TEACHING DEVELOPMENTAL ENGLISH: PERCEPTIONS AND MOTIVATIONS OF ONE ADJUNCT FACULTY GROUP

A Dissertation Submitted to the Temple University Graduate Board in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

---

by

Joanne Zeas

May 2013

Examining Committee Members:

Corrinne A. Caldwell, Ph.D., Advisory Committee Chair, Educational Leadership
Avi Kaplan, Ph.D., Advisory Committee Member, Educational Psychology
John McClendon, Ph.D., Advisory Committee Member, Human Resource Management
Joan Poliner Shapiro, Ed.D., Examining Committee Chair, Educational Leadership
Steven Jay Gross, Ed.D., Examining Committee Member, Educational Leadership

ABSTRACT

TEACHING DEVELOPMENTAL ENGLISH: PERCEPTIONS AND MOTIVATIONS OF ONE ADJUNCT FACULTY GROUP

by Joanne Zeas

Doctor of Education

Temple University, 2013

Major Advisor: Dr. Corrinne A. Caldwell

This qualitative study describes members of the Liberal Arts/English adjunct faculty teaching developmental English at one mid-Atlantic urban community college (MAUCC), along with their perceptions of the organizational climate of their program. Adjunct faculty member perceptions are discussed and analyzed relative to member satisfaction, attitude toward student learning, and general motivational patterns. The study was designed as a case study focusing on one MAUCC department.

Through interviews with current adjunct faculty members who teach introductory English at MAUCC, I have obtained data regarding current adjunct faculty members' perceptions regarding their position and department. Data have been obtained through individual qualitative interviews. Adjunct faculty members were selected from the developmental English program to focus on the particular needs and challenges within this critical arena. This population was also selected to reduce differences created by varying subjects. The purposive interview sample was reviewed for differences regarding educational attainment, years in position, age, and gender. Key

administrators at MAUCC involved in hiring were interviewed for background information and administrative perspective.

The ultimate aim of this research was to obtain a composite of current faculty members' perceptions within this specific population. Transcription and analysis were conducted, and a grouping of respondents was created to describe types within interview respondents. Five adjunct types were found: strivers, the job-focused, altruists, cynics, and individuals "in the weeds." Respondent attitude toward students varied according to their type.

This study aims to contribute to the general body of literature regarding adjunct faculty members within the limitations described in this proposal. The study contains many potential implications for practitioners, including recommendations for faculty selection, orientation, and resource allocation. Recommendations for expansive future research are also included.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Throughout my graduate program, and specifically during my dissertation research, I have been fortunate to have the support of family and friends. My husband, Robert, has provided me with countless weekend time to complete this research, supported various high and low points throughout the program, and acted as my sounding board for my thoughts. My children, Jonathan, Jessica, and Regina, have been patient with time constraints and extra chores; Regina is looking forward to a time when she can remember her mother out of school. Our extended family has provided support, and friends have given a great deal of encouragement along the way.

The support of my advisor, Dr. Corrinne Caldwell, has been invaluable throughout this process. Dr. Caldwell was the first person whom I met in the Educational Leadership program, and was a guide for me from the point of my first pre-matriculated class. I selected my topic of interest together with Dr. Caldwell, and have turned to her every time I had a question or faced a concern. This dissertation, including the literature review, research questions, and final analysis, has been formed in conjunction with Dr. Caldwell's valued guidance. I am grateful to Dr. Caldwell for her leadership throughout my entire program completion.

Dr. Avi Kaplan and Dr. John McClendon, my two committee members, have been generous with their time and assistance in this project. Through various meetings and communications, Dr. Kaplan has worked with me in understanding the theoretical aspects of this research. Dr. Kaplan's guidance strengthened my research and interviewing skills, and provided me with guidance in analyzing results. Dr. McClendon's project review allowed me to provide a framework that incorporated Human Resources as a lens for review.

Dr. Joan Shapiro and Dr. Steven Gross are also acknowledged. I am grateful for their willingness to examine my work and provide feedback. I have been fortunate to work with Dr. Shapiro and Dr. Gross throughout the doctoral program, and am thankful for their assistance with this work.

