it and that's what keeps me coming back.

Participants strongly indicated their motivations for teaching were based upon intrinsic factors and were not based upon the desire or need for additional monetary compensation. Participants described intrinsic rewards such as giving back to the their communities, helping other succeed, and being role models as motivating factors in their decision to serve as an adjunct faculty member at the college.

Marginalization and exclusion. Based upon the lived experiences of the study's participants, marginalization has been defined as the condition of being considered and treated as a second-class citizen within the institution (McLaughlin, 2005; Burnstad, 2002). Further, based upon those same lived experiences of the study's participants, exclusion has been defined as the degree to which one feels removed or distanced from particular activities, such as campus events, training, or celebrations, particularly those that may be considered relevant to an institution's cultural fabric.

Environment. The majority of participants indicated that the college's general environment had influenced their experience, often leading to feeling excluded from the greater college community. Marie expressed her experience with being included in larger groups of faculty and staff on her campus. She stated:

These people have all worked together for the last 30 plus years. So, they all know what's going on and they have like a little insiders' club. Everyone else is kind of on the outside begging for either information or funds to get let in and they won't, it's almost like they won't listen. There is disparity amongst the two groups.

Dr. Massey also indicated that becoming included in the campus culture was challenging because from an adjunct faculty member's perspective, it appeared the college lacked continuity and he was uncertain who was in charge. He described his feelings as follows:

There is too much fragmentation of authority, there's not somebody at the top who can knock heads today and say, "This is going to work, this is where we are going to spend our money." I wasn't able to see the final review from the accrediting people, but I understand that they were pretty vigorous on the subject.

Based upon the general environment for adjunct faculty at the college, Dr. Massey also stated:

At some point, there's going to be a pretty big reorganization. I'm not so sure myself, just looking at it since I have no stake in it at this age in life, but just looking at it as an educator, I'm not so sure that having a lot of adjuncts is a bad thing or having a lot of full-time people is necessarily a good thing. I've taught both as full-time and part-time as a department chair; I've got pretty good experience at stuff. I don't think there is anything magic about being full-time. We have here, a lot of what I characterize as a lot of dead weight; people who have been here a long time, who teach their classes, who do less work than adjunct, and no one knows who they are.

The majority of participants also indicated the college's growth had influenced their experience as an adjunct faculty member. Marie indicated that the college's large enrollment growth over the past several years "exposed the college's weaknesses" in terms of adjunct faculty and that the growth made it more difficult to find qualified adjunct faculty to teach courses. She stated that she felt adjunct faculty were frequently treated like "second-class citizens and maybe even third-class, on some levels." Marie also stated:

It seems like, and I have gotten the feeling on occasion, that we really are like fast food workers that they put us in a schedule and you show up and do your job and leave. That is just not a good way to do things. I want it to be better, but am I deluded in my thinking that it needs to be happy and sunshine and everything else?

Marie shared her continued experiences with being excluded and marginalized at the college. She described the process by which adjunct faculty members sign their employment contracts on her campus. Marie stated:

I don't know if everyone sees the big picture. I think the contract we sign – every time I sign it, I just have to swallow hard. I understand why it's worded the way its worded to protect the college, but it seems so confrontational that you can be removed at any time, for any reason, and says "This is no guarantee that you are ever going to be hired again." "You must do this and you must do that." It seems so mandated and unfriendly. And then, we set the tone when we do put somebody new in that we aren't welcoming them really or we're certainly not following up on it.

In reaction to the college's focus on enrollment growth and increased use of adjunct faculty, Marie shared "It seems like more and more, we're backpedaling. We keep adding more classes and not adding more continuity and that's a problem." Marie further stated:

It's like, we need numbers, we need numbers, we need numbers! I don't know if it's an academic versus business model switch. I'm not saying the old guard academic model is perfect, and it's not. But we have to find some middle ground, because what they're asking us to do is not gonna happen.

Diversity. While the majority of participants in this study described various factors that influenced adjunct faculty experiences regarding marginalization and exclusion, two participants expressed how diversity and multiculturalism influenced their experiences. Trina shared:

I noticed, for me, even throughout the campus, I noticed that with the administrators and faculty there did not seem be a balance between the demographics and racial makeup of faculty. I would have thought that they would have had more minority faculty, more minority administrators on this campus. That was very surprising to me. And that is considerably lower than it should me. To me, I don't think they are concerned as much as they should be with diversification.

Trina further stated:

I noticed that there are certain areas that you find that there are a lot of minorities in certain positions, like administrative assistants. They seem to find those very easily…I find that the number of minorities that they have in professional positions are extremely low even though I hear them say that the college is concentrating on diversity.

Trina reported that she had sought full-time employment with the college as either a full-time faculty member or administrator. However, she described her experience as negative:

You can apply for certain positions but you probably…won't get it. After what I've done professionally, when you're talking about someone that's been involved in computers since 1969…I've worked for some major organizations, no mom-and-pop companies, some major organizations, Fortune 500 companies, that you would have thought that a college would have jumped at the opportunity to have someone like that in a particular area, especially in technological areas. I even applied for positions that weren't nearly on that level, they were almost entry level positions, that I was never ever given the chance

to even interview. So, after going through that three times, you stop interviewing in that

area because it is like, okay, you see people that come in and what type of experience

they have and then you wonder. I've heard things like "You weren't interviewed because

you were overqualified." So, I just stopped even filling out applications.

In addition to the marginalization and exclusion described by Trina on her campus,

Marie, who indicated during her interview that she was lesbian, described her experience with

the college's limited medical plan accessible to adjunct faculty. Marie stated:

I had raised the question off the cuff about the spouse and what they would consider to be

a spouse. Being a homosexual, my partner would probably have loved the

opportunity…I didn't receive a "No," but I didn't receive a "Yes." That spouse thing just

really twists a little bit because they don't recognize everyone equally and that's still a

little bit of a problem.

Marie further described her experience regarding the college's limited medical plan. She stated:

When I asked my department chair, I did it sort of to be a stickler and just to prove a

point more than anything. She said that she would ask, but I'm sure in her grand scheme

of things, that's the least of things on her scale. We have a lot of other battles to fight.

But it's also about what most people consider to be your diversity issues: your African

American population, Latinos, others who speak English as a second language, and other

groups that have been transplanted here. We don't address them at all. We may say we

do, but on this campus, no. There's no recognition, there's no identity for them, there's

no outlet. So one may argue and say that's not what a community college is for, we're

just to suppose to churn out people with some intelligence instead of being well-rounded,

that we should leave the well-roundedness for the four year schools. I don't agree with

that. We can have a huge influence on people, but we just don't do it and I would think

it's probably just because nobody has ever thought about it or that's not an initiative

that's even on anybody's radar. Do I think that hurt me here? Absolutely not. You

know, I teach probably more than I should, but I was rewarded with an award this spring.

So, I don't feel that kind of discrimination here. That comment though about spouse and

then nothing else written and knowing through the medical plan that I couldn't, if that

was my only opportunity for insurance, I couldn't put her on it. That's still just a little

twist.

Value and mattering. The majority of participants in this study indicated they felt

valued by their individual supervisors and that they mattered to their colleagues. However, the

majority of participants in this study did not feel valued by the college. Dale expressed that

every year, "The dean will stand up and tell us that they couldn't do this without us and yet, she

stated, "There are some things that make people feel second-class or inferior." Dale further

stated that she felt a greater sense of self value at the college due to the large enrollment growths

experienced over the past several years at the college. She felt that as an adjunct faculty

member, she had contributed to the success of the college, which was largely measured by

administrators through enrollment growth. She stated:

> I feel a little bit more valuable now that enrollment has blossomed. So, they need us, you
>
> know. But once in a while, things come along like where full-time faculty get the big
>
> advantages and adjuncts the crumbs kind of thing. Once in a while that sticks in my
>
> craw.

However, Dale also described a situation where adjunct faculty pay checks were

distributed in a less than desirable manner, leading her to question the value the college placed

on adjunct faculty. Dale indicated when concerns had been expressed by adjunct faculty

members to the administration the response was "We have to wait until we find out who's

teaching what and how many of those classes, how many students are over, how many are going

to be in that class, or whether the class will go." According to Dale, the process often results in

adjunct faculty members going without paychecks from the mid-December until the mid-

February. She stated:

> At other institutions, adjunct faculty are paid two thirds of the class upfront. They're
>
> paid right at the beginning of the course and then they have to teach the whole time
>
> before they get the last one third of their salary for that particular course. We don't. And
>
> sometimes six weeks go by before we get a paycheck. That is appallingly unprofessional
>
> and I think unconscionable. It's okay for me; I have a husband, you know, he's got some
>
> income coming in. I'm working with young people, they don't know where their next
>
> meal is coming from and I'm not kidding about that. They're hanging on by their
>
> fingernails to pay a car payment or rent somewhere. What are these people supposed to
>
> do? I suggested, if you're not going to do that, give everybody $100.00. Give them
>
> enough money to go to the grocery store and have a little food before they get their first
>
> paycheck.

Dale went on to further describe her concern with the amount of value placed on adjunct

faculty and stated, "Once in a while, things come along that full-time faculty get the big

advantages and we get the crumbs." Specifically, Dale provided the example of when full-time

faculty were extended an opportunity to receive cardio pulmonary resuscitation training at no

cost, while adjunct faculty members who sought the same training were told they would have to

pay $40.00 to participate, thus leading to feeling marginalized and less valued than full-time

faculty. After expressing concern to the administration, Dale indicated the final decision was for adjunct faculty to pay half the cost.

Dr. Massey indicated that he also felt valued as an adjunct faculty member by his current supervisor but also expressed frustration with the payment processes at the college. He shared:

When I was on a statewide committee and I had to travel, my supervisor said "Fine, not a problem. Develop an alternative learning experience for your class" and off I went. However, I had to buy a substitute - pay a substitute out of my own pocket even though I was travelling on college business. I had a three-hour class, so it cost me $75.00 out of my pocket because we pay each other at the old rate, which is under the table cash. And that pretty much ate up what I got back in travel. So, it was almost a wash and that's just because adjuncts shouldn't be doing that kind of thing and it was obviously a message.

Adolph indicated that he also felt valued by his supervisor, but felt that the college placed less value on adjunct faculty reflected in how the college responded to concerns raised by adjunct faculty. Adolph stated:

I don't get the impression that they hear us. It's sort of like my two year old saying "Daddy, can I go out and play?" and I'm doing something very important. And when I get finished doing it, and I go, "Why are you out there playing?" "Dad, you told me it I could go out and play." "No, I didn't." "Yes, you did." You know, I hear you, but I don't hear you and sometimes. I think that the powers that be act the same way. They hear us, but then they don't hear us.

Dusty indicated that on her campus, returning adjunct faculty members were not invited to attend all the meetings newly hired adjunct faculty were asked to attend at the beginning of each semester. When Dusty asked administrators the reasons why returning adjunct faculty were

not included, she was told that it was to control cost and one way to do that was by not inviting

returning adjunct faculty members to all the meetings because newly hired adjuncts were

provided a dinner. Dusty expressed:

> You would think it would be to the college's advantage for returning adjunct faculty to
>
> interact with newly hired adjuncts. So, I'm feeling like "Yeah, I've been here for a lot of
>
> years, but hey, I'm still of value." I mean, it's disappointing to me. I mean, I don't see
>
> the sense in it. You know it makes more sense to me to be able to introduce yourself to
>
> the new adjuncts. They're not here just to meet each other. It would make sense that
>
> they'd want to meet us. They probably have a million questions and who better to ask
>
> than one of us who have been here?

The majority of participants in this study indicated their experiences as an adjunct faculty

member at the college led to feelings of being marginalized and excluded. Participants described

how the culture of the institution influenced their experience. Specifically, participants described

feeling excluded from information sharing, communication, the decision the making process, and

being treated differently than full-time faculty members at the college. Participants also

described how the college's growth influenced their feelings of marginalization due to the

continued focus on enrollment growth, leading to adjunct faculty being treated more and more

like hourly employees hired to cover particular course sections rather than being hired based

upon skill, qualifications, and ability to teach.

Additionally, two participants of the study described how diversity and multi-culturalism

influenced their experience at the college. One participant described how the lack of racial

minorities in full-time faculty and administrative positions influenced her overall experience,

indicating that she felt welcomed at the college, but did not feel there was commitment from the

college to diversity and multiculturalism based upon her experiences while seeking full-time employment there. As a result of those experiences, she decided to no longer pursue employment beyond her adjunct faculty position. Another faculty member, who indicated that she was a lesbian, said that she also felt the college lacked commitment to diversity and multiculturalism because her domestic partner was not allowed to use the limited medical plan and fee remission. As a result, she indicated that she felt marginalized and excluded based upon her sexual orientation.

The majority of participants in the study indicated that they felt valued by individuals, mainly their supervisors and fellow faculty members, within the college. However, the majority of participants did not feel the institution valued their contributions to the college and success of its students. Utilizing the descriptions from participants of the study, adjunct faculty measured their sense of being valued based upon established relationships and perceived treatment. To illustrate this point, one participant described how her supervisor frequently consulted with her regarding curriculum and textbook adoption. As a result, the participant indicated she felt very valued by her supervisor. The same participant also described the process by which adjunct faculty were compensated by the college and indicated feeling frustrated and a sense of not mattering to the college. Other participants of the study cited examples of how the college demonstrated not valuing adjunct faculty through processes related to payment, reimbursement, and travel. However, adjunct faculty feelings of not being valued by the college were strongest when it came to having input into the decisions-making process, being valued for their previous work experiences, and being recognized for the contributions they could make to newly hired adjunct faculty experiences.

Relationships. The majority of participants in this study indicated they felt somewhat satisfied with their relationships with the institution and fellow faculty members. However, participants also indicated that continued growth and development of relationships on all levels was needed. Dr. Massey described his experience when first starting his employment at the college. He stated:

> We had a chancellor for years and years who specialized in not spending money. I don't know if he actually turned money in at the end of the year, but his theory of impressing central office was to spend as little as possible. He also operated under a total dictatorial regime. There was an absolute climate of fear. When I came here, I was walking down the hall one day and my supervisor grabbed me and pulled me into her office and closed the door. I said, "What's that?" And she said, "You don't want the chancellor to see you, you don't want to be seen."

Dr. Massey went on to state that a change in chancellor had resulted in a marked improvement in the relationship between the college and adjunct faculty. He stated:

> One of the things that the new chancellor did was to make it clear that adjunct faculty were welcome to attend general faculty meetings. Prior to that time, the adjuncts were not encouraged to do anything except to show up and go home. It was just like an iron curtain between full-time regular people and adjuncts. The new chancellor and the new academic dean both made very strenuous efforts to make sure that adjunct faculty were involved and over the years, the participation of adjunct faculty in these regular meetings, informational meetings, had gone up dramatically.

Dr. Massey further described how the addition of an adjunct faculty coordinator had a positive influence the relationship between adjunct faculty and the college. He stated:

Until we got a full-time adjunct support person, which has made a world of difference

too, we had very little information to work on. When I came here at the end of the first

year of the Lilly grant, there was a person hired half-time to work as a support person and

she had a very frustrating experience and left and took a job [at another institution]. Then

she was replaced by our current person who has a full-time position and she has been able

to really make some significant changes both as an advocate and with information. But,

even in all that information flow, I don't think that the idea that the Lilly grant was kind

of behind this thing was ever totally apparent. It was not my perception and I'm pretty

perceptive.

Through the development of the full-time adjunct faculty support position described

above, Dr. Massey indicated that the relationship between the college and adjuncts has improved.