Finally, I am grateful to my student colleagues in the Ed.D. program. I have been fortunate to work with an amazing group of colleagues in this program. Together, we have provided each other with mutual support as we completed our classes and worked on our individual projects. With these individuals, I have been able to create organized study weekends, review challenging concepts, and work toward a goal of mutual success.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

Statement of the Problem

Adjunct faculty members are currently integrated into the teaching cadre in most colleges and universities throughout the United States. Although these adjunct faculty members play a critical part in the education of students, these teachers frequently are hired under a less formal employment process, are evaluated differently than full-time faculty members, and are less visible in campus activities, committees, and events. As a consequence, little is often known about hiring and retaining the best adjunct faculty members possible for our institutions.

Community colleges, in particular, rely on heavy use of adjunct faculty. Adjunct faculty members are often able to teach classes that are not staffed by full-time faculty members, and provide a teaching resource for community colleges at a cost significantly lower than the cost of full-time faculty members. However, institutions using adjunct faculty members currently have little assurance that they are maximizing their efforts in hiring or retaining their adjunct faculty members.

The English program at MAUCC has a heavy reliance on the use of adjunct faculty members. MAUCC is a unionized environment, and is contractually obligated to use adjunct faculty members according to employee seniority. Accordingly, the college has selection flexibility for adjunct faculty members solely during the hiring, selection, and probationary period of new employment. Once this period is complete, adjunct faculty members are assigned classes each semester according to a seniority system.

The impact of adjunct faculty use on student learning outcomes is uncertain. Many studies have been conducted in this area, and conflicting results have been found. The preponderance of studies has noted few, if any, negative effects from the use of adjunct faculty members. However, some recent studies have noted concerns specific to learning outcomes for remedial students and retention of community college students. Concerns regarding adjunct effectiveness in remedial classes are directly applicable to the English department identified in this study; the adjunct faculty members interviewed are directly responsible for English remediation.

As adjunct faculty members continue to be heavily used in community colleges such as MAUCC, it is paramount to understand their motivations for teaching and perspectives regarding the organizational climate within which they work. Such an understanding may permit MAUCC to tailor its recruitment and retention programs for maximum benefit to the organization and its adjunct faculty.

Purpose of the Study

This dissertation was conducted to study the perceptions of adjunct faculty members regarding their role in teaching introductory English in one community college. The perceptions and motivations of adjunct faculty members are essential in their satisfaction and motivation, and could be a key to their success in teaching a critical population of students.

At this time, we know that community college enrollment is growing, and remedial education is required for most new community college students. The US

Census estimates that in 2008, community college enrollment was 5.8 million students, a 48.7% increase from enrollment just 8 years before (US Census Bureau, 2011). Fifty-eight percent of entering community college students require remedial education before beginning their college-level classes (Achieving the Dream Foundation, 2010).

Remedial education is provided at MAUCC at a rate that exceeds the national community college statistics. MAUCC is a large urban community college serving more than 39,000 students (MAUCC, 2010). As noted in their "Achieving the Dream" profile (2005), the majority of MAUCC's students require remedial or developmental education to be fully prepared for college-level work. During the 2011-2012 academic year, more than 70% of entering students required at least one remedial class (MAUCC, 2012).

The developmental English curriculum offered by MAUCC consists of eight classes: four classes focus on reading and four on writing (MAUCC, 2012). The classes are designed to increase in difficulty and prepare students for college-level reading and writing. Students may enter the developmental curriculum at any level, and MAUCC conducts new student testing to determine the need for developmental support. New student testing also determines the level of support when developmental work is needed. Some developmental students at MAUCC require a sequence of classes before entering a college curriculum. Support is necessary at each step of this sequence if these students are to achieve success.

Developmental students are statistically unlikely to complete their course sequence and continue on to a college-level curriculum. Statistics show that 68% of students enrolled in developmental English courses complete the initial course in which

they enroll (Bailey, 2009). When multiple courses are reviewed, the national percentage of students completing all developmental coursework is 44% (Bailey, 2009). Individual class statistics at MAUCC are slightly below this national average. At MAUCC, between 58% and 60% of students enrolled in developmental English courses passed the course in which they enrolled during the 2010-2011 academic year (MAUCC, 2012). The percentage of developmental students persisting through multiple courses was not reported by MAUCC in its recent statistical data. With a lower pass rate per class than the national average, the full completion rate for the developmental sequence will not exceed this national average.

Faculty members are a critical element in developmental students' success. Within community colleges, students who require introductory classes typically are taught by adjunct faculty members. These students often do not complete their Associate's degree, and are frustrated in their goals of degree completion. Various studies (Harrington & Schibik, 2001; Eagan, 2009; Jaeger, 2009) indicate that students who were taught by adjunct faculty members were less likely to persist to degree completion. In particular, these studies identified introductory courses as an area where students taught by adjunct faculty were less successful. Some authors (Ronco & Cahill, 2004; Eagan, 2009) posit that adjunct faculty members were less successful in working with developmental students because they were not able to establish strong relationships with their students.

MAUCC is an example of a community college that relies on adjunct faculty members. The college employed approximately 395 full-time and 737 part-time faculty

members during the 2009-2010 academic year (MAUCC, 2010). MAUCC's Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs and Dean of Liberal Studies estimates that approximately 300 of the 737 adjunct faculty members at the community college teach in the English program (personal communication, October 17, 2008). MAUCC does not publish the percentage of developmental classes taught by adjunct faculty. However, internal publications by MAUCC institutional research note that encouragement from faculty is a top factor in developmental student success (MAUCC, 1997). Although general information is known about adjunct faculty and their motivations for teaching, there is not any specific literature regarding adjunct faculty who teach introductory classes. We do not know their motivation for teaching or their perceptions of their role. A greater understanding of this motivation within one community college environment is helpful to understand the instructor's perspective of teaching in this context. A complete understanding of the instructor's perspectives and motivations will provide a base of knowledge that can be used to develop a complete understanding of the introductory class environment.

This research is designed within the context of one institution and focuses on the adjunct faculty members in one department. Accordingly, it provides an in-depth, detailed understanding of this particular participant group. This research may then be viewed in light of this particular participant group, analyzed for theoretical insight, and used as a basis for future research. Accordingly, it will provide insight that may be of value in similar settings.

Research Questions

This study is designed to answer the following research question:

- "How do adjunct faculty members teaching developmental English courses at MAUCC describe their satisfaction within their current organizational roles?"

In addition to the main question above, I plan to obtain interview data that answer the following three sub-questions:

- How do adjunct faculty members teaching developmental courses in a community college perceive their responsibility toward student learning and academic success?
- How do MAUCC adjunct faculty members describe their motivation within their current role?
- How do adjunct faculty members' perceptions of satisfaction, instructional effectiveness, and motivation relate to personal background?

The questions above are non-experimental and will be illuminated through individual interviews with adjunct faculty members at MAUCC. Qualitative research will be most effective in answering the "how" and "why" questions posed above.

Definition of Terms

The following terms are used throughout the study with the following operational definitions:

1. Adjunct Faculty Member – Used in this dissertation proposal as synonymous with part-time faculty member, this term is used to refer to any faculty member who is not employed under a full-time contract. Adjunct faculty members at MAUCC are part-time professional employees and are covered by a collective bargaining agreement. For purposes of this study, the term *adjunct faculty member* does not refer to types of employees such as full-time, non-tenure track (NTT), and/or graduate assistants.

2. Contingent – A worker or faculty member who is employed on a temporary basis or for an uncertain length of time.

3. Part-Time Worker – As defined by the US Bureau of Labor Statistics, a person who works fewer than 35 hours per week. For purposes of this study, this definition will be applied to each individual employer with whom a part-time worker may be employed.

4. Developmental Education – For purposes of this study, *developmental education* is defined as coursework that is completed by a community college student, on a non-credit basis, to learn basic skills necessary for college-level coursework.

5. Remedial Education – Synonymous with developmental education, this term is often used in literature regarding basic skills education for college students. Throughout this study, the term *developmental education* will be consistently used.

Limitations

This study only addresses a sample of adjunct faculty members who are teaching English at MAUCC at the time of the study. Accordingly, the results obtained will be

specific to this population. As only one group is being studied during one point in time, the results are not generalizable to other populations. Furthermore, as humanities adjunct faculty members have been found to vary from adjunct faculty members in other disciplines, the information obtained from this study has limited applicability to other disciplines.

MAUCC employs approximately 300 adjunct faculty members in their Liberal Arts/English program (personal communication, October 2008). As all subjects for this study are employed by MAUCC's English department, results from this study are not designed to be generalized to any other community college or institution of higher education. Results may also not be applicable to other departments or programs at MAUCC.

As all interviews are conducted during one time period, this study is subject to the influence of factors related to the college during Summer 2012. Accordingly, this study must be read within the context of factors that had a potential influence on adjunct faculty responses to the interview questions at that time. In particular, adjunct faculty members frequently discussed the lack of a current union contract as an issue of concern.