However, he indicated that the relationship among faculty members, in general, needs continued

improvement. Dr. Massey stated:

I would say that there is more closeness and part of it is that it's easier in the arts and

sciences because we have so few full-time people. Now, if you were interviewing

adjuncts from health science that might be a totally different story because the nursing

accrediting people require that virtually everyone be full-time. So, health science, as you

know, is staffed with very few adjuncts, probably 80 percent are full-time. And those

people who teach as adjuncts, for example, we have three positions, M.D's working as

adjuncts. They just come in, they just teach, they are retired doctors. I think, if you talk

to an adjunct, you would get a different vision of college life and how things are. They

probably would not have as much sense of belonging, the inclusiveness. And then in the

academic skills advancement department, adjuncts are pretty much frozen out of decision

making and everything else.

Dr. Massey indicated that the college should make better attempts to focus on the

satisfaction and treatment of employees in general. Dr. Massey stated:

It's hard to understand why that eludes management and administration. The top Fortune

500 companies are usually the same companies year after year and the business people

who have studied them, they find out, low and behold, that their secret is that they treat

their employees well. They do this; they provide childcare, dry cleaning, or whatever.

They treat them as if their employees are their most important center and then the happy

employee goes out and makes money for the company. That is the principle that ought to

work across the board, but it is hard sometimes for people to grasp that. It just pays to be

nice to the people at the bottom of the pile.

Dr. Massey further stated how the relationship between the college and adjunct faculty

might be improved:

If you want adjuncts to be doing things over and above teaching, punching the pay clock,

you need to treat them as human beings, value their contributions, encourage them to get

out and bond with the community and bring in students, and all that kind of stuff.

While Dr. Massey's description of his relationship with the college and among his peers

working in different departments within the college varied, he indicated that the Lilly grant had

an overall positive impact. He stated, "The Lilly grant had a significant impact on changing the

culture, even though we weren't aware of what was driving it."

Mary also indicated that the relationship between the college and other faculty members

was an important factor in her overall experience as an adjunct. Mary stated that working at the

college part-time and trying to develop and maintain relationships with both the college and individuals was challenging. She described her experience as feeling similar to "ships passing in the night." However, Mary further stated:

> I have been very, very blessed…in the fact that there are so many people, regardless of where you go, regardless of who you ask, if they do not know the answer, they know somebody who does. Now, they'll tell you, "Well, you need to see so-and-so, or that person for that reason or whatever," and that has been really great. But, I have never, ever gone to anyone and said "I need help with such and such" and they've said "Too bad" or walked away. They always try to find me, either help me themselves, or work with me to get me somebody who will help me and that's something that's just tremendous. And I don't know if it's like that at every college, I would hope so, I really would, because I don't see how in the world you are going to maintain adjunct faculty if you don't. But, I think the working conditions here, the friendliness, the family-like atmosphere, really make for a good working relationship.

Mary indicated that "the most important thing that a college does for their adjunct faculty is, number one, to make them feel welcome" and "to make them feel like they are part of the staff regardless of how many classes they teach or don't teach." Mary further stated:

> I really think that the full-time staff needs to be given a lot of credit. Many times because they work together, many time full-time staff who work together tend to sometimes forget adjunct faculty because they don't really see us a lot…But then again, that goes back to something I've already said, but I think that they need to be given a lot of credit for creating the atmosphere that adjuncts work in. I don't think many times enough credit is given to those people for creating a positive work environment with adjuncts for

adjuncts. I think that they need to know that their willingness to answer questions and to

sit down and discuss things or to give us the benefit of their experience in the college

realm has been a godsend and it is a godsend and I'm really very fortunate that I had the

people in my life at the college that I've had. And I mean that sincerely. I cannot say

enough positive things about the permanent…teachers who work there full-time. They

have never, ever looked down their nose at me or anybody else that I have ever known

and said "Who are you?"

Trina also described the relationship between adjunct and full-time faculty and staff as

positive. She indicated:

> They have been so good to me here, they really have. I feel like they have embraced me
>
> and that I've been included in so many things. They deal with me outside of the adjunct
>
> faculty and they give me exposure in business areas and professional areas.

Inclusion. As part of the adjunct faculty development plan, one of the initiatives

developed and implemented was a policy that required, as a standard practice, that adjunct

faculty be invited to participate in campus and regional activities. These activities included, but

were not limited to commencement, committee meetings, and faculty meetings. During the

course of the interviews, the majority of participant of the study indicated the degree to which

they felt included in the institution's community influenced their experience as an adjunct faculty

member. The majority of participants indicated the development and implementation of the

adjunct faculty inclusion policy assisted in the legitimization of their role at the college. Dr.

Massey explained, "I think it did by legitimizing adjunct faculty participation in the life of the

college – more than just coming in, punching your clock and keeping you head down."

Dr. Massey further stated:

> I would say that the status of adjuncts has improved dramatically since I've been here and these kinds of activities probably, I don't know how you would show that empirically, but just looking at this sheet of paper, I can see how "ah," a light goes on that legitimizes adjuncts as more than manpower day labor.

Dr. Massey also indicated the results of the college's adjunct faculty inclusion policy were evidenced by the increasing roles adjunct faculty assumed in the overall operation of the college. Dr. Massey stated:

> Many adjuncts serve on faculty committees. This is one of the regions that has a faculty senate. There aren't very many of them. I served as a founding member of the faculty senate, wrote the constitution, and was very active in that as an adjunct. About 75 percent of the membership of the senate was adjuncts.

Dr. Massey further explained that the increasing role of adjunct faculty in the college also resulted in a realization that commonalities between full-time faculty and adjunct faculty existed. Dr. Massey stated:

> We worked very hard to do away with this distinction of full-time versus part-time and tried to nurture this concept of faculty. And to the degree to which full-time people realized that they were in the same boat and in many ways weren't being treated any better than adjuncts, they began to see that there's kind of a divide-and-conquer strategy. Maybe it was counterproductive in that it was quite possible for a full-time person, thinking that their full-time status would insulate themselves from some of the things that happened to adjuncts, that just wasn't necessarily true.

In addition to helping to legitimize the role of adjunct faculty with the college, participants indicated that the adjunct faculty inclusion policy also had an positive influence on general adjunct faculty participation in the college. Mary indicated:

I truly feel that I am more involved with the college, and I don't know if it was necessarily because of my years of experience teaching in the college or because of the initiatives. I truly feel that there are a lot of things I probably would not have done, especially getting my online certification. I think that the participation, the invitations to attend commencements and so forth are vital and I didn't really feel that as adjunct faculty we were necessarily invited.

Dale described how interactions with her supervisor resulted in feeling included in the curriculum decision making process. Dale stated, "She asks my opinion on textbooks and there are no changes made without asking my opinion. She comes to me, makes me feel good and makes me feel like I'm a valuable employee."

While participants of the study described a greater sense of inclusion at the college, several challenges remain for integrating adjunct faculty into the institution. When asked about integration into the campus environment, participants responded in many ways, and provided insight into the experiences of integration into meetings, social gatherings, and celebrations. Specifically, Mary stated:

There are times when I feel left out of the loop simply because I don't get to go to the meetings which to me, as a teacher, there's a lot of stuff that goes on in the meetings. It does matter if people aren't there because one person may have a question that would have brought up something else that might need to be solved or resolved before anything happens and if that one person is absent, that question doesn't get asked and it doesn't get

answered. But, there are times when I think that it is necessary for adjuncts to get

together and to make sure they can touch base and see each other's faces and call each

other's names and I think that's one of the things about the meetings that really does help.

Dusty explained that her sense of exclusion was influenced by the lack of adjunct faculty

in recognition at the college. Dusty stated, "We have these annual thank you receptions. There's

one that we don't get to go to. You know, why not? I mean what better place to network with

your colleagues that you don't know." Dusty further stated, "I've been frustrated by it." She

also indicated that she often felt a lack of inclusion for adjunct faculty when social opportunities

were available on her campus. She stated, "When we do social gatherings, sometimes the

adjuncts aren't really included in different things. That kinda makes me feel like – 'Come on, so

what I'm not a full-time member.' I'm still doing what they're doing."

The majority of participants in this study indicated relationships and the sense of

connection to the college and its individuals were key factors that influenced their experiences.

Prior to the implementation of initiatives developed as part of the grant, one participant described

an environment where faculty and staff, including adjuncts, operated in fear of their regional

chancellor. However, through changes in leadership and the development of the adjunct faculty

coordinator position under the grant, the majority of participants of this study described positive

relationships with individuals at the college.

The majority of participants in the study also indicated that the adjunct faculty inclusion

policy that was developed as an initiative under the adjunct faculty management program had a

positive influence on their experiences. Specifically, as a result of the policy, participants felt

that adjunct faculty have been legitimized within the college, which has resulted in greater

professional opportunities through engagement on committees, participation in ceremonies, and

inclusion in meetings. However, while participants indicated increased inclusion at the college, they also indicated the need for continued growth regarding inclusion. As a result of the adjunct faculty inclusion policy, adjunct faculty are now included in many of the college's day-to-day operations and ceremonies. However, adjunct faculty continue to feel excluded from social interactions with full-time faculty, interactions with newly hired adjunct faculty during the orientation process, and during the college's yearly recognition of faculty.

Resources. The majority of participants in this study indicated that access to college resources influenced their experience as an adjunct faculty member. Responses regarding access to resources ranged from technology to basic classroom supplies. Dr. Massey described some of his challenges that arise when attempting to access to technology in the classroom. He stated:

> I don't know at any given day, whether my classroom equipment is going to work or not. And if it does work, I don't know what part is going to work, whether it's the computer or overheard projector. If I want to show a video, I take two formats. I take a DVD and VHS because one or the other is probably broken. Hopefully, one is working, sometimes I have to fall back to plan C, D, and E. It's kind of a joke here.

He further described his experiences with technology in the classroom when his supervisor was present to evaluate his teaching effectiveness. Dr. Massey indicated that he had planned to use some of the technology in the classroom, but it failed. According to Dr. Massey, when his supervisor filled out the in the evaluation form, she wrote, "He tried" under the use of technology section.

Dale also described her experience with classroom technology on her campus. She stated, "I'm in a room, my first class, with no computers at all. Granted, I moan and groan about them because I hate them, but the students need them, so we need access to more computers."

In addition to concerns expressed about technology, the majority of participants in this study expressed concerns regarding office and storage space. All participants of the study indicated that the college had developed workspaces for adjunct faculty as part of the grant. Trina stated:

> I feel like things have gotten better than when I initially started. If my students wanted [to meet with me], they would say, "Well, what are your office hours?" Well, we didn't have an office and my response would be, "Let me know when you want to see me" and I would run around and find someplace to have a meeting. Now, there's a designated area for adjunct faculty where there are phones. We don't have our own phones, but there are phones and a desk. There's an area where you can sit down and talk with students. So the college has improved from that perspective, but still a lot more needs to be done.

However, several participants of the study indicated that, while having dedicated workspace for adjunct faculty was helpful, challenges still existed with access. Dr. Massey stated, "There's no place where a student can come find me. I'm in a room that a big sign that says, 'Adjunct Faculty, Keep Out!" Adolph also stated:

> If I had an office, I could come to my office anytime and do what I need to do. Whereas, on any given day of the week, if you got to the adjunct faculty workspace and you want to go to the computer to check your email or you got to catch up on *Blackboard*, you better hope that all the computers are available. All you need is to have three or four of them down and the rest of the computers are being used. So, you just waste time and energy getting here.

Marie also expressed concern regarding access to computers within the adjunct faculty workspace. She stated:

We have made huge steps in the last three years by having the computers in the adjunct

faculty workspace. It used to only be one computer. There was one computer to log all

the grades and there are maybe 300 adjuncts within our little division. Let alone, you add

everybody else and that just was a problem getting grades put in, because we had to do it

ourselves.

Marie described further challenges with current adjunct faculty workspaces. Specifically,

she described the lack of storage space allocated to adjunct faculty. As a result, Marie stated:

I threw my own file cabinet in the room I normally teach in because I just wanted to

make sure I had my materials in class and I usually need them. I would love to have a

room or an environment where we could lock up our purse or laptop, go teach, and come

back and sit down and either speak with students or each other.

While several of the study participants described current challenges with access to space,

Trina added:

I think that it's unreal to think that that they would have offices for each one of us, but I

think that they could better allocate space maybe if they had departmental offices. Right

now, the area I go, which is like the general education, I've noticed most of the people

there are general education. They either teach reading or math, so I go into the area and I

feel like, "Get me a section and talk to my students." But, I think it would be a lot better

if each area had its own area for adjuncts.

In addition to the descriptions provided above, Marie also described her experience

regarding access to basic classroom supplies. Specifically, she stated:

The access to classroom items is almost a joke, because even today, I had a student ask

me for paper clips after I had run some things off. He's a special needs student and we're

trying to get a jump on the fall semester and I didn't even have paper clips. I can staple it

for him, but I don't even have paper clips and it's kind of embarrassing when they sit and

look and you don't even have paper clips. Of course, I played it off and said "They don't

let us have sharp objects." But, it's really embarrassing. If I asked for it; I would

probably get maybe one or two of the things. I think our supplies end up in other

programming areas. I'll just say that and I don't think from a classroom management

standpoint, we get the resources the maybe we should be allocated.

Marie further described a time when she requested classroom supplies from a clerical

staff member on her campus. Marie stated:

I've had a receptionist stop me after I got a folder, a manila folder. She said "Those are

ours for the front desk" and I'm thinking, "I need to organize some exams for these

online classes that we're trying to do." She said "Well, you can't use that." I understand

the receptionist is important because she is the first face that they see walking in the door,

but we're trying to do some things too.

Summary of Results II

The primary research question in this study was what influence did the Lilly

Endowment's grant to recruit and retain intellectual capital have on adjunct faculty teaching

within a community college system. Through examination of the participants' statements during

the semi-structured interviews and field notes, four sub-themes emerged.

The first sub-theme revealed that the primary motivating factors that led adjunct faculty

to teach were not based upon monetary reward or compensation. Participants expressed that

their desire to teach as an adjunct faculty member at a community college allowed them to make

positive contributions to their community. This ability appeared to take precedent over any other

motivating factor, including the initiatives that were developed and initiated under the adjunct faculty management program. Although the ability to make positive contributions to their communities was the primary motivation for teaching, additional factors that had significant influence on the overall adjunct faculty experience emerged.

The second sub-theme to emerge in this study was that adjunct faculty's desire to feel included in the cultural fabric of the institution. However, the majority of participants in this study described experiences of being excluded and marginalized from the college. Participants indicated they felt excluded from the decision making process at the college and reported feelings of being treated less than equal to their full-time peers. Similarly, participants also indicated not feeling valued by the college based upon their perception of not having a voice in the decision making process, administrators' lack of action when concerns were expressed, and the lack of perceived recognition of the value their value and how they could assist newly hired adjunct faculty.

Two participants of the study also discussed how the perceived lack of commitment by the college to diversity and multiculturalism led to feelings of exclusion in their employment experience. Specifically, one participant described how racial minorities were underrepresented in full-time faculty and administrative roles at the college and also described her own experiences as an African American female seeking full-time employment at the college. Another participant, who is a lesbian, shared her disappointment with the college's limited medical plan for adjuncts that does not allow them to purchase coverage for their domestic partners.

The third sub-theme to emerge in this study was adjunct faculty's desire to feel connected through relationships with each other, full-time faculty, administrators, and the institution. The

majority of participants in this study indicated that relationships and a sense of connection were key factors that influenced their experience. The majority of participants expressed that the grant and the development and implementation of the adjunct faculty management plan assisted in legitimizing the role and importance of adjunct faculty. As a result, the majority of participants in this study indicated increased connection and involvement with the college through participation in meetings, professional development opportunities, and ceremonies. However, participants indicated that the need for greater social interaction between adjunct and full-time faculty, and greater integration of returning adjunct faculty with newly hired adjunct faculty were still needed.

The fourth and final sub-theme to emerge in this study was access to resources significantly influenced the adjunct faculty's experience. Participants in this study indicated access to basic classroom supplies and appropriate technology in the classroom remains a challenge. The majority of participants also indicated access to workspaces, while improved under the grant, remains challenging due to the increasing number of adjunct faculty members at the college. Also, participants indicated that while workspace had been dedicated to adjunct faculty on all the campuses, there is a continued lack of space for storage of personal and classroom items and access to computers.

As part of the adjunct faculty management program, mentoring and orientation programs were to be developed and implemented on all campuses beginning in the spring 2008 semester. Participants of this study were hired prior to the implementation of these initiatives; therefore, their descriptions were based upon their own lived experiences as newly hired adjunct faculty prior to the development of the adjunct faculty management plan. All participants in the study indicated proper orientation and mentoring did not occur at the beginning of their employment

with the college. However, all participants indicated proper orientation and mentoring were key

factors in the success of adjunct faculty members at the college and expressed the belief that both

should be mandatory for all newly hired adjunct faculty. Based upon their observations of the

orientation and mentoring programs developed under the adjunct faculty management plan, the

majority of participants expressed belief that both activities were becoming more engaging and

improving.

CHAPTER 6

Discussion

The purpose of this study was to examine the influence of the adjunct faculty management program developed and implemented through grant funds received from the Lilly Endowment at a Midwestern community college. Chapter 4 provided the results regarding participants' awareness of the grant and emergent themes. The chapter highlighted five themes: (a) limited awareness of the grant; (b) limited knowledge of the nine initiatives developed and implemented under the grant; (c) lack of formal communication regarding the grant and its initiatives; (d) the adjunct faculty experience was significantly influenced by orientation to the position; and (e) mentoring had a significant influence on their experience. Chapter 5 detailed sub-themes that emerged through analyzing data from the semi-structured interviews. The chapter highlighted four sub-themes: (a) intrinsic motivation to teach; (b) feelings of being marginalized and excluded from the cultural fabric of the institution; (c) value and mattering of relationships; and (d) access to resources. Chapter 6 provides a discussion on the data analysis of the emergent themes from the previous two chapters in this study.

Scholarly research on the lived experiences of adjunct faculty, their integration into higher education, and evaluation of effective programs that lead to their increased recruitment and retention in the nation's community colleges has been virtually nonexistent (Valadez & Anthony, 2001). In 1968, it was estimated that adjunct faculty constituted only 20% of all

faculty in higher education (Feldman & Turnley, 2001). However, over the past four decades,

the use of adjunct faculty has grown exponentially. In 2005, it was estimated that nearly 270,000

individuals (Wallin 2005) or 48% of all faculty employed in institutions of higher education were

adjunct faculty (NCES, 2007). Frequently, the growth in the employment of adjunct faculty in

higher education is viewed as a characteristic and challenge primarily for community colleges.

While the use of adjunct faculty is more predominate at community college throughout the

nation (Brewster, 2000; Grusin & Reed, 1994), four year institutions still employ approximately

44% of all adjuncts teaching in higher education (NCES, 2005).

Demographics and Diversity

Participants in this study came from diverse backgrounds and settings, including race,

gender, sexual orientation, and motivation for teaching. In Chapter 3, Table 1 provided detailed

demographics about participants in this study, including age, gender, and race. Based upon data

from the college's 2007 adjunct faculty survey, males comprised 57% of adjunct faculty teaching

at the college and females comprised 43% of the adjunct faculty teaching at the college (Ivy

Tech Community College, 2007a). In this study, males comprised 28.5% of the sample and

females comprised 71.5% of the sample. Additional data from the college's 2007 adjunct faculty

survey also found the majority of adjunct faculty employed at the college were White (83.5%),

followed by Blacks (5.1%), Native Americans (1.8%), Asians (1.6%), and Hispanics (1.3%) (Ivy

Tech Community College, 2007a). In this study, Whites accounted for 71.5% of the sample and

Blacks accounted for 28.5% of the sample. It should be noted that none of the participants in this

study self-identified as Native American, Asian, or Hispanic. Additional data from the 1993

National Study of Postsecondary Faculty found 48% of adjunct faculty held a bachelor's degree,

52% of adjunct faculty held at least a master's degree prior to employment (NCES, 2002) and an

additional 11% held either a doctorate or equivalent professional credential (Leslie & Gappa, 2002; Pearch & Marutz, 2005). In this study, 57.2% of participants held a bachelor's degree, 28.5% held a master's degree, and 14.3% held a doctorate.

Gender. Participants of this study represented a cross-section of the college's adjunct faculty. Scholarly research has found that females are generally over represented among the adjunct faculty ranks in community colleges (Lundy & Warme, 1990; NCES, 2002). In addition to the general disproportionate number of females in part-time positions, females often face career barriers within the academy. These barriers are often associated with balancing family, career obligations, and rearing children (Gardner, 2007; Marcus, 2007). The female participants in this study did not indicate through their responses that family, career obligations, or child rearing influenced their decisions to pursue adjunct faculty positions at the college. It should be noted that the females who participated in this study previously held professional positions outside the academy and serving as an adjunct faculty member was not a result of attempting to balance career and family obligations.

Race. In both two year and four year institutions, Whites occupy the majority of full-time and adjunct faculty positions. Between the years of 1993 and 2004, the National Study of Postsecondary Faculty found the representation of minorities in adjunct faculty positions increased at the nation's two year colleges (NCES, 2002). On the surface, increased diversity among adjunct faculty may appear to be a positive step toward inclusion and equity, however, data do not exist to support whether these individuals were choosing to seek part-time employment or were being tracked into part-time positions due to unsuccessful full-time employment searches.

In scholarly research conducted by Stanley (2006), six themes emerged regarding minority faculty experiences teaching at predominately White institutions. Specifically, Stanley's research found that (a) minority faculty experienced challenges in the classroom regarding their authority with students; (b) mentoring relationships played a significant role in their satisfaction with the institution; (c) lack of collegiality among peers had a negative influence on their experience; (d) they struggled to separate themselves from commonly held stereotypes about their race or ethnic background; (e) they felt the burden of heavy service loads being placed upon them because of their race; and (f) they experienced racism during the tenure and promotion process.

Two participants in this study identified themselves as African American. However, only one participant, Trina, described experiences related to racial or ethnic exclusion at the college. Trina indicated that she observed an imbalance between the college's student demographics, racial makeup of the faculty, and the number of administrators who were racial minorities. Trina also indicated that her experiences in seeking full-time employment at the college were somewhat negative. She stated, "I noticed that there are certain areas that you find that there are a lot of minorities in certain positions, like administrative assistants." She went on to further state:

> You can apply for certain positions but you probably…won't get it. After what I've done professionally, when you're talking about someone that's been involved in computers since 1969…I've worked for some major organizations, no mom and pop companies, some major organizations, Fortune 500 companies, that you would have thought that a college would have jumped at the opportunity to have someone like that in a particular area, especially in technological areas. I even applied for positions that weren't nearly on

that level, they were almost entry level positions, that I was never ever given the chance

to even interview. So, after going through that three times, you stop interviewing in that

area because they have and then you wonder. I've heard things like "You weren't

interviewed because you were over qualified." So, I just stopped even filling out

applications.

Sexual orientation. Marie, who identified herself as a lesbian, also described exclusion

from the college through the implementation of policies and practices developed under the grant.

Marie indicated the college's limited medical plan excluded her by not allowing her partner to

receive the same benefits a spouse of a heterosexual peer would receive. Marie indicated that

she spoke with her department chair about her concerns but never received a response.

Summary of demographics and diversity. Literature on the experiences of adjunct

faculty, including those of minority adjunct faculty, is virtually nonexistent (Valadez & Anthony,

2001). It seems reasonable to conclude that adjunct faculty experience many of the challenges

and barriers experienced by full-time faculty. Based upon the responsibilities generally

associated with adjunct faculty positions, it is likely that minority adjunct faculty experience

challenges to authority in the classroom, receive minimal mentoring from full-time or more

experienced adjunct faculty, experience less collegiality and less interaction with peers, struggle

with separating themselves from negatively associated stereotypes, and face racism or

homophobia through the hiring process, whether it be for part-time or full-time employment. In

this study, data revealed that minority adjunct faculty experienced additional barriers in their

employment through the hiring process and through benefits offered to part-time employees.

Based upon the analysis of data, study findings support previous scholarly research that minority

adjunct faculty face many of the same barriers and challenges in the employment area as do full-time faculty.

Employment. One of the myths often associated with adjunct faculty is they only teach for short periods of time and are highly transient in their employment. However, data collected through scholarly research have found that adjunct faculty are more stable in their employment than previously believed. In a study conducted by Pearch and Marutz (2005), it was found that over 30% of adjunct faculty had served at the same institution for 10 or more years. Using length of service as one measure of job satisfaction, adjunct faculty at the college used in this study appear to be generally satisfied with their overall employment with 28.5% of participants serving between four and six years, 57.2% serving between seven and 10 years, and 14.3% serving more than 10 years. Based upon national data, participants of this study are consistent with national averages in length of service as an adjunct faculty, supporting the notion that length of tenure is one indicator of employment satisfaction.

While research supports that the employment of adjunct faculty is more stable than previously thought, individuals are motivated to teach on a part-time basis for many reasons. Another myth about adjunct faculty is that the majority of individuals who teach part-time seek full-time teaching appointments. However, data analyzed from the 1993 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty revealed that only 16% of individuals teaching as adjunct faculty sought full-time appointments (Gappa & Leslie, 1993). Tuckman (1978) conducted research utilizing survey data and developed a system to categorize individuals who served as adjunct faculty. Tuckman's original work remained largely unchanged until Gappa and Leslie (1993) conducted interviews with adjunct faculty members to further understand their motivations for teaching part-time. Based upon their research, Gappa and Leslie provided a new frame to categorize

individuals who serve as adjunct faculty: career-enders; specialists, experts, and professionals;

aspiring academics; and freelancers.

Based upon biographical data collected during the semi-structured interviews, the

majority of participants in this study are considered as career-enders or individuals who had

retired from positions either within or outside the academy. Only two of this study's participants

fit into categories other than career-ender. Specifically, Marie would be considered a specialist,

expert, and professional based upon her current full-time employment status outside of the

college and her advanced knowledge in the subject area she teaches. Trina, although

successfully employed at large corporations prior to her adjunct faculty position, currently seeks

a full-time teaching position at the college. While the participants in this study support the

findings that only 16% of adjunct faculty seek full-time employment, it is important to note the

majority of participants in this study had previous employment outside of higher education and

have either retired or chosen to no longer work in those fields.

Motivation

While the categories of adjunct faculty provided by Gappa and Leslie (1993) are helpful

in understanding some of the characteristics of adjunct faculty, they do not reveal the

motivations to teach part-time. Scholarly research conducted by Morton and Rittenberg (1986)

revealed the most significant motivating factors for adjunct faculty were the pursuit of

professional growth and desire to earn additional income. Morton and Rittenberg also found that

adjunct faculty were significantly motivated by intrinsic rewards, such as "personal

development, social interaction, and community or professional service" (p. 37). In the same

study, Morton and Rittenberg found that extrinsic rewards, such as money, status, and the

prospect of full-time employment, were secondary in nature and not as significant motivators as intrinsic rewards.

Based upon data analyzed in this study, the majority of participants indicated their motivation to serve as adjunct faculty were based upon intrinsic reward rather than monetary compensation. Marie stated:

I am a philanthropist at heart, and I decided if I can teach enough people to either be good students, or good medical professionals, or at least have half of a heart, my whole community's going to be better and that's really why I do it.

One participant in particular, Trina, strongly indicated that her motivation to teach was directly linked to assisting her community in becoming a better place. Trina indicated that she felt a strong sense of responsibility to her community, particularly the youth. The campus on which Trina teaches is located in an economically depressed area and is one of the most racially diverse areas of the state. Due to job losses over the past several decades, the area is also one of the lowest socioeconomic regions of the state in which this study took place. Trina described the importance of her role as follows:

When people of my community see me going to work, they don't see me with the Kentucky Fried Chicken hat. They don't see me with the blue shirt from the KFC. They see me walking out as a professional. So, by them seeing me, they see "Well, she's doing that. I see her here on the weekends working in her yard when she has on a t-shirt, some blue jeans, and gym shoes. But now, I see her going to work in this other role as a professional."

The findings from this study are consistent with Morton and Rittenberg's (1986) research that revealed adjunct faculty were more motivated by intrinsic reward rather than monetary

compensation. Participants in this study indicated their primary intrinsic motivations were based upon the potential to positively influence and contribute to their local communities.

Communication

While the number of adjunct faculty teaching in the nation's institutions of higher learning has increased exponentially over the past several years, research regarding their experiences has been virtually nonexistent (Valadez & Anthony, 2001). The college used in this study sought to improve the experiences of its adjunct faculty by applying and receiving funding from the Lilly Endowment over a five year period. As a result of the funds, the college made efforts to identify the needs of adjunct faculty and to implement programs and initiatives to improve their experiences. However, participants of this study described a lack of formal communication regarding the grant's purpose. During the course of her interview, Marie stated, "I've not seen any formal documentation about it. It's all been downstream information coming to me" and Dale asserted, "Before today, I didn't know anything about it."

While the experiences of adjunct faculty in this study are not unique with regard to integration into the cultural fabric of the institution, scholarly research has found that institutions, in general, have failed to actively involve adjunct faculty in the larger academic community (McLaughlin, 2005). It has also been well documented that this failure results in adjunct faculty feeling "powerless, alienated, invisible, and second class" (Burnstad, 2002, p. 17). Dale stated during her interview that every year "The dean will stand up and tell us that they couldn't do this without us," but she went on to share that some of the college policies and practices "make people feel second-class or inferior." Adolph described his frustration with being excluded from the academic community during his interview. He stated:

I don't get the impression that they hear us. It's sort of like my two year-old saying,

"Daddy, can I go out and play?" and I'm doing something very important. And when I

get finished doing it, and I go, "Why are you out there playing?" "Dad, you told me I

could go out and play." "No, I didn't." "Yes, you did." You know, I hear you, but I

don't hear you sometimes. I think the powers that be act the same way. They hear us,

but then they don't hear us.

Dusty described similar frustration with being excluded from attending orientation

activities at the beginning of the semester. The orientation activities she described were specific

to newly hired adjunct faculty and she believed the failure to include returning adjunct faculty

members overlooked their role and value in assisting newly hired individuals' transition to the

college.

In research conducted by Gappa and Leslie (1993), one senior-level administrator who

participated in their study indicated adjunct faculty:

Are often very fine teachers, and our money goes much further than when we put all into

full-time faculty. Furthermore, we can "pour it down the drain" if they have any flaws at

all. We have made no big investment in part-time faculty (p. 141).

The viewpoint expressed by the senior-level administrator above supports Marie's view

on how adjunct faculty are frequently treated at the college. She stated:

It seems like, and I have gotten the feeling on occasion, that we really are like fast

food workers that they put us in a schedule and you show up and do your job and leave.

That is just not a good way to do things. I want it to be better, but am I deluded in my

thinking that it needs to be happy and sunshine and everything else?

Dr. Massey, a retired full-time college faculty member, indicated becoming integrated in into the campus culture had been challenging and also indicated that often the work of adjunct faculty was unrecognized and unappreciated. From his perspective, Dr. Massey perceived these issues were compounded by the lack of continuity at the college and the lack of understanding of who was in charge of the institution and the direction it was headed.

Based upon the data collected in this study, adjunct faculty have not been integrated into the cultural fabric of the institution. This is evidenced by the general perceived treatment of adjunct faculty, including the failure to develop formalized communication regarding the grant. Additionally, adjunct faculty at the college expressed feeling marginalized and excluded through policy, practices, and lack of intentional involvement in meetings and activities. The findings of this study support the previous findings of research conducted by Burnstad (2002), Gappa and Leslie (1993), and McLaughlin (2005) that concluded institutions of higher education have failed to integrate adjunct faculty into the cultural fabric of the academy.