As described above, this study is intentionally designed to be completed using a sample within one discipline and one community college. The intent of this study is to obtain a full description of the motives and perceptions of this particular faculty population. Through this study, I will illuminate potential factors that can be generalized

to theory. These factors may also be further reviewed and/or studied with other populations and institutions.

Significance of the Study

The retention and use of competent adjunct faculty members is critical to the learning and retention of community college students. Recent educational statistics note that 60% of entering community college students require remedial/developmental educational courses. Of these students, fewer than 25% successfully complete their Associate's degree within 2 years (Adams, 2010).

The success of community colleges has a direct impact on the educational attainment of the US population and disproportionately impacts minority and low-income students. Minority students are more likely to attend community colleges than white students; US Census Bureau statistics report 45% of Hispanic students and 36% of African-American students attended community college compared with 28% of white students (US Census Bureau, 2008). Community college students span age types and socio-economic status. Community colleges enroll more low-income students than 4-year public institutions and provide an economical opportunity for degree attainment (Bailey, Jenkins, & Leinbach, 2005).

MAUCC employs approximately 300 adjunct faculty members each year to teach English to a population that often requires developmental education (Achieving the Dream, 2005; MAUCC, 2010). MAUCC has wide latitude in the initial hiring of adjunct faculty members but is limited in its discretion regarding adjunct faculty member

selection after the first three classes taught (personal communication, October 17, 2008). Accordingly, MAUCC is reliant on the motivation and success of its adjunct faculty members to meet the developmental and educational goals of its student population. MAUCC is significantly limited in the management decisions that it can make regarding its adjunct faculty members after employment has started. MAUCC has wide latitude in selecting and hiring its adjunct faculty members and uses a process that is much more informal than the process used in selection of full-time faculty (MAUCC Vice President, personal communication, October 17, 2008). The college also has the ability to continue or terminate the services of adjunct faculty during their first few classes. However, once an adjunct faculty member begins to teach classes, he/she accrues seniority in the Faculty Federation of the American Federation of Teachers (Faculty Federation, 2006). Accordingly, the college must ensure that it is using fair employment practices and assigning and dismissing adjunct faculty members according to objective and/or defensible criteria. Accordingly, initial hiring and selection of adjunct faculty members is of paramount importance at MAUCC.

Once an adjunct faculty member is hired, he/she will have an effect on the "gateway" course learning of scores of community college students. It is critical that MAUCC understands the motivations and perceptions of its adjunct faculty members.

The adjunct faculty members who teach in MAUCC's developmental English curriculum have a direct impact on the students they teach in their classes. There is a large developmental student population at MAUCC, as more than 70% of MAUCC students require at least one developmental class and many require an introductory

sequence of developmental classes. These students must overcome developmental challenges in meeting their goals for degree completion.

The adjunct faculty in MAUCC's English department will have a critical role in the learning outcomes of developmental students. If students do not meet the learning outcomes in this critical class, they will not have the skills necessary to earn their degree or even attain successful learning outcomes. MAUCC's research notes that faculty engagement with students is a crucial component in the success of developmental students (MAUCC, 1997). The retention and engagement of adjunct faculty members in these classes provides a base that can be used for instructor training and student opportunity.

Through this study, adjunct faculty members will provide direct information regarding their perceptions of MAUCC. This information will provide insight into the experiences of these adjunct faculty members, current level of satisfaction, awareness levels of support resources, and areas of concern. Through this feedback, MAUCC may obtain a greater understanding of its adjunct faculty members. This understanding may provide suggestions for future hiring and retention practices.

Organizational Theoretical Base

In her quantitative research with adjunct faculty members at the Community College of Philadelphia, Harris-Pereles presents an organizational theory of commitment. This theory is based on Etzioni's research on organizations (1975) and postulates that organizations create systems to "ensure the compliance of subordinate

members with the directives of superior members." Harris-Pereles' discussion of organizational commitment describes three primary connections that individuals use in thinking about and interacting with their organizations: Organizational connection as its own reason via "moral commitment," coercive commitment or "alienative commitment," and "calculative commitment," which reviews the economic exchange that is present between an individual and the organization.

Moral commitment is characterized by a match between the individual employee's values and the values of the organization. Because there is a willingness on the part of the individual to accept organizational values, the individual is likely to be vested in the success of the organization. Accordingly, the individual will "comply with directives of superiors and perform the behaviors necessary for organizational effectiveness because the members are dedicated to the organization" (Harris-Pereles, 1997, p. 36).