In addition to feelings of being excluded and marginalized by the institution, research revealed that adjunct faculty also experience strained relationships with full-time faculty members (Gappa & Leslie, 1993; McLaughlin, 2005; Roueche et al., 1996). These strained relationships are often caused by the lack of role clarity for adjunct faculty and "unclear administrative policies for the hiring, retention, and management" (Pearch & Marutz, 2005, p. 32) of adjunct faculty. The majority of participants of this study indicated they did not feel valued or appreciated by the college. However, the majority of participants indicated they were somewhat satisfied with the relationships they had developed at the college.

Mary described her experience teaching as an adjunct faculty member and the ability to develop relationships with individuals at the college as challenging. She stated that often she felt

as if adjunct and full-time faculty were like "ships passing in the night." However, Mary indicated that whenever she sought assistance from full-time or adjunct faculty and staff, she always perceived a willingness to help. As a result of connecting with individuals at the college, Mary indicated that making adjunct faculty feel welcome was the single most important thing the institution could do to assist newly hired adjunct faculty with their transition.

Dr. Massey indicated that the initiatives developed under the grant helped legitimize adjunct faculty within the institution, and as a result, had a positive influence on the relationship between adjunct faculty and the college, as well as between adjunct and full-time faculty. However, he felt that the college needs to continue to seek ways to focus on the satisfaction and treatment of their adjunct faculty. Dr. Massey stated:

> If you want adjuncts to be doing things over and above teaching, punching the pay clock, you need to treat them as human beings, value their contributions, encourage them to get out and bond with the community and bring in students, and all that kind of stuff.

In this study, data revealed that adjunct faculty continue to feel disconnected and perceive a lack of relationship with the institution. However, initiatives developed under the grant appear to have assisted in developing positive relationships with individuals at the college. While findings from previously conducted scholarly research found adjunct faculty generally experienced strained relationships with full-time faculty, this study found that adjunct faculty relied upon the relationships with individuals within the college to assist in their transition and to provide guidance and support.

Education

Historically, institutions of higher education have employed a significant number of individuals in adjunct faculty positions who lack familiarity with higher education beyond their

student experience. Fogg (2002) found the transition to the higher education environment was frequently challenging for adjunct faculty due to their "limited knowledge about the inner workings, culture, and language of academia" (p. A15). Additionally, Alfred (2003) found that institutions of higher education have made limited efforts to assist faculty in the transition to their position or to connect them with the values, culture, and mission of the institution. In an effort to help bridge this gap, some institutions have developed orientation programs, handbooks, and other printed materials. Pearch and Marutz (2005) found these efforts were unsuccessful in transmitting institutional culture and only minimally assisted individuals in becoming integrated into the environment. Pearch and Marutz further asserted that in order for an individual to become integrated into the institution's culture, purposeful interaction and activity must occur.

With the exception of one participant in this study, all participants came from non-higher education employment backgrounds. Dr. Massey was the only participant with previous full-time and part-time higher education employment. However, he indicated that due to the size and complexity of the institution with its 23 campuses located across the state, he viewed the organization as having "too much fragmentation of authority." The lack of connection to the institution and understanding its values, culture, and mission is commonplace among adjunct faculty in higher education (Alfred, 2003). According to Schein (2004), organizational culture is an abstraction that requires more than superficial interaction with the organization. To more fully understand an organization's culture, one must be engaged below the superficial layers and base their understanding upon personal interactions (Frost & Jean, 2000; Schein, 2004). Due to the lack of communication, adjunct faculty at this college lacked awareness of the grant and its purpose. Such lack of communication is ironic since institutions of higher learning "claim (a) to be of and about building community, (b) to promote egalitarian and inclusive values, and (c) to

provide access while simultaneously achieving excellence in higher education" (Roueche et al., 1996, p. 107).

With a dearth of research focused on the lived experiences of adjunct faculty, existing research regarding adjunct faculty has mostly "focused on pay inequities, lack of advancement opportunities," (Feldman & Turnley, 2001, p. 2) and the "perceived mistreatment of adjunct faculty" (Feldman & Turnley, 2001, p. 2). The relevant literature examined in this study primarily focused on: (a) legal aspects of employing adjunct faculty; (b) demographics, teaching experience, pay, and use of time of adjunct faculty; (c) types of adjunct faculty based upon commonly held characteristics; (d) adjunct faculty teaching motivations; and (e) the influence adjunct faculty have on higher education.

Benefits

With the increasing number of adjunct faculty employed in higher education, these individuals are demanding more and more recognition within the academic community. Although participants of this study indicated a lack of knowledge about the grant's purpose, the majority of participants were familiar with the majority of nine initiatives developed under the grant. However, all participants of the study were familiar with three of the initiatives: (a) the limited medical plan of adjunct faculty; (b) the *Introduction to Community College Instruction: Getting Results* online professional development activity; and (c) the availability of fee remission for adjunct faculty, their spouse, and their dependent children.

Literature reviewed for this study found that adjunct faculty across the nation have begun to organize and take action against the institutions that employ them, demanding access to employment benefits, including health care. In Washington, the state and its State Board of Community and Technical Colleges have twice been sued by adjunct faculty over retirement and

health care benefits (Manger, 1998). In 2004, under a class action lawsuit, adjunct faculty were

awarded $11 million in a health care benefits settlement (Anonymous, 2004). Additional

evidence of adjunct faculty discontent with employment benefits has been observed at Western

Michigan University, where adjunct faculty successfully sued the institution over tenure rights

for adjunct faculty (Fogg, 2002), and at Suffolk University in New York, where adjuncts

successfully petitioned the National Labor Relations Board for recognition of the Suffolk

Affiliated Faculty/AAUP as their collective bargaining unit (Flower, 2006).

　　　　While participants in this study did not indicate any intent to organize or file lawsuits for

the purposes of gaining employment benefits, based upon their knowledge and responses, it was

clear benefits were a primary concern. Data collected from the semi-structured interviews, it was

revealed that all participants of the study were aware of the limited medical plan available to

adjunct faculty. Participants' responses regarding access to this benefit were generally positive.

Regarding the access to the college's limited medical plan, Dusty stated, "Even though I myself,

am not a participant, I was aware of it and I thought it was a welcomed benefit" and also stated,

"I think it's very cool…especially for adjuncts." Support for the limited medical plan was

further underscored by Marie's statement. She said "The medical plan has helped a lot of

people, and that's positive because there are people who use it…Having insurance offered is a

tremendous benefit."

　　　　Participants of the study also made positive statements about the college's fee remission

policy. Adolph indicated that although his children were grown and ineligible for fee remission

through his employment at the college, he wished it had existed when his children were younger.

He believed most institutions wanted to provide more compensation to employees, including

adjunct faculty, but were unable due to financial constraints. Adolph further indicated that

providing benefits, such as the adjunct faculty fee remission, resulted in adjunct faculty feeling more appreciated by the institution. These feelings of recognition from and appreciation by the institution assist in helping integrate adjunct faculty into the institution, resulting in a more positive overall experience.

The data collected in this study regarding the limited medical plan and fee remission policy for adjunct faculty, their spouse, and their dependent children were positive. While the participants in this study did not indicate any plans or desire to organize and demand more benefits from the college, it was clear, based upon their responses, that access to benefits are important to overall job satisfaction. Study participants also indicated that benefits created a greater sense of appreciation and recognition from the college and were viewed as an alternative mechanism to increase adjunct faculty compensation without increasing salaries.

Professional Development

In addition to providing access to the limited medical plan and fee remission, all participants of this study were aware of the college's online activity, *Introduction to Community College Instruction: Getting Results*. Frequently, concern has been expressed throughout the greater academic community regarding the ability and level of preparedness of adjunct faculty to teach effectively. Research conducted by Gappa and Leslie (1993) found that, in general, adjunct faculty were better prepared to teach than typically assumed. However, additional scholarly research has found that students generally perceived adjunct faculty as being less knowledgeable about the academic subject and less able to present course materials effectively (Fagan-Wilen et al., 2006).

While several studies have found that being taught by an adjunct faculty member does not have a negative influence on student learning (Hom, 2001; Kamps, as cited in Parson, 1998;

Umbach, 2007; Wallin, 2004), research revealed adjunct faculty were less likely to use innovative teaching styles or technology in their classrooms (Schuetz, 2002). The majority of participants in this study had participated and completed the *Introduction to Community College Instruction: Getting Results* online activity since it was first offered during the spring 2008 semester. One participant of the study, Dr. Massey, indicated that this online experience was the most valuable professional development activity during his 40-year career teaching in higher education. Trina stated that it taught her how to incorporate multiple teaching styles and activities to support various learning styles among her students. Similar statements from the majority of participants in this study affirm the positive impact of the online activity.

Throughout literature regarding higher education, significant value has been placed on the importance of professional development activities for faculty. According to Schuster et al. (1990), institutions of higher education have failed to sufficiently adjust to meet the changing needs of faculty, especially adjunct faculty. Murray (1999) concluded that most institutions fail to provide adjunct faculty with professional development activities, such as workshops and programs. As discussed throughout this study, the landscape of higher education continues to change.

In research conducted by Murray (1999), nearly every institution surveyed indicated the lack of an individual dedicated to providing faculty development. Of the individuals he surveyed who provided professional development activities to faculty but had other primary job responsibilities, it was estimated that 43% of the respondents spent less than 10% of their time providing professional development opportunities. Additionally, research revealed that of the 130 participating institutions, 19 institutions indicated that adjunct faculty were not permitted to participate in any professional development activities and 108 indicated that adjuncts were only

allowed to participate in some professional development activities offered by the institution

(Murray, 1999).

Murray's (1999) research went on to conclude that in most cases, the professional

development opportunities provided to faculty were little more than "collections of loosely

connected efforts" (p. 48) provided by the institution. Based upon these findings, Murray

recommended that institutions develop professional development frames that support the mission

of various institutions that are "systematic, demonstrable, and highly regard the improvement of

teaching" (p. 48). Murray concluded that to have an effective professional development

program, institutions of higher education must develop activities that consist of:

> …institutional support, that is a climate that fosters and encourages faculty development;
>
> a formalized, structured, and goal-directed development program; a connection between
>
> faculty development and reward structure; faculty ownership; support for colleagues for
>
> investment in teaching; and a belief that good teaching is valued by administrators. (p.
>
> 48)

Orientation. The majority of participants in this study indicated that orientation to the

college was a significant factor in their overall employment experience. However, participants

of the study indicated they had experienced minimal orientation at the time their employment

began. The lack of orientation to the college was reflected by the majority of participants in this

study who indicated feeling excluded and marginalized from the greater campus community.

With regard to the amount of orientation Dusty received, she stated:

> I was disappointed, but understood because I could see what they were dealing with as far
>
> as having no time…But, I just felt like they were just throwing me into this situation and

you know, without a teaching degree. I felt like, "Boy, they are really giving me a lot of responsibility without having any clue what I am going to teach."

At the time the majority of participants began their employment with the college, orientation had not been developed for adjunct faculty and other resources, such as a handbook, did not exist. The majority of participants in this study emphasized the importance of the adjunct faculty handbook. Adolph indicated that he felt providing adjunct faculty with information regarding the college's policies and procedures was an important element to the orientation process.

While participants of this study indicated dissatisfaction with their own orientation to the college, the majority of participants indicated that the orientation initiative developed under the grant was a positive step forward for adjunct faculty in transition. Marie indicated that due to the orientation initiative developed under the grant, the orientation session's focus had shifted from being administratively driven to more presentation- and discussion-based.

In addition to orientation, other professional development activities were established under the grant. The majority of participants in this study indicated that mentoring was an important factor that influenced their experience as adjunct faculty members. While participants of this study were hired before the implementation of the college-wide mentoring program developed under the grant, the descriptions of their lived experiences were valuable. Dusty indicated that due to the lack of mentoring she received, the beginning of her employment was stressful. She stated:

> I was thrown into a situation I knew nothing about. And that was really stressful for me. But, I am not afraid to ask questions. So, I always asked questions and you know we didn't have any adjunct faculty mentoring then.

Participants of this study described a lack of connection to the college and a lack of

general knowledge regarding their role and ability to access resources, due in part to the absence

of an adjunct faculty mentoring program. However, although there was no formalized mentoring

program, the majority of participants in this study indicated that due to their tenure at the college,

they often sought ways to serve as informal mentors to newly hired adjunct faculty members

because of the lack of a formalized mentoring program. Adolph described his experience:

> When I came on board, there were no guidelines or nobody coming in and sitting me
>
> down and saying "Okay, this where you go here, this is where you go there."   You sort
>
> of had to learn all of that on your own. So, I just started jotting things down, making my
>
> own little operating manual so that when somebody else came in, I would have a guide to
>
> help them along so they didn't stumble along and get into bad habits like I did when I
>
> first came on board. I would have loved to have had a mentoring program like that when
>
> I first came on board, but that was not the case.

Summary of professional development. Research by Gappa and Leslie (1993)

concluded that adjunct faculty were often better prepared to teach college-level curriculum than

previously believed. Several studies revealed that the impact of adjunct faculty on student

learning was not negative (Hom, 2001; Kamps, as cited in Parsons, 1998; Umbach, 2007;

Wallin, 2004). However, research concluded that students perceive adjunct faculty as less

knowledgeable and less skilled in presenting course materials (Fagen-Willen et al., 2006) and

also concluded that adjunct faculty were less likely to use innovative teaching styles and

technology in the classroom to support student learning (Schuetz, 2002). Participants in this

study indicated participation in the College's *Introduction to Community College: Getting*

Results online activity was a valuable professional development activity. The activity provided

adjunct faculty an opportunity to learn how to teach more effectively and employ new teaching styles and technology in the classroom, shifting them away from the traditional lecture style delivery of instruction.

Historically, higher education institutions have failed to provide sufficient professional development opportunities for faculty, including both full-time and adjunct (Murray, 1999; Schuster et al., 1999). Research conducted by Murray found that the majority of professional development opportunities provided to faculty were little more than "collections of loosely connected efforts" (p. 48). The majority of participants in this study described a lack of orientation and mentoring programs prior to the implementation of initiatives developed under the grant. The lack of these programs at the beginning of their employment with the college had a negative influence on the overall experience of adjunct faculty who participated in this study. However, based upon observation and some limited activities, participants indicated the development of both the orientation and mentoring programs were positive steps for the college to take in assisting adjunct faculty transition to the institution. Currently, participation in both these programs is optional for newly hired adjunct faculty. Based upon the positive influence of these programs on their overall experience, the majority of participants recommended that participation in the orientation and mentoring programs be made mandatory for all newly hired adjunct faculty.

Access to Resources

Literature commonly acknowledges that adjunct faculty often lack the necessary resources to effectively perform job duties and fulfill their job responsibilities. Research conducted by Townsend and Hauss (2002) revealed that 27% of adjunct faculty did not have access to office space; 26% did not have access to a college-supplied telephone; 42% did not

have access to computers at the institutions where they taught; 8% did not have access to photocopiers or photocopying services; and 8% did not have access to library resources. This study's findings revealed the majority of participants in this study indicated they did not have access to appropriate classroom supplies and resources to fulfill their job responsibilities and to perform their job duties effectively. Additionally, one participant in the study, Dr. Massey, also indicated that he frequently had difficulty using technology in the classroom due to equipment failure.

Beyond the use of workable technology in the classroom, the majority of participants expressed concern regarding the availability of useable office space to conduct job responsibilities, including meetings with students, and accessing space to store personal and job-related items. Since the implementation of the grant, campuses have developed dedicated workspace for adjunct faculty. As a result, participants indicated access to useable office space has improved. However, the majority of participants indicated that useable office space is still a challenge and negatively influences their ability to connect with students. To describe her experiences, Trina stated:

> I feel like things have gotten better than when I initially started. If students wanted [to meet with me], they would say, "Well, what are your office hours?" Well, we didn't have an office and my response would be, "Let me know when you want to see me" and I would run around and find someplace to have a meeting. Now, there's a designated area for adjunct faculty where there are phones. We don't have our own phones, but there are phones and a desk. There's an area where you can sit down and talk with students. So, the college has improved from that perspective, but still a lot more needs to be done.

In addition to limited access to office space and storage, participants in this study also experienced a lack of access to basic classroom supplies. One participant, Marie, indicated difficulty in obtaining items such as manila folders and paper clips to perform job duties, which compromised her ability to provide a reasonable accommodation to a student with a disability. Such difficulty in obtaining basic classroom supplies leads to frustration and underpins the feelings of marginalization and exclusion previously described in this chapter.

In addition to the research conducted by Townsend and Hauss (2002), the lack of resources available to adjunct faculty is widely acknowledged throughout the greater academic community. In 1997, the AAUP developed a statement intended to advocate on behalf of adjunct faculty. The *Statement from the Conference on the Growing Use of Part-Time and Adjunct Facult*y (AAUP, 1997) asserted that adjunct faculty should be provided:

> …appropriate working conditions essential to perform assigned responsibilities, ranging from office space, supplies, support services, equipment (for example, telephone and computer access), parking permits, library access, after-hours access to buildings, email accounts, and the like. (p. 10)

Based upon the descriptions of their lived experiences, the experiences of participants in this study are consistent with the findings of Townsend and Hauss (2002) that adjunct faculty lacked access to many basic resources to conduct their jobs. Additionally, the lived experiences of participants are underpinned by the AAUP's statement that asserts that adjunct faculty are frequently deprived of basic support, including access to supplies and equipment, to perform their jobs effectively.

Liminality and Sensemaking

Turner (1967) identified and used the term "liminality" (Bettis et al., 2005, p. 48) to describe the period of adolescence between ending one identity and beginning to develop or adopt a new identity that aligns with the current environment. Since the term was first coined, liminality has also been associated with the process of sensemaking. According to Turner, the transition between one identity and another is not seamless and results in a period in which one feels "betwixt and between" (Bettis et al., 2005, p. 48) the two identities. During this period, individuals often are reflective in their thought processes with regard to their identities and their environments. This time of reflection has been referred to as the "interstructural stage" (Bettis et al., 2004, p. 48).

To better understand liminality or the process of sensemaking, Kezar et al. (2006) asserted that it be viewed from the social constructivism paradigm. This paradigm is based upon "the belief that reality is developed through one's interpretation of the world and denial of essences or universal qualities" (p. 19). Kezar et al. asserted liminality and the process of sensemaking are based upon the lived experiences of individuals and their interactions with their environment. Bettis et al. (2005) found that adjunct faculty members, as well as full-time faculty members, experienced periods of liminality or sensemaking as they transitioned to their institution's culture. As part of this transition, individuals begin to socialize within the organization and begin to adopt the "values and attitudes of the group they wish to join" (Austin, 2002, p. 96). Therefore, the process of sensemaking or the period of liminality can also be described as the process of understanding and appreciating the institution's "values, attitudes, and expectations" (Austin, 2002, p. 96).

It is important to recognize that liminality and sensemaking are processes and not single events or interactions. According to Eckel and Kezar (2003), liminality and the process of sensemaking involve spending "time gathering information, interpreting meaning, negotiating importance, and evoking symbols to create organizational realities" (p. 40). Furthermore, Eckel and Kezar stated the process of sensemaking, based upon the lived experiences and participation in individual and organizational activities, assists individuals in creating "interpretations and meaning" (p. 41) of their environments. Therefore, Eckel and Kezar asserted that participating in individual and organizational activities assists individuals in understanding their environment, and their understanding organizational culture, and also assists in the creation of "new meanings" (p. 41) for individuals based upon their lived experiences.

In 1995, Weick developed a template based upon the seven properties that identified activities associated with liminality and the process of sensemaking. Using Weick's properties and based upon the description of the initiatives developed under the grant in Chapter 3, it is reasonable to assert the college developed initiatives that assisted adjunct faculty members with the transition to their new environment. While this purpose is not explicitly stated, the initiatives developed under the grant, particularly the orientation and *Introduction to Community College Instruction: Getting Results* activity, appear to meet the criteria of Weick's template for sensemaking activities (Eckel & Kezar, 2003). As previously discussed in this chapter, adjunct faculty often lack experience in higher education, resulting in additional challenges for newly hired adjunct faculty as they make the transition to their new environment (Fogg, 2002). Scholarly research conducted by Alfred (2003) revealed that institutions of higher education have not sufficiently assisted individuals hired as adjunct faculty in their transition.

Data collected from participants during the semi-structured interviews in this study support the assertion that the initiatives developed under the grant meet the criteria for sensemaking activities as established by Weick (Eckel & Kezar, 2003). Regarding the orientation initiative developed under the grant, Marie stated, "We can actually go in and have materials presented and talk. We've been trying to do more dynamic activities." Dr. Massey stated with regard to the *Introduction to Community College Instruction: Getting Results* online activity:

> It was one of the best courses I've ever taken and I wish that I had taken it in 1960. I learned so much from that. It was fantastic. In fact, I've volunteered to be a facilitator…I'm a lifelong learner and while there was some defects in the course, if focused a lot on the science and technology side. The whole course, in general, was just tremendous. So, I benefited from that.

Trina also indicated that the online activity benefited her as a returning adjunct faculty member in the classroom. She stated that the online activity assisted in her in providing course materials to students through more dynamic methods, as well as her understanding how to utilize technology to enhance learning.

Based upon this data, it appears the orientation program and *Introduction to Community College Instruction: Getting Results* activity assisted adjunct faculty in becoming grounded in the environment through interaction and active discussion with fellow faculty members, both full-time and adjunct. In Marie's statement, she indicated the orientation program served as a starting point for conversations regarding laboratory activities for students as part of their course work. With this as a starting point, ongoing conversation and social interaction with peers will assist Marie and other adjunct faculty members in understanding their environment by

developing an appreciation and understanding of the institution's history, culture, and mission.

Trina and Dr. Massey both indicated the *Introduction to Community College Instruction: Getting*

Results activity was a significant learning experience that resulted in their being better prepared

to serve as adjunct faculty instructors. As a result of this learning, both Trina and Dr. Massey

will likely be better able to transition from the "betwixt and between" (Bettis et al., 2005, p. 48)

phase of liminality or sensemaking to the "interstructual stage" (Bettis et al., 2005, p. 48) that is

characterized by reflection of what has been learned in the new culture or environment. As the

result of the interactions from the orientation program and *Introduction to Community College*

Instruction: Getting Results activity, adjunct faculty will also be engaged in the institution's

culture and will learn what is acceptable within the institution and be able to more easily

assimilate to their environment.

Theory of Work Adjustment

Scholarly research conducted by Bretz and Judge (1994) resulted in developing the

theory of work adjustment which asserts that overall employee satisfaction is linked with

organizational fit. Their theory also asserts that individuals base their perception of overall job

satisfaction on the perceived ability of the employer to meet their needs as employees (Bretz &

Judge, 1994). Based upon this assertion, "job tenure is the most basic indicator of job

satisfaction because it purportedly represents a state in which the individuals finds the work

environment to be acceptable (satisfaction) and the environment finds the individual to be

acceptable (satisfactoriness)" (Bretz & Judge, 1994, p. 33).

In studies conducted by Blau (1987), Caldwell and O'Reilly (1990), Meglino et al.

(1989), Smart et al. (1986), and using the theory of work adjustment, data revealed links between

individual and organizational fit and job involvement, commitment to the employing

organization, satisfactory performance, and positive attitudes towards employment and organization. Based upon these findings, it was concluded that individuals who find congruence with their employing organization "are more likely to be attracted to the organization, be favorably evaluated by established organizational members, display greater work motivation and perform better than those who do not" (Bretz & Judge, 1994, p. 33).

According to the 1999 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty, the average tenure of an adjunct faculty member at community colleges nationally is approximately six years (NCES, 2002). In research conducted by Leslie and Gappa (2002) it was revealed that approximately 30% of adjunct faculty teaching in the nation's two year community colleges had a tenure of 10 years or more at the same institution. In this study, approximately 28.5% of participants had been employed at the college between four and six years and an additional 57.2% of participants had been employed at the college for more than ten years. With length of tenure being considered one of the most basic indicators of job satisfaction according to the theory of work adjustment, participants of this study meet or exceed national norms and therefore, appear to be satisfied with their overall employment experience.

Although length of tenure is considered one of the basic indicators of job satisfaction according to the theory of work adjustment, it is not the only factor to consider when determining if adjunct faculty are generally satisfied with their overall employment experience. According to Bretz and Judge (1994), "individuals will seek out, find comfort, and flourish in environments that support" (p. 33) their personal and professional needs. Scholarly research studies conducted by Gappa and Leslie (1993) and Morton and Rittenberg (1986), it was revealed that adjunct faculty are intrinsically motivated. In their studies, intrinsic motivation was defined to encompass things such as personal development, social interaction, and community or

professional service. While the review of literature in Chapter 2 illustrated that generally adjunct

faculty are underpaid, Morton and Rittenberg's study found that the ability to earn additional

money and increase income were secondary motivating factors for adjunct faculty.

The data from this study support the theory of work adjustment and its theoretical

framework that asserts personal and organizational fit contribute to job satisfaction. This is

demonstrated in Marie's description of her motivation to serve as an adjunct faculty member.

She stated:

> I am a philanthropist at heart and I decided if I can teach enough people to either be good
>
> students, or good medical professionals, or at least have half of a heart, my whole
>
> community is going to be better and that's really why I do it. You know…I'm not going
>
> to lie to you, I would not do it if there wasn't a paycheck, but believe me, its half of an
>
> hourly wage of what I make as a medical professional. I really, really, want to move my
>
> community ahead. I don't want to be in an environment where it gets so stagnant and no
>
> one is doing anything to better themselves and that's why I can make a few better people
>
> that can save somebody's life in my community, that's why I am here.

Another participant of the study, Dale, also indicated that her motivation to serve as an

adjunct faculty member is driven by the human factor. She stated, "I like my job. I really do.

That's what I will tell you overwhelmingly. I love the people, it gives me a reason to get out of

bed in the morning and come here."

Through the descriptions of the lived experiences described in the semi-structured

interviews, it appears that adjunct faculty members at the institution used in this study are

intrinsically motivated and do not seek significant monetary gains through their employment.

Based upon their statements regarding their employment, participants of this study indicated a

desire to make positive contributions personally and professionally to their field of expertise, their community, or both. Using the theory of work adjustment as a frame, the college is meeting the needs of its adjunct faculty as they relate to their employment. Therefore, it appears that based upon their intrinsic motivation to make positive contributions to individuals in their community and their community at large, adjunct faculty at the college are generally satisfied with their overall employment.

CHAPTER 7

Conclusion

The purpose of this study was to examine the influence of policy changes supported by a Lilly Endowment grant to recruit and retain part-time faculty in a Midwestern community college system. Chapter 4 provided demographical data and highlighted the emergent themes based upon the lived experiences of adjunct faculty, highlighting five emergent themes: (a) limited awareness of the grant; (b) limited knowledge of the nine initiatives developed and implemented under the grant; (c) lack of formal communication regarding the grant and its initiatives; (d) the adjunct faculty experience was significantly influenced by orientation to the position; and (e) mentoring had a significant influence on their experience. Chapter 5 provided detailed sub-themes that emerged through analyzing data from the conducted semi-structured interviews. The chapter highlighted four sub-themes: (a) intrinsic motivation to teach; (b) feelings of being marginalized and excluded from the cultural fabric of the institution; (c) value and mattering of relationships; and (d) access to resources. Chapter 6 provided a discussion of the emergent themes and sub-themes from the previous chapters. Chapter 7 provides implications for institutions and research, makes recommendations for institutions to consider when developing and implementing initiatives that affect adjunct faculty, as well as recommendations for future research regarding adjunct faculty and their experiences within higher education. Chapter 7 also provides a conclusion and summary of the study.

Implications for Practice

The findings of this study illustrated several implications for institutions of higher education and their employment of adjunct faculty. Data revealed adjunct faculty at the institution used in this study experienced exclusion and marginalization at the college. Over the past several decades, institutions of higher education have become increasingly dependent on adjunct faculty for the delivery of curriculum (Gappa & Leslie, 1993; Klein et al., 1996; Noble, 2000; Umbach, 2007). It is expected that all institutions of higher education will continue to employ a significant number of adjunct faculty. It is also expected that public institutions will most likely increase the number of adjunct faculty who are employed as a mechanism to adjust for the continued decline of state funding (Valadez & Anthony, 2001). Therefore, continuing to seek ways to improve integration of adjunct faculty into the cultural fabric of higher education and to legitimize their role within the academy is critical to the overall success of an institution and the students it serves.

The two theoretical frames used in this study were the theory of liminality (Bettis et al., 2005) and the theory of work adjustment (Bretz & Judge, 1994). The theory of liminality acknowledges a period of uncertainty for individuals as they transition to a new environment or adopt a new identity. This period of uncertainty is often characterized by a lack of clarity and understanding of events, activities, and interactions that occur within their environment (Bettis et al, 2005; Eckel & Kezar, 2003; Kezar et al., 2006). The theory of work place adjustment asserts that through involvement in the work place environment, individuals develop an understanding of their environment, an understanding of the organization's culture, and are better able to assess the alignment of the organization's perceived ability to meet their personal and professional needs (Bretz & Judge, 1994).

Data revealed that adjunct faculty at the institution used in this study described a lack of formalized communication regarding the grant's purpose and initiatives developed under the grant. Participants of this study also indicated a lack of relationship with the college. However, participants described positive relationships with other adjunct faculty, as well as full-time faculty at the college. It appears in both circumstances that the foundation of the positive relationships with adjunct faculty and full-time faculty are based upon the opportunity to interact and communicate with each other. Data illustrated that communication served as a key element in developing positive relationships with individuals who serve as adjunct faculty. Therefore, the college would be well served to formalize communication with adjunct faculty regarding future initiatives that influence them directly and indirectly. By doing so, the college will increase the ability for adjunct faculty to understand their environment, the college's culture, and will assist them in their transition to their adjunct faculty position.

Data from this study also revealed activities that assisted adjunct faculty in assimilating to their environment had a positive influence on their overall experience. While participants of this study were not part of the college's mentoring program because their employment began prior to the grant's implementation, it was perceived that the formalized mentoring program had a positive influence on the overall experience of newly hired adjunct faculty. The majority of participants in this study were allowed to participate in some of the college's orientation activities for adjunct faculty. However, on some campuses, the ability to participate in the activities was limited, but all participants were permitted to engage in some orientation activities as returning adjunct faculty members. The orientation activities developed under the grant also appear to have had a positive influence on the overall adjunct faculty experience. According to participants of this study, newly hired adjunct faculty were able to build rapport with returning

adjunct faculty, as well as full time faculty through these interactions. Based upon the template of sensemaking activities provided by Weick (1995), the college's orientation initiative served as a sensemaking activity for newly hired adjunct faculty, resulting in their ability to better understand their environment and role within the college as an adjunct faculty member.