Alienative commitment is described as a response to an organization's "coercive power as resting on the ability of the supervisor to inflict sanctions on the members, to restrict members' movements, or to regulate the members by controlling their abilities to satisfy their needs" (Harris-Pereles, 1997, p. 36). Although this dynamic is originally noted as characteristic of an institutional setting such as prison or the military, Harris-Pereles notes that this type of commitment may also be present in a work setting where there are few alternative employment options and a clear need to avoid employee termination. Harris-Pereles further notes that this type of commitment can be

attributed to “highly-paid, older traditional workers or involuntarily contingent workers, especially” (p. 40), as they may have limited employment alternatives.

In regard to calculative commitment, as applied to a workplace, Harris-Pereles notes that “members engage in the behaviors necessary for workplace effectiveness as a result of the economic inducements offered by the organization” (p. 37). These calculations address direct job rewards, such as salary and benefits, or indirect rewards, such as work schedules or office space. Various other rewards can also be included in this typology. Essentially, individuals will participate in the workplace to the extent that they are rewarded in some way for these efforts.

An academic environment offers an ideal testing ground for organizational commitment theory. The position of an adjunct faculty member requires professional commitment and will have measurable differences in “discretionary work behaviors” (Harris-Pereles, p. 58). This proposed qualitative study will provide a small sample that can be studied and aligned in regard to organizational theory.

Organizational commitment offers a way to understand organizational benefits to adjunct faculty members, and can provide a way to categorize and assess the importance of these benefits. Depending on the motivations of the individual faculty member, some motivational methods may have more success than others. Accordingly, the college may want to take individual motivations and needs into account when designing programs, supports, and/or inducements for their adjunct faculty. Organizational approaches toward engagement of adjunct faculty members can be adjusted based on data obtained in this study.

Role of the Researcher

In additional to my current role as a doctoral student in Temple University's Educational Leadership program, I am a full-time human resources practitioner in a university setting. My work in human resources requires an understanding and practical application of hiring and retention practices. Before my current position, I have worked in roles within the areas of employee relations and social work. These work experiences have provided me with the opportunity to develop sound skills in the areas of interviewing and assessment. I also work part-time as an adjunct faculty member and have an understanding of the adjunct faculty member role within the higher education industry.

I have a strong interest in the area of adjunct faculty recruitment and retention. I am attracted to this topic because of the personal impact of the topic, as well as its implications for higher education. I believe that my experience in human resources and as a doctoral student in educational administration have provided me with a strong background to research this topic.

Because this study is conducted with a population that is outside of my work or teaching responsibilities, there are no conflicts between my research and my employment roles. I do not have a vested interest in any particular outcome from this study.

Summary

The above sections have provided a summary and rationale for the proposed study of adjunct faculty members at MAUCC. This study provides a detailed accounting of respondents' views regarding their adjunct faculty member role. Upcoming sections will provide a background for this study via a literature review, and describe the methodology that was used in this study.

CHAPTER 2
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

To understand adjunct faculty members within the program to be studied, it is important to review previous work about the use of these faculty members. To begin this literature review, an organizational context regarding higher education will be provided. This context includes information on financial pressures on higher education, tuition increase pressure, the business functionality of higher education, and increasing disaggregation of the faculty role.

After describing the overall context of higher education, this literature review moves into a description of the community college environment, and specifically the area of English education. The challenges of English education will be discussed. Literature regarding student outcomes in community colleges and developmental education is given particular attention. Student outcome information is also included, as this is the primary basis with which adjunct faculty use can be correlated to college results.

General literature regarding part-time employment characteristics is discussed in this paper to provide an employment context for the part-time employment role and its general use. The history of adjunct faculty is then discussed as a part-time role specific to higher education. This history provides an understanding of the use of adjunct faculty within higher education and community colleges in particular. Specific information regarding liberal arts adjunct faculty members and MAUCC adjunct faculty members is included in this section.

From a human resources perspective, literature regarding job satisfaction and retention is discussed. This literature will be used to compare and contrast the experiences of MAUCC adjunct faculty members within the context of job satisfaction and retention. Literature specific to job satisfaction for part-time employees is included in this section.

Through the above strands, this review incorporates the major information and issues surrounding adjunct faculty use in community colleges. The literature is used to explain the critical nature of the proposed research. Information in the literature review is also used to frame research questions for individual interviews. The information that is collected will be analyzed within the context of existing literature.

The Industry of Higher Education

Higher education is currently a growth industry within the United States and has experienced rapid enrollment gains over the past several decades. However, the industry is facing several changes and challenges. As noted by Gappa et al. (2007), four significant challenges are currently on the horizon for the higher education industry: financial constraints and increased competition, calls for accountability and shift in control, growing enrollments and increasing diversity of students, and the growth of the "information age," including new technologies for learning. These four frames provide the structure for the following review and analysis.

Financial constraints and increased competition.

Public universities, including community colleges, have received generally decreasing levels of government support in recent years. During the 1990s, the schools experienced a significant decrease in revenue from state governments (Serban & Burke, 2008). Responses to this revenue decrease have varied and include many alternatives for revenue enhancement and/or budget reductions.

Budget restrictions continue within public higher education. According to the National Conference for State Legislatures (NCSL), state funding for public higher education has declined for the past 3 years (2010). If measured in constant dollars, state funding is currently at an amount lower than funding in 1980.

Throughout the nation, funding for public community colleges is traditionally based on a formula of student tuition, state government support, and sponsoring agency (such as local counties or school district) support. Funding formulas vary from state to state. In Pennsylvania, public community colleges are modeled to receive one-third of their support from the state budget, one-third from the local county or school district, and one-third from student tuition (Ingram, 2004). In constant dollars, Pennsylvania community colleges have had their levels of state funding decreased by 1% between 2008 and 2011 (Pennsylvania Budget and Policy Center, 2012). Funding for 2012 declined by an additional 2%, and 2013 funding is proposed with an additional 3% reduction (State of Pennsylvania, 2012).

Although local support is mandated, Ingram found that the mandated support level is only met in two counties in Pennsylvania (2004). Other community colleges are

left to find ways to balance their budgets with less than one-third of their county support. Levels of government support are not increasing. In a time where Pennsylvania student headcount by credit hour has increased by 20% (Pennsylvania Commission for Community Colleges, 2010), Pennsylvania state funding has not increased substantially. Accordingly, community colleges are financially challenged to meet the needs of their surging student population.

Many alternative funding methods are used in community colleges. The most common sources of additional revenue for community colleges after government support and tuition are grants and contracts (Fernandez, 2011). Fundraising is also a newly developing field for these institutions (Fernandez, 2011). Sometimes, creative revenue generation ideas are used, such as the admission of out-of-county students (who do not receive support and pay double or triple tuition rates). Non-credit programs of all kinds, from vocational to leisure, often are used to generate additional revenue.

One important institutional goal for legislators, students, and individuals is the institution's affordability to current and prospective students. Public institutions and community colleges accept government funding and provide education under the premise of affordability and accessibility to local and state constituents.

Affordability is a challenge that is difficult to meet in an era of declining budgetary supports. To address affordability, public colleges and universities often seek to meet their cost constraints through avenues other than tuition increases. Institutions will often look for alternative sources of revenue, such as private philanthropy, corporate

grants, or auxiliary services. Budget reductions are also a potential strategy to meet financial needs in a time of decreasing governmental support.

The need for accountability.

When providing educational services, colleges and universities are accountable to various stakeholders, ranging from individual students and their families to local communities, accrediting bodies, and state and local governments. Institutions are accountable to their students and alumni regarding the quality of education provided. Constituent groups such as communities and governments have a stake in the education provided by public universities and community colleges because they allow for public funding and/or student financial aid.

Financial aid and public funding continue to provide a primary source of revenue to community colleges. Accordingly, community colleges must face a high level of public accountability. However, as community colleges serve a varied and diverse population, a functional definition of accountability can be difficult to determine.

Cohen and Brawer (2008) note that there are varied purposes for the programs and services of community colleges. Community college programs are broken down by Cohen and Brawer (2008) as academic transfer, vocation/technical, remedial/developmental, continuing education, and community service. Bailey and Averianova (1999) also cite these purposes and add a category for “Contract Education and Other Economic Development Activities” (p. 2). Together, these categories create a broad-based approach to the mission of community colleges.

Community colleges are often designed as “open access,” allowing students to enroll in their offerings regardless of past academic performance. Accordingly, these institutions must provide a cadre of courses to meet the learning needs of students with diverse backgrounds and educational needs. Many special populations look to community colleges to serve their needs, including foreign students and “reverse transfers” or degreed individuals who seek to further their skills with new training. In addition to these two groups, community colleges are the modal choice within higher education of lower socio-economic status students (Bailey et al., 2004). The offerings of the institution must be flexible enough to meet these varied student populations.