The data from this study revealed that the investment of human and financial capital in activities that result in the development of relationships and greater understanding of the organization, its culture, and the role of adjunct faculty in the academy were beneficial. While this study is not intended to measure adjunct faculty satisfaction, it does appear that activities, specifically the mentoring program and orientation activities, have the potential to positively influence the overall employment experience of adjunct faculty. Although demographical data from the participants in this study points to overall job satisfaction based upon their length of tenure, no data existed to measure adjunct faculty members' level of engagement in the learning process. Using the theory of work adjustment as a framework, scholars have asserted employees who are satisfied and engaged in their work are more committed it, provide higher quality outputs, and have more positive attitudes about their work and the employing organization (Caldwell & O'Reilly, 1990; Meglino et al., 1989; Smart et al., 1986). Thus, activities that support adjunct faculty in their transition to higher education have the potential to increase employment satisfaction, but also the potential to positively influence the quality of instruction and learning outcomes for students.

Recommendations for Institutions

Participants of this study indicated a lack of connection with the institution and also described lived experiences that resulted in feeling marginalized and excluded. It became clear through the study's data that participants perceived their value and base their sense of mattering

upon the opportunity to interact with faculty, both full-time and adjunct, and their ability to

establish positive relationships with individuals and the organization. Therefore, the following

recommendations are made for institutions of higher education to consider as they continue to

seek ways to more effectively integrate adjunct faculty in to the cultural fabric of higher

education and to legitimize their role.

1. Develop formalized communication with adjunct faculty that assist in the

    development of understanding organizational culture, goals, and mission. According

    to Alfred (2003), institutions of higher education have done little to assist adjunct

    faculty in the transition to higher education and have done even less to assist them in

    developing an understanding of institutional goals, mission, and culture. Through

    formalized communication, adjunct faculty could assess and develop an

    understanding of their environment and begin to feel valued by the institution. It is

    critically important for institutions to understand that communication should not only

    inform adjunct faculty, but it must engage adjunct faculty in communication with the

    institution. This recommendation is supported by the research of Gappa and Leslie

    (1993) who found adjunct faculty felt less excluded and marginalized and expressed

    more positive feelings about their work and the organization when they felt a sense of

    collaboration existed.

2. Continue to provide adjunct faculty with access to employment benefits for adjunct

    faculty. Research regarding the influence of providing employment benefits to

    adjunct faculty is virtually nonexistent. However, based upon the review of literature,

    it is apparent that adjunct faculty members across the nation are beginning to demand

    access to benefits as evidenced in the states of Washington, Michigan, and New York.

Data in this study revealed that adjunct faculty perceived access to limited medical plans and fee remission as a positive step toward being legitimized and valued within the institution. As a result, such benefits can assist institutions in minimizing the feelings of exclusion and marginalization often experienced by adjunct faculty and assist in their integration into the academic community.

3. Continue to develop and implement sensemaking activities, such as orientation and mentoring and make participation mandatory for newly hired adjunct faculty. Scholarly research conducted by Fogg (2002) revealed that adjunct faculty struggle with their transition to higher education because of they lack a familiarity with the environment, culture, language, and internal workings of higher education. Some institutions have attempted to assist adjunct faculty with their transition by providing items such as handbooks. However, Pearch and Marutz (2005) found that institutional culture, values, and norms could not be transmitted through items such as handbooks and they asserted that in order for individuals to understand their institution's culture, purposeful and meaningful activities must occur.

4. Develop and implement professional development activities for faculty, including both full-time and adjunct. As recommended by Murray (1999), professional development activities for faculty should be "systematic, demonstrable, and highly regard the improvement of teaching" (p. 48). Data in this study revealed that structured activities that are outcome-based and focused on the improvement of classroom pedagogy, such as the *Introduction to Community College Instruction: Getting Results,* were effective for adjunct faculty regardless of length of service or teaching experience.

5. Institutions should examine the influence of institutional policies and practices on minority populations. The review of literature indicated barriers for several minority groups within higher education including females, racial minorities, and homosexuals (Drago & Colbeck, 2003; Gappa & Leslie, 1993; Gardner, 2007; Lundy & Warme, 1990; Marcus, 2007; Stanley, 2006). Two participants in this study, who happen to be minorities, described lived experiences in which institutional practices and culture negatively influenced their experience as adjunct faculty members. Therefore, as institutions seek ways to improve the overall experience of adjunct faculty, it is critical that consideration be given to the potential negative influence that could result for underrepresented groups or minority populations.

Recommendations for Research

This study examined to what degree adjunct faculty, at the institution used in this study, were aware of a grant whose purpose was to positively influence their overall experience. The study also examined to what degree adjunct faculty were aware of policy changes that influenced their employment at the college. Finally, the study examined to what degree adjunct faculty felt marginalized and excluded from the college. Earlier in this study, it was noted that a dearth of research exists regarding adjunct faculty and their experiences within higher education.

Much of the data that exist regarding adjunct faculty is focused on demographical information including age, gender, race, educational obtainment, pay, and teaching experience. A growing body of information regarding adjunct faculty members' dissatisfaction with employment conditions, pay, and benefits began to emerge in the 1990s. However, few scholarly attempts have been made to better understand the lived experiences of adjunct faculty and the dynamic relationships among adjunct faculty, institutions of higher education, collective

bargaining organizations, professional associations, and students. Limited scholarly research has been conducted on adjunct faculty member's lived experiences and what can be done to improve their overall employment experience in higher education. To further compound this concern, scholarly research that examines environmental factors and provides recommendations to assist in the improvement of the overall adjunct faculty experience is virtually nonexistent.

Therefore, it is recommended that future research regarding adjunct faculty and their lived experiences examine the influence of professional development programs, workshops, and initiatives on their overall experience. Scholarly research should also be conducted to examine what activities or initiatives have the most significant influence on decreasing adjunct faculty's feelings of exclusion and marginalization of adjunct faculty, as well as which activities and initiatives assist in the development of positive relationships with individuals in the organization and with the organization itself.

Limitations

In this study, the eight steps recommended by Moustakas (1994) were followed to help ensure validity. However, despite multiple techniques, the human factor of qualitative research always results in study limitations. In this study, three additional limitations were identified.

The first limitation indentified was the reliance on adjunct faculty coordinators. Participants of this study were selected using two purposeful sampling approaches based upon participant criteria. The first criterion was based upon site selection to ensure a broad representation of participants from across the college. The second criterion used was length of tenure, which required participants to have been employed at the college prior to the beginning of the grant's implementation. To identify individuals who met the criteria described above, the adjunct faculty coordinators at each of the college's 14 administrative regions were contacted

and assisted in indentifying individuals who they believed could provide rich information regarding their experiences as an adjunct faculty member at the institution used in this study. Based upon the recommendations of the adjunct faculty coordinators, potential participants were contacted and the final selection of participants was created to reflect a cross-section of the college, including location, race, age, and gender, as well as academic background and degree obtainment. Because of the reliance on the adjunct faculty coordinators to assist in the identification of participants, the study's validity may have been influenced due to perceived positive relationships with individual adjunct faculty members.

The second limitation of this study was the time of the participants' employment. Due to the purposeful sampling criteria that were established for this study, participants were required to have begun their employment at the college prior to the beginning of the grant's implementation. Therefore, participants may have had limited perspective about the influence of some of the initiatives that had been developed under the grant. Specifically, participants of the study had no lived experiences regarding the orientation and mentoring programs developed under the grant. However, the descriptions of their lived experiences as newly hired adjunct faculty members who did not have access to orientation or mentoring were valuable. Additionally, participants provided some insight regarding the influence of the orientation and mentoring programs based upon their observations and interactions with individuals employed by the college after the initiatives were implemented.

The final limitation of this study was the lack of time and resources. As a full-time employee of the community college used in this study, a limited amount of time existed to conduct research regarding the lived experiences of adjunct faculty. Additionally, this study was conducted using personal funds, which resulted in a limitation of funds to conduct research.

Conclusion

This study examined the influence of the Lilly Endowment's grant to recruit and retain adjunct faculty within a statewide community college system located in the Midwest. Specifically, the study examined: (a) the degree to which adjunct faculty were aware of the goals and objectives of the grant; (b) the degree to which adjunct faculty were informed of the policy changes and the potential influence those changes had on their employment and status within the college; and (c) the influence changes in policies pertaining to adjunct faculty had on their perception of marginalization and exclusion at the college.

Over the past several decades, the number of adjunct faculty who are employed at institutions of higher education has grown exponentially (Feldman & Turnley, 2001; Wallin, 2005). As institutions continue to adjust to the changing landscape of higher education, it is expected that two year colleges and four year universities will continue to employ significant numbers of adjunct faculty (Brewster, 2000; Grusin & Reed, 1994;). Individuals who serve as adjunct faculty at the nation's institutions of higher education represent a cross-section of American society, including but not limited to race, gender, age, education, and teaching experience. While participants in this study did not precisely align with national demographics of adjunct faculty, the participants did provide a cross-section of adjunct faculty employed at the institution used in this study.

Although there was a diversity of background, experiences, and various demographics among the participants, common themes and experiences emerged. Based upon the analysis of data, the findings of this study were consistent with previous scholarly research regarding adjunct faculty members' length of service, their desire to seek full-time employment, and their motivation to teach. Twenty-eight percent of this study's participants had served as an adjunct

faculty member at the institution used in this study for at least four years, 57.2% had served

between seven and 10 years, and 14.3% of the participants had served as an adjunct faculty

member at the college for more than ten years.

According to Bretz and Judge (1994), researchers who developed the theory of work

adjustment, length of service is the most basic indicator of job satisfaction. Based upon the

consistency with national data from a report by the National Center for Education Statistics

(NCES, 2002), adjunct faculty employed by the institution used in this study are similarly

satisfied with their employment as adjunct faculty employed at other institutions of higher

education. In 1993, Gappa and Leslie concluded that only 16% of adjunct faculty sought full-

time employment. In this study only one participant out of seven was currently seeking full-time

employment at the college. Therefore, the commonly held belief that the majority of adjunct

faculty seek full-time employment did not hold true in this study and the findings from this study

were consistent with those found by Gappa and Leslie (1993).

Another common assumption often made about adjunct faculty is that they are motivated

to teach part-time for additional compensation or the desire to increase their salaries. Scholarly

research conducted by Morton and Rittenberg (1986) found that adjunct faculty are primarily

motivated to teach based upon intrinsic reward. Participants of this study indicated that while

they would not serve as adjunct faculty without compensation, their primary motivation to serve

as adjunct faculty was based upon their desire to make positive contributions to individuals in

their community and to the their community as a whole. Based upon the theory of work

adjustment, individuals are satisfied with their employment when they perceive that the

employing organization is meeting their personal and professional needs and desires. Using this

theory as a framework and the described lived experiences of individuals in this study, data

indicated that the organization is effective in assisting individuals to meet their personal and professional needs and desires.

In addition to the common themes described above, additional analysis of the data helped answer the research questions that guided this study. The first research question examined to what degree adjunct faculty members were aware of the grant and its objectives. Previous research conducted by McLaughlin (2005) revealed that adjunct faculty are often marginalized and excluded from the cultural fabric of their institutions due to the failure of institutions to actively involve them. As a result of this failure, adjunct faculty often feel "powerless, alienated, invisible and second class" (Burnstad, 2002, p. 17) within their institutions and larger academic community. The majority of participants indicated that no formal communication existed between the college and adjunct faculty members regarding the goals or objectives of the grant. In some instances, participants in this study indicated they learned of the grant's existence during the semi-structured interviews conducted to collect data for this study. Based upon the analysis of data and the description of the lived experiences of participants in this study, it was concluded that the college did not effectively communicate the purpose and objectives of the grant to the greater adjunct faculty community. By doing so, the college perpetuated adjunct faculty's feeling marginalized and excluded of the adjunct faculty.

While the participants of this study lacked a clear understanding of the grant's purpose or its objectives, the majority of participants were aware of some of the initiatives developed under the grant. The participants of the study were well aware of three specific initiatives: (a) the college's limited medical plan that was accessible to adjunct faculty; b) the college's *Introduction to Community College Instruction: Getting Results* online professional development activity; and (c) the college's adjunct faculty fee remission that is available to adjunct faculty,

their spouses, and their dependent children. Based upon data collected from the semi-structured

interviews, participants of the study were somewhat more aware of initiatives developed under

the grant compared to being generally aware of the grant, its purpose, and its objectives.

Moreover, beyond awareness of the initiatives as a whole, this study revealed that specific

initiatives or activities developed under the grant had a positive influence on the overall

experience of adjunct faculty.

Scholarly research conducted by Murray (1999) revealed that most institutions of higher

education have failed to provide adjunct faculty with any type of professional development.

Murray (1999) asserted that institutions of higher education should develop professional

development activities that are "systematic, demonstrable, and highly regard the improvement of

teaching" (p. 48) as a means to provide support for adjunct faculty. Historically, institutions of

higher education have attempted to provide professional development and support for adjunct

faculty by developing handbooks and other printed materials. However, in research conducted

by Alfred (2003) and Pearch and Marutz (2005) the development and distribution of such

materials was found to be ineffective and did not transmit the values, mission, and culture of the

organization. In addition, the challenges for adjunct faculty are compounded by their general

"limited knowledge about the inner workings, culture, and language of academia" (Fogg, 2002,

p. A15).

Research conducted by Bettis et al. (2005) asserted that individuals who transition to

faculty positions, adjunct and full-time, experience a period of time in which their environment

and interactions in their environment may lack clarity. As individuals transition through this

"betwixt and between" (Bettis et al., 2005, p. 48) period, sensemaking activities are valuable in

assisting the individual to understand and appreciate the world around them, including the

"values, attitudes, and expectations" (Austin, 2002, p. 96) of the organization. Based upon data

collected and analyzed in this study, initiatives developed under the grant served as sensemaking

activities, particularly the orientation, mentoring, and *Introduction to Community College*

Instruction: Getting Results activities. According to participants of this study, these activities

were perceived as being valuable in assisting with their transition or the transition of other

adjunct faculty members to the college.

Participants of this study described a general lack of connection with the institution. One

participant of the study described the relationship between adjunct faculty and the college in the

following manner:

> It seems like, and I have gotten the feeling on occasion, that we really are like fast food
>
> workers that they put us in a schedule and you show up and do your job and leave. That
>
> is just not a good way to do things. I want it to be better, but am I deluded in my thinking
>
> that it needs to be happy and sunshine and everything else?

However, data revealed that positive relationships existed among individuals at the

institution used in this study, which were occasionally facilitated by initiatives developed under

the grant. Based upon data collected and analyzed, the initiatives developed under the grant had

a positive influence on adjunct faculty at college. During the course of the semi-structured

interviews, participants described the benefits of some of the initiatives such as the limited

medical plan, adjunct faculty fee remission, *Introduction to Community College Instruction:*

Getting Results, orientation activities and the mentoring program. Through data collection, data

analysis, and review of field notes, it became clear that an unevenness of adjunct faculty

treatment and engagement existed across the college and influenced the overall experiences of

adjunct faculty. However, it was concluded that the overall objective of the grant to strengthen

its adjunct faculty base was met. Although effective communication regarding the grant and its purpose did not occur, adjunct faculty at the college benefited from the overall grant and its initiatives. Although the initiatives did not produce the perfect or ideal results, one participant of the study described the grant's influence on the college and on individual adjunct faculty in the following manner:

> The Lilly Grant had a significant impact on changing the culture, even though we weren't aware of what was driving it. But there were definite changes and I think that for example, all this week I am sitting as an adjunct on a committee to hire a full-time faculty and since it's in my area that's my specialty, I am basically the lead interviewer and I was just talking to my supervisor about yesterday's candidate, "What did you think about them, you are the historian, how did they resonate?" So, I felt very validated and I know of a number of adjuncts who sit on hiring committees now…So, I would say that the status of adjuncts have improved dramatically since I've been here and these kind of activities are probably why. I don't know how you would show that empirically, but just looking at this sheet of paper, I can see how "ah-ha" a light bulb goes on that legitimizes adjuncts.