To serve their student populations, community colleges typically have an overarching mission statement that includes this flexibility to meet the students' widely varying needs. Some students may require extensive developmental programs for academic remediation, whereas reverse-transfer students require specific skill development. Community members may seek non-credit course offerings, while students seeking matriculation into a 4-year institution seek credit offerings that will be acceptable within a transfer program. Some students may seek one or more specific courses for skill development and enter the institution without a goal to earn a degree or graduate. The varied needs of students may lead community colleges to pursue “multiple missions” in making their offerings appropriate for the needs of varied students.

Dowd (2003) notes that governments are asking colleges to act like businesses in terms of efficiency and performance goals. These performance goals can come into

conflict with the other goals that community colleges would like to pursue, such as open access and social mobility (Dowd, 2003). In an environment of open access and varied goals, Dowd (2003) recommends a measurement of "outcome equity" that measures success against the goal of the entering student.

Brint (2003) notes that community colleges often experience conflict when they adopt the broad-based approach to mission as described above. For example, Cohen and Brawer (2008) cite an increasing need for developmental education in community colleges. Brint (2003) notes that instructors may lower standards in their classroom in response to developmental students. Consequently, a lowering of classroom standards may leave transfer students less prepared to enter a baccalaureate program at the time of transfer. Maintaining high standards, however, may lead to dissatisfaction and lower completion rates from developmental students. In cases such as these, it appears clear that a decision must be made regarding the goals of specific differentiated groups of students.

Accountability has been a key focus for national and state leaders throughout the field of education. In 1983, a presidential commission published "A Nation at Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform." This report contended that American educational progress in primary, secondary, and higher education was declining and falling behind the progress of other nations. For higher education, the report claimed that the quality of learning for a graduate had been declining. Various recommendations were made for primary and secondary education. Higher education was challenged to ensure learning.

The idea of testing learning on entry into the workplace was noted as a possibility in this report (National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983).

More than 20 years later, a presidential commission led by Margaret Spellings studied higher education. This commission found that the system of higher education was challenged to provide access, affordability, learning, innovation, and accountability. The Spellings Commission contended that accountability of our institutions must be quantified. Measures such as a national database of results were suggested, and colleges were strongly encouraged to use learning assessments and measures that could quantify student outcomes (US Department of Education, 2006).

The challenge areas identified by the Spellings Commission are all still important to community colleges today. As these institutions are called on to serve larger numbers of students, they strive to quantify their impact as measured by student outcomes. Accountability will be a key concern for these institutions as they work to carry out their multiple missions.

Growing enrollments and increasing diversity.

Student diversity is increasing. A recent Pew Research Center Study (2011) notes that college enrollment of 18- to 24-year-old minority students increased by 480,000 students between 2009 and 2010. During this same time period, the enrollment of white students decreased by 320,000. Enrollment of non-traditional-aged students has also been increasing as a percentage of the student population (Fry, 2011). Accordingly, instructors must be prepared to teach classes with a diverse student enrollment. As a

group, community colleges are serving those of a lower socio-economic status than those enrolled in traditional Bachelor's-level university education (Bailey et al., 2004). Accordingly, instructors must be prepared to teach classes with diverse and potentially needy students.

Diversity in community colleges occurs in both traditional demographics and personal lifestyle differences that could play a part in the learning environment. In terms of demographic diversity, the American Association of Community Colleges (2011) estimates that 45% of students enrolled in community colleges are identified as minority. Fifteen percent are more than 40 years of age, while an additional 45% are between the ages of 22 and 49 years. Accordingly, community colleges are educating a primarily adult population with a substantial population of minority students.

Life characteristics that may play a role in the learning environment include parenting status, external employment, and family education. Of current community college enrollees, 42% are first-generation students (American Association of Community Colleges, 2011). First-generation students may not have external resources to turn to for informal advice regarding course selection, study skills, or navigating the college environment. As a result, additional institutional resources may be needed to support first-generation college students.

Various life events may pose learning challenge for community college learners. Twelve percent of community college students are learners with disabilities, 13% are single parents, and 21% are full-time employees (American Association of Community Colleges, 2011). For community college courses and programs to be successful, they

must meet a wide variety of student needs and assist student with navigating the community college environment.

Growth of the information age.