Summary

The college used in this study applied for and received a $12.5 million dollar grant from the Lilly Endowment to recruit and retain intellectual capital. The funds from the grant were divided within the institution for various purposes and initiatives as outlined in the college's grant proposal. One of the major grant objectives for the college was to strengthen its adjunct faculty base; $6.25 million of grant funds were allocated for this purpose. The college's adjunct

faculty development committee identified nine college-wide initiatives whose primary purpose was to improve the overall experience of adjunct faculty at the college's 23 campuses.

The purpose of this study was to examine the influence of policy changes supported by the grant. The following questions were used to guide this study:

1. To what extent were adjunct faculty aware of the goals and objectives of the grant?

2. To what degree were adjunct faculty informed of the policy changes and the potential influence they had on their employment and status within the college?

A review of literature was conducted for this study which included literature regarding environmental factors that influenced adjunct faculty experiences; national demographics regarding adjunct faculty's gender, age, marital status, and race; the teaching experiences, pay, and use of time by adjunct faculty; the categories of adjunct faculty, their motivations to teach, and their influence on higher education; and their overall experiences including environmental factors, resources, professional development, and job satisfaction. In addition, a review of scholarly research was conducted to identify appropriate theoretical frames in this study. The two theoretical frames that were indentified for this study were liminality and sensemaking and the theory of work adjustment

Qualitative research was conducted to examine the lived experiences of adjunct faculty at the institution used in this study. Therefore, a phenomenological transcendental approach was used to capture the essence of the participants' lived experiences. Participants of the study were selected using a purposeful sampling approach based upon two criteria. The first criterion was a site selection approach to ensure representation from across the college and the second criterion was that participants were employed at the college prior to the grant's implementation. Adjunct faculty coordinators at each of the college's 14 administrative regions were used to identify

potential study participants based upon the above criteria, as well as their perceived ability to provide rich data. Data were collected from study participants through the use of semi-structured interviews that were approximately one to two hours in length. Data were analyzed using steps recommended by Creswell (2007), Moustakas (1994), and Polkinghorne (1989).

Based upon data analysis, five theme emerged in this study: (a) participants had limited awareness of the grant; (b) participants had limited knowledge of the nine initiatives developed and implemented under the grant; (c) participants indicated a lack of formal communication regarding the grant and its initiatives; (d) the adjunct faculty experience was significantly influence by orientation to the position; and (e) adjunct faculty indicated that mentoring had a significant influence on their experience. In addition to these five themes, four sub-themes also emerged. The sub-themes that emerged were: (a) adjunct faculty are intrinsically motivated to teach; (b) adjunct faculty continue to have feelings of being marginalized and excluded from the cultural fabric of the institution; (c) adjunct faculty place significant value on relationships and base their value and mattering upon those relationships; and (d) the ability to access resources, including but not limited to classroom supplies and professional development opportunities, influences the overall adjunct faculty experience.

Based upon the analysis of data, it was concluded that adjunct faculty at the institution used in this study continue to feeling of marginalized and excluded. As previously mentioned, participants of the study were generally unaware of the grant, its purpose, and its objectives. However, participants were somewhat more aware of the nine initiatives developed under the grant and all participants of the study were aware of the limited medical plan, *Introduction to Community College: Getting Results* activity and the adjunct faculty fee remission policy. Using liminality and the process of sensemaking, as well as the theory of work adjustment as

theoretical frames in this study, it was concluded that initiatives developed under the grant assisted adjunct faculty in their transition to their role and to the environment of higher education. The activities, particularly orientation, mentoring and the *Introduction to Community College Instruction: Getting Results* activity were valuable or perceived as valuable in assisting newly hired adjunct faculty in understanding their role and the institution's culture, value, and mission.

Data also revealed that adjunct faculty were motivated by intrinsic reward and that the ability to increase their salary was a secondary motivating factor. These findings are consistent with scholarly research conducted by Morton and Rittenberg (1986). According to the theory of work adjustment, individuals seek out organizations that are comfortable and allow them to flourish (Bretz & Judge, 1994). Participants of this study indicated their primary motivation to serve as adjunct faculty was based upon the desire to make positive contributions to individuals within the community and their community as whole. Using the theory of work adjustment as a frame, it was concluded that the institution used in this study is effective in meeting the needs of its adjunct faculty. Additionally, the theory of work adjustment asserts that tenure is the most basic indicator of job satisfaction. Demographical information collected in this study revealed that participants in this study had similar employment tenure as the adjunct faculty at different institutions across the nation. Therefore, it was concluded that participants were as satisfied with their overall employment experience at the college used in this study as adjunct faculty were nationally.

Data in this study were used to assist in answering the study's research questions. Based upon an analysis of data, it was concluded that the institution used in this study did not effectively communicate with adjunct faculty regarding the grant, its purpose, or its objectives.

However, participants of this study were somewhat more aware of the initiatives developed under the grant, particularly those that were considered benefits and those which assisted in the process of understanding the institution's culture and the greater higher education environment. Although formal communication about the grant was lacking, it was concluded that the initiatives developed under the grant met the college's objective to strengthen its adjunct faculty base by improving the overall employment experience of its adjunct faculty. Participants of the study described improved relationships with individuals at the college and feeling more legitimized and less marginalized and excluded.

REFERENCES

Akroyd, D., & Caison, A. L. (2005). Part-time community college faculty and their full-time counterparts. In D. Wallin (Ed.), *Adjunct faculty in community colleges: An academic administrator's guide to recruiting, supporting, and retaining great teachers* (pp. 15-42). Boston, MA: Anker.

Akroyd, D., Jeager, A., Jackowski, M., & Jones, L. C. (2004). Internet access and use of the web for instruction: A national study of full-time and part-time community college faculty. *Community College Review, 32*(1), 40-51

Alfred, R. (2003). The wolf at the door: Where colleges could fail. *Community College Journal, 73*(5), 16-24.

American Association of University Professors. (1997). *Statement from the conference on the growing use of part-time and adjunct faculty*. Retrieved from http://www.aaup.org.aaup/issuesed/contingent/conferencestatement.htm

American Federation of Teachers. (2002). *Standards of good practice in employment in part-time/adjunct faculty*. Retrieved from http://archive.aft.org/pubs-reports/higher_ed/standards_pt_adjunct.pdf

Anonymous. (2004). Contingent faculty win legal victory in Washington. *Academe*, *90*, 5-7.

Austin, A. (2002). Preparing the next generation of faculty. *Journal of Higher Education*, *73*(1), 94-122.

Banachowski, G. (1997). *Advantages and disadvantages of employing part-time faculty in community colleges*. Retrieved from ERIC database. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED405037)

Bettis, P., Mills, M., Williams, J., & Nolan, R. (2005). Faculty in a liminal landscape: A case study of a college reorganization. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies, 11*, 47-61.

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

Blau, G. J. (1987). Using a person-environment fit model to predict job involvement and organizational commitment. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 30*, 240-257.

Bolman, L., & Deal, T. (2003). *Reframing organizations.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Bretz, R., & Judge, T. A. (1994). Person-organization fit and the theory of work adjustment: Implications for satisfaction, tenure, and career success. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *44*(1), 32-54.

Brewster, D. (2000). The use of part-time faculty in the community college. *Inquiry, 5*(1), 66-76.

Burnstad, H. (2002). Part-time faculty development at Johnson County Community College. *New Directions for Community Colleges, 120*, 17-25.

Caldwell, D. F., & O'Reilly III, C. A. (1990). Measuring person-job fit with a profile-comparison process. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 75*, 648-657.

Capiro, M., Dubowsky, N., Warasila, R. L., Cheatwood, D. D., & Costa, F. T. (1998). Adjunct faculty. *Journal of College Science Teaching, 28*(3), 166-173.

Charfauros, K., & Tierney, W. G. (1999). Part-time faculty in colleges and universities: Trends and challenges in a turbulent environment. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education, 13*(2), 141-151.

Creswell, J. W. (2007). *Qualitative inquiry & research design: Choosing among five approaches* (2nd ed.)*.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Drago, R. & Colbeck, C. (2003). *The mapping project: Exploring the terrain of U.S. colleges and universities for faculty and families*. Retrieved from http://lser.la.psu.edu/workfam/mappingproject.htm

Eckel, P., & Kezar, A. (2003). Key strategies for making new institutional sense: Ingredients to higher education transformation. *Higher Education Policy, 16*, 39-53.

Evans, N. J., Forney, D. S., Guido, F. M., Patton, L. D., & Renn, K. A. (2010). *Student development in college: Theory, research, and practice*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

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

Feldman, D. C., & Turnley, W. H. (2001). A field study of adjunct faculty: The impact of career stages on reactions to non-tenure-track jobs. *Journal of Career Development, 28*(1), 1-16.

Flower, R. (2006). Suffolk university adjuncts file for union. *Academe, 92*, 13-14.

Fogg, P. (2002). Some adjuncts at western Michigan u. win right to tenure. *Chronicle of Higher Education, 49*(12), A15.

Frakt, P., & Castagnera, J. O. (2000). *One university's plan to support and reward part-timers.* Retrieved from http://www.aahea.org/bulletins/articles/sept2000_2.htm

Freeland, R. S. (1998). *Adjunct faculty in the community college.* Retrieved from ERIC database. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED424899)

Frost, S., & Jean, P. M. (2000). Making more of faculty culture: An experiment in building intellectual community. *Tertiary Education and Management, 6*, 227-243.

Fugate, A., & Amey, M. (2000). Career stages of community college faculty: A qualitative analysis of their career paths, roles, and development. *Community College Review, 28*(1), 1-22.

Fulton, R. (2000). The plight of part-timers in higher education. *Change, 32*(3), 38-43.

Gaillard-Kenney, S. (2006). Adjunct faculty in distance education: What program managers should know. *Distance Learning, 3*(1), 9-17.

Gappa, J. M., & Leslie, D. W. (1993). *The invisible faculty.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Gardner, S. (2007). AAUP reports on gender equity. *The Hispanic Outlook in Higher Education*, *17*(11), 34-37.

Gorse, T. (2004). Above the fray. *ASEE Prism, 14*(3), 22-27.

Grusin, E., & Reed, B. S. (1994). The role of part-time faculty in the quality of instruction. *Journalism Educator, 48*(4), 15-26.

Hom, W. (2001). *Part-time faculty.* Sacramento, CA: California Community Colleges.

Huber, M. (1998). *Community college faculty attitudes and trends, 1997.* Retrieved from www.stanford.edu/group/NCPI/documents/pdfs/4-03_ccfacultyattitudes.pdf

Indiana Public Law, P.L. 127-2005 (2005).

Ivy Tech Community College of Indiana. (2004, July). *A proposal in response to the Lilly endowment's initiative to recruit and retain intellectual capital for Indiana higher education*. Indianapolis, IN: Author

Ivy Tech Community College of Indiana. (2007a, August). *Endorsed policies*. Indianapolis, IN: Author.

Ivy Tech Community College of Indiana. (2007b, June). *Ivy tech community college 2007 statewide adjunct faculty survey: Report of statewide results*. Indianapolis, IN: Author.

Ivy Tech Community College of Indiana. (2008). *Ivy tech community college 2008 adjunct faculty survey: Full report of statewide results*. Indianapolis, IN: Author

Jacoby, D. (2005). Part-time community college faculty and the desire for full-time tenure track positions: Results of a single institution case study. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 29*(1), 137-152.

Johnson, I. (2006, May). *Examining part-time faculty utilization and its impact on student retention at a public research university*. Paper presented at the meeting of the 46th Annual Forum of the Association for Institutional Research, Chicago, IL.

Kezar, A. J., Carducci, R., & McGavin-Contreras, M. (2006). *Rethinking the "L" word in higher education: The revolution of research on leadership*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Kim, D., Twombly, S., & Wolf-Wendel, L. (2008). Factors predicting community college satisfaction with instructional autonomy. *Community College Review, 35*(3), 159-180.

Klein, W., Weisman, D., & Smith, T. E. (1996). The use of adjunct faculty: An exploratory study of eight social work programs. *Journal of Social Work Education, 32*, 253-263.

LaRocco, D. J., & Bruns, D. A. (2006). Practitioner to professor: An examination of second career academics' entry into academia. *Education, 126*, 626-639.

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

Levine, A. (1997). How the academic profession is changing. *Daedalus*, *126*(4), 1-20.

Lundy, K., & Warme, B. D. (1990). Gender and career trajectory: The case of part-time faculty. *Studies in Higher Education, 15*, 207-223.

Magner, D. (1998). Washington state sued over adjuncts' benefits. *Chronicle of Higher Education, 45*(12), A12.

Marcus, J. (2007). Helping academics have families and tenure too. *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning 39*(2), 27-32.

Maynard, D., & Joseph, T. A. (2006). *Are all part-time faculty underemployed? The influence of faculty status preference on satisfaction and commitment* [Monograph]. doi: 10.10071/s10734-006-9039-z

McLaughlin, F. (2005). Adjunct faculty at the community college: Second-class professorate? *Teaching English in the Two Year College, 33*, 47-64.

McMillan, J. H., & Schumacher, S. (2001). *Research in education: A conceptual introduction* (5th ed.). New York, NY: Longman.

Meglino, B., Ravlin, E. C., & Adkins, C. L. (1989). A work-values approach to corporate culture: A field test of the value congruence process and its relationship to individual outcomes. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 74*, 424-432.

Morton, R. D., & Rittenburg, T. L. (1986, April). *Motivations of part-time teachers in noncredit programs: A factor analytic approach.* Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA.

Moustakas, C. (1994). *Phenomenological research methods.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Murray, J. (1999). Faculty development in a national sample of community colleges. *Community College Review, 27*(3), 47-64.

Murray, J., & Cunningham, S. (2004). New rural community college faculty members and job satisfaction. *Community College Review, 32*(2), 19-38.

National Center for Education Statistics. (2002). *Part-time instructional faculty and staff: Who they are, what they do, and what they think*. Retrieved from http://nces.ed.gov/pubs2002/2002163.pdf

National Center for Education Statistics. (2005). *2004 national study of postsecondary faculty (nsopf: 04) report on faculty and instructional staff in fall 2003.* Retrieved from http://nces.ed.gov/pubs2005/2005172.pdf

National Center for Education Statistics. (2007). *Digest of education statistics 2006.* Retrieved from http://nces.ed.gov/pubs2007/2007017.pdf

Noble, J. (2000). Cherchez l'argent: A contribution to the debate about class size, student-faculty ratios, and use of adjunct faculty. *Journal of Social Work Education, 36*(1), 89-101.

Nutting, M. M. (2003). Part-time faculty: Why should we care? *New Directions for Higher Education, 123*, 33-39.

Outcalt, C. (2002). *A profile of the community college professorate, 1975-2000.* New York, NY: Routledge.

Parsons, M. (1998). *How the other 2/3 live: Institutional initiatives for part-time faculty assimilation in America's 2-year colleges* Retrieved from ERIC database. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED417793)

Pearch, W. J., & Marutz, L. (2005). Retention of adjunct faculty in community colleges. *Community College Enterprise, 11*(1), 29-44.

Polkinghorne, D. E. (1989). Phenomenological research methods. In R. Valle, & S. Halling (Eds.), *Existential-phenomenological perspectives in psychology* (pp. 41-60). New York, NY: Plenum.

Roueche, J., Roueche, S., & Milliron, M. (1996). In the company of strangers: Addressing the utilization and integration of part-time faculty in American community colleges. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 20*(2), 105-117.

Rudolph, F. (1990). *The American college and university.* Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press.

Schein, E. (2004). *Organizational culture and leadership* (3rd. ed.)*.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Schibik, T., & Harrington, C. (2004). *Caveat emptor: Is there a relationship between part-time faculty utilization and student learning outcomes and retention?* Retrieved from http://AIRweb3.org/AIRpubs/91.pdf

Schlossberg, N. K. (1989). Marginality and mattering: Key issues in building community. *New Directions for Student Services, 48*, 5-15.

Schuetz, P. (2002). Instructional practices of part-time and full-time faculty. *New Directions for Community Colleges, 118*, 39-46.

Schuster, J., & Finkelstein, M. J. (2006). *The American faculty.* Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Schuster, J., Wheeler, D., & Associates. (1990). *Enhancing faculty careers: Strategies for development and renewal.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Smart, J., Elton, C., & McLaughlin, G. W. (1986). Person-environment congruence and job satisfaction. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *29*, 216-225.

Stanley, C.A. (2006). Coloring the academic landscape: Faculty of color breaking the silence in predominately white colleges and universities. *American Educational Research Journal, 43*, 701-736.

Styne, M. (1997). Those unfamiliar names and faces: The hiring, management, and evaluation of part-time faculty. *Teaching English in the Two Year College, 24*(1), 50-55.

Thelin, J. (2004). *A history of American higher education.* Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Townsend, R., & Hauss, M. E. (2002). *The 2002 AHA-OAH survey of part-time and adjunct faculty*. Retrieved from http://www.historians.org/Prespectives/issues/2002/0210/0210aha3.cfm

Tuckman, H. (1978). Who is part-time in academe? *AAUP Bulletin*, *64*, 305-315.

Tuckman, H., & Pickerill, K. L. (1988). Part-time faculty and part-time academic careers. In D. Breneman, & T. K. Youn, *Academic labor markets and careers* (pp. 98-113). New York, NY: Falmer.

Turner, V. (1967). *The forest of symbols.* Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Twombly, S. B. (2005). Values, policies, and practices affecting the hiring process for full-time arts and sciences faculty in community colleges. *Journal of Higher Education, 76*(4), 423-447. Retrieved from http://www.ohiostatepress.org/Journals/JHE/jhemain.htm

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

Valadez, J. R., & Anthony, J. S. (2001). Job satisfaction and commitment of two-year college part-time faculty. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 25*(2), 97-108.

van Manen, M. (1990). *Researching lived experiences: Human science for an action sensitive pedagogy.* Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Wallin, D. (2005). *Adjunct faculty in community colleges: An academic administrator's guide to recruiting, supporting, and retaining great teachers.* Boston, MA: Anker.

Wallin, D. L. (2004). Valuing professional colleagues: Adjunct faculty in community and

    technical colleges. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 28*, 373-391.

Weick, K. (1995). *Sensemaking in organizations.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Will, G. (1999, April 25). Ph.D. plenty. *Washington Post*, p. B7. Retrieved from

    http://www.washingtonpost.com

Wyles, B. (1998). Adjunct faculty in the community college: Realities and challenges. *New*

    Directions for Higher Education, 26(4), 89-93.

APPENDIX A: EMAIL TO POTENTIAL PARTICIPANTS

Dear Adjunct Faculty Member,

My name is Chuck Lepper and I am a doctoral student in the Department of Educational Leadership, Administration, and Foundations (ELAF) at Indiana State University. I am in the process of conducting my research to fulfill the requirements of my program and to complete my dissertation. Specifically, I am conducting qualitative research that examines the influence of initiatives used to recruit and retain adjunct faculty in a community college system. Dr. Kandace Hinton serves as my faculty sponsor for this study.

Based upon my selection criteria for this study, I seek your assistance. Participation is strictly voluntary and the decision to not participate in the study will not result in any penalty or other negative influence.

- **PURPOSE OF THE STUDY**

The purpose of this study is to examine the influence of policy changes supported by The Lilly Endowment's grant to recruit and retain part-time faculty in a community college system. Specifically, the study will focus on the influence of the nine college-wide initiatives developed and implemented at Ivy Tech Community College and their influence on the adjunct faculty's perceptions about pay and benefits, their access to workspace and storage space for teaching-related items, and their overall experience at the institution.

- **PROCEDURES**

If you volunteer to participate in this study, you will be asked to participate in a one to two hours semi-structured interview. As part of the interview process, you will be asked to self-select a pseudonym. The purpose of using a pseudonym is to keep your identity and location where you teach confidential. Interviews will be conducted between June 2009 and October 2009 at a location convenient and comfortable for you.

If you volunteer to participate, during the interview you will be asked a series of questions related to your knowledge of the grant, initiatives started and implemented under the grant, and about your overall experiences as an adjunct faculty member at the College.

Interviews will be recorded using a digital recording device and I will also record field notes in my own hand-writing. All interviews will be recorded and will be transcribed. After transcription, you will be asked to review the transcription of our interview and verify its accuracy.

- **POTENTIAL RISKS AND DISCOMFORTS**

Due to the nature of this study, participants are not expected to be exposed to any risks beyond those associated with day-to-day living. In the unlikely event a participant becomes uncomfortable or emotional, the interview will be stopped and the individual will be provided

information about the College's Employee Assistance Program. The questions that will be asked are about general knowledge of the grant and experiences, and will not consist of things that might be considered sensitive or personal in nature.

- **POTENTIAL BENEFITS TO SUBJECTS AND/OR TO SOCIETY**
    Current research regarding the lived experiences of adjunct faculty at community colleges is very limited. Participants of this study will benefits by sharing their experiences. Also, participation in this study will help broaden the research in this area, and provide higher education administrators and the general higher education community with insights into adjunct faculty and their lived experiences.

- **PAYMENT FOR PARTICIPANTION**
    There is no cost association for participating in this study and participants will not receive any type of compensation.

- **CONFIDENTIALITY**
    Through the use of pseudonyms, the identity and location of where adjunct faculty members teach will only be known to the principal investigator. All interviews will be recorded and transcribed. Participants of the study should be aware that a transcriptionist will be utilized to type, verbatim, the semi-structured interviews. The transcriptionist will be required to sign a confidentiality agreement and will not know the identity of the participants. Members of the dissertation committee will have access to data and transcriptions. However, only the principal investigator will know the identities and campuses where participants of the study teach.
    All transcriptions will be reviewed and analyzed in this study. Direct quotes from the interviews will be used and will only reveal the pseudonym of the participant and not their actual name or campus where they teach.
    All data, including digital recordings, will be filed under each participant's pseudonym and will be stored in a locked file cabinet that is only accessible to the principal investigator. All data from this study will be destroyed three years after its completion.

- **PARTICIPATION AND WITHDRAWAL**
    Again, participation is strictly voluntary and the decision to not participate in the study will not result in any penalty or other negative impact. If you agree to participate, you may withdraw at any time, without penalty, and all data, including digital recordings and field notes will be destroyed immediately.

- **IDENTIFICATION OF INVESTIAGTORS**
    If you have any questions or concerns about the research, please feel free to contact

Mr. Chuck Lepper	Dr. Kandace Hinton, Associate Professor
Principal Investigator	ELAF Department – College of Education
9433 W. Constellation Dr.	Indiana State University
Pendleton, IN 46064	Terre Haute, IN 47809
317-414-0487	812-237-2900
clepper@ivytech.edu	kghinton@indstate.edu

- **RIGHTS OF RESEARCH SUBJECTS**

If you have any questions about your rights as a research subject, you may contact the Indiana State University Institutional Review Board (IRB) by mail at Indiana State University, Office of Sponsored Programs, Terre Haute, IN 47809, by phone at (812) 237-8217, or email the IRB at irb@indstate.edu. You will be given the opportunity to discuss any questions about your rights as a research subject with a member of the IRB. The IRB is an independent committee composed of members of the University community, as well as lay members of the community not connected with ISU. The IRB has reviewed and approved this study.

APPENDIX B: INFORMED CONSENT

CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN RESEARCH

Recruit and Retain Adjunct Faculty Study

Dear Adjunct Faculty Member,

My name is Chuck Lepper and I am a doctoral student in the Department of Educational Leadership, Administration, and Foundations (ELAF) at Indiana State University. I am in the process of conducting my research to fulfill the requirements of my program and to complete my dissertation. Specifically, I am conducting qualitative research that examines the influence of initiatives used to recruit and retain adjunct faculty in a community college system. Dr. Kandace Hinton serves as my faculty sponsor for this study.

Based upon my selection criteria for this study, I seek your assistance. Participation is strictly voluntary and the decision to not participate in the study will not result in any penalty or other negative influence.

- **PURPOSE OF THE STUDY**

The purpose of this study is to examine the influence of policy changes supported by The Lilly Endowment's grant to recruit and retain part-time faculty in a community college system. Specifically, the study will focus on the influence of the nine college-wide initiatives developed and implemented at Ivy Tech Community College and their influence on the adjunct faculty's perceptions about pay and benefits, their access to workspace and storage space for teaching-related items, and their overall experience at the institution.

- **PROCEDURES**

If you volunteer to participate in this study, you will be asked to participate in a one to two hours semi-structured interview. As part of the interview process, you will be asked to self-select a pseudonym. The purpose of using a pseudonym is to keep your identity and location where you teach confidential. Interviews will be conducted between June 2009 and October 2009 at a location convenient and comfortable for you.

If you volunteer to participate, during the interview you will be asked a series of questions related to your knowledge of the grant, initiatives started and implemented under the grant, and about your overall experiences as an adjunct faculty member at the College.

Interviews will be recorded using a digital recording device and I will also record field notes I my own hand-writing. All interviews will be recorded and will be transcribed. After transcription, you will be asked to review the transcription of our interview and verify its accuracy.

- **POTENTIAL RISKS AND DISCOMFORTS**

Due to the nature of this study, participants are not expected to be exposed to any risks beyond those associated with day-to-day living. In the unlikely event a participant becomes uncomfortable or emotional, the interview will be stopped and the individual will be provided information about the College's Employee Assistance Program. The questions that will be asked are about general knowledge of the grant and experiences, and will not consist of things that might be considered sensitive or personal in nature.

- **POTENTIAL BENEFITS TO SUBJECTS AND/OR TO SOCIETY**

Current research regarding the lived experiences of adjunct faculty at community colleges is very limited. Participants of this study will benefits by sharing their experiences. Also, participation in this study will help broaden the research in this area, and provide higher education administrators and the general higher education community with insights into adjunct faculty and their lived experiences.

- **PAYMENT FOR PARTICIPANTION**

There is no cost association for participating in this study and participants will not receive any type of compensation.

- **CONFIDENTIALITY**

Through the use of pseudonyms, the identity and location of where adjunct faculty members teach will only be known to the principal investigator. All interviews will be recorded and transcribed. Participants of the study should be aware that a transcriptionist will be utilized to type, verbatim, the semi-structured interviews. The transcriptionist will be required to sign a confidentiality agreement and will not know the identity of the participants. Members of the dissertation committee will have access to data and transcriptions. However, only the principal investigator will know the identities and campuses where participants of the study teach.

All transcriptions will be reviewed and analyzed in this study. Direct quotes from the interviews will be used and will only reveal the pseudonym of the participant and not their actual name or campus where they teach.

All data, including digital recordings, will be filed under each participant's pseudonym and will be stored in a locked file cabinet that is only accessible to the principal investigator. All data from this study will be destroyed three years after its completion.

- **PARTICIPATION AND WITHDRAWAL**

    Again, participation is strictly voluntary and the decision to not participate in the study will not result in any penalty or other negative influence. If you agree to participate, you may withdraw at any time, without penalty, and all data, including digital recordings and field notes will be destroyed immediately.

- **IDENTIFICATION OF INVESTIAGTORS**

    If you have any questions or concerns about the research, please feel free to contact

    Mr. Chuck Lepper   Dr. Kandace Hinton, Associate Professor
    Principal Investigator   ELAF Department – College of Education
    9433 W. Constellation Dr.   Indiana State University
    Pendleton, IN 46064   Terre Haute, IN 47809
    317-414-0487   812-237-2900
    clepper@ivytech.edu   kghinton@indstate.edu

- **RIGHTS OF RESEARCH SUBJECTS**

    If you have any questions about your rights as a research subject, you may contact the Indiana State University Institutional Review Board (IRB) by mail at Indiana State University, Office of Sponsored Programs, Terre Haute, IN 47809, by phone at (812) 237-8217, or email the IRB at irb@indstate.edu. You will be given the opportunity to discuss any questions about your rights as a research subject with a member of the IRB. The IRB is an independent committee composed of members of the University community, as well as lay members of the community not connected with ISU. The IRB has reviewed and approved this study.

    I understand the procedures described above. My questions have been answered to my satisfaction, and I agree to participate in this study. I have been given a copy of this form.

_____
Printed Name of Subject

_____   _____
Signature of Subject   Date

APPENDIX C: SUMMARY OF INITIATIVES

Summary of College-wide Initiatives For Adjunct Faculty

1.) Introduction to Community College Instruction: Getting Results: An on-line professional development tool was created using products developed by the League for Innovation in the Community College and embedding them into a distance-learning platform. A policy was developed and approved that would make the tool available to adjunct faculty college-wide each semester.

2.) Adjunct Faculty Inclusion: A policy was developed and approved that required as a standard practice, adjunct faculty should be invited to participate in campus and regional activities including but not limited to commencement, committee meetings, and faculty meetings.

3.) Adjunct Faculty Mentoring Program: A policy was developed and approved that required each region to develop and implement an adjunct faculty mentoring program and make it available to all newly hired adjunct faculty. It was also recommended that each campus and region design a recognition plan for participation in the mentoring program and could include such items as additional compensation, stipends, and certificates.

4.) Faculty Network Plans: A policy was developed and approved that each region, where applicable, should, when possible, develop a faculty network plan with surrounding institutions, graduate programs, and other appropriate entities to facilitate the recruitment and sharing of adjunct faculty.

5.) Adjunct Faculty Orientation: A policy was developed and approved that required each campus and region on a yearly basis to provide all adjunct faculty with a face-to-face faculty orientation program on each campus. In addition, the Office of the Provost would be responsible for the development and maintenance of a broad-based, college-wide, on-line orientation experience that could be utilized as a resource or alternative in cases where adjunct faculty are unable to attend their campus face-to-face orientation.

6.) Access to Classroom Items: A policy was developed and approved that requires each campus to provide access to classroom items and supplies that support student success. Specifically, this policy serves as a mechanism to ensure adjunct faculty have access to dry-erase markers, chalk, paper, notebooks, and other classroom materials and supplies to support student learning.

7.) Adjunct Faculty Welcome Kits: A policy was developed and approved that requires each campus and region to provide all newly hired adjunct faculty, at the commencement of their initial employment, a "Welcome Kit." Some examples of items that could be included in the kit include such things as a coffee mug, water bottle, or College tee-shirt.

8.) Adjunct Faculty Limited Medical Plan: A policy was developed and approved that allowed adjunct faculty and other part-time employees the ability to access a limited medical plan through a College-selected vendor. Individuals who elected to participate in the limited medical plan were responsible for all monthly fees.

9.) Adjunct Faculty Fee Remission: Upon the successful completion of two semesters of teaching, all adjunct faculty members, their spouse, and their dependent children are each entitled to six credit hours of tuition at Ivy Tech Community College of Indiana.

APPENDIX D: PEER DEBRIEFER LETTER

Dear Colleague,

I am writing to request your assistance. I am in the process of conducting research study for the partial fulfillment of my requirements towards completing a Doctorate of Philosophy at Indiana State University in the Educational Leadership, Administration, and Foundations. My study specifically focuses on the influence of the Lilly Endowment's grant to recruit and retain intellectual capital on adjunct faculty in a community college system.

Attached are the findings of the study and my interpretation of those findings. I request that you review the attached and provide feedback regarding the accuracy of my interpretations, paying specific attention to any noted bias, understatement, or overstatement of the findings.

Thanks in advance for your assistance with this endeavor. If I can be of any assistance or provide additional information to clarify my request, please do not hesitate contacting me at 317-921-4405 or via email at clepper@ivytech.edu.

Sincerely,

Chuck Lepper