Technology is a large and growing part of our institutions and has an effect on both the administration of colleges and universities as well as the teaching and learning within these institutions. Without a focus on technology, our community colleges will be unable to reach students in a practical manner, and will also not train them within the context that they will need to use to be successful in many of their chosen career paths. Accordingly, technology is a key institutional need at colleges and universities.

There is a history of investment in technology during past budget challenges at public institutions. During recent budget cuts at their institutions, all noted that they incorporated some methods of increasing productivity and/or efficiency (Serban & Burke, 2008). One of the most common measures implemented was the increased use of technology within the teaching and learning context (Serban & Burke, 2008). In a new era of fiscal pressure, the use of technology can again be a useful avenue for increased efficiency and revenue enhancement.

Technology investment will have a significant impact on higher education, and technological changes will likely have an impact in the debate regarding adjunct faculty use. Adjunct faculty are well-positioned to offer classes that are offered via distance learning, and can often offer these classes at a fraction of the cost when compared with a full-time faculty member. It is likely that technological changes will increase adjunct faculty use.

Characteristics and Expectations of Community College Students

As noted above, community college learners are increasing in demographic diversity. In addition, these students express a wide variety of educational goals. Most community college students attend with the goal of degree completion and/or transfer, while 23% of students indicate that they attend for job skill increases and 16% attend for personal reasons (Cohen & Brawer, 2008).

In addition to the large categories above, special populations exist in community colleges. More than 10% of community college enrollment is currently considered "reverse transfers" who have already obtained a 4-year degree (Quinley & Quinley, 2000). These individuals may be returning to the community college for career change, skill upgrades, or additional learning. Foreign-born students often seek the services of community colleges to further their goals in the United States; despite a frequent language barrier, these students have often been found to be successful. Particular success has been found with foreign-born and foreign-schooled individuals within this population (Bailey & Weininger, 2002).Community college students are primarily commuter students, as the vast majority of community colleges do not provide student housing. Many students are also "distance learners," as this type of education is a regular component of community colleges. Cohen and Brawer (2008) noted that community colleges were using closed-circuit TV as a method for distance education since the early 1970s. In addition to programs that are offered via technology, community colleges have created programs at the location of interested students. Such distance programs have been taught in locations as diverse as corporate campuses and

prison cells where general educational development (GED) programs are offered. Community college students have different student support needs than students at Bachelor's institutions. Accordingly, the role and structure of student affairs professionals at community colleges will necessarily vary from the role of their counterparts at Bachelor's institutions.

Developmental Learning and Remediation

The US Department of Education (2006) notes remediation as a key concern for higher education. In their Facts and Findings regarding access to American higher education, the US Department of Education (2006) noted that more than 40% of college students require a developmental class; developmental education is estimated by the US Department of Education to cost more than $1 billion annually. The Achieving the Dream Foundation (2010) notes a high proportion of developmental education in community colleges. The Achieving the Dream study estimates that more than 58% of community college students require at least one developmental course.

Developmental classes are a relatively new phenomenon in higher education. Bailey et al. (2010) cite statistics noting that in 1960, fewer than 10% of colleges offered developmental classes. This number increased dramatically to 95% by 1970 and almost 100% in 1980. These classes continue to be offered today to serve the high percentage of students in need of remediation. However, colleges and universities have not been able to successfully link developmental classes back to student outcomes (Bailey, Jeong, & Cho, 2010). Accordingly, students assigned to developmental classes frequently lose

time and funding in non-credit courses. They are often not as engaged in their student learning and withdraw from programs at an alarming rate. Without a method to more effectively assist this student population, they will frequently fail in their pursuit of educational goals.

When students begin their program requiring developmental education, fewer than 25% successfully complete their Associate's degree within 2 years (Adams, 2010). These statistics underscore the tremendous expense and challenge that remedial education poses to students and community colleges. The American Institute for Research (2011) estimates that the federal government spends approximately $660 million annually for student grants supporting students who do not return to their community college for a second year.

In a study of college presidents, Green et al. (2001) expressed the concern that 2-year college presidents currently have regarding student remediation. Green et al.'s study (2001) included 344 current 2-year college presidents. When asked what the two most important issues are confronting their institutions over the next 2 to 3 years, 27.2% of 2-year college presidents surveyed listed student remediation and college readiness as their primary or secondary concern.

Adjunct faculty members are frequently tasked with teaching introductory, remedial, or developmental courses. Accordingly, the success of adjunct faculty teaching is a key ingredient in the success of students who are in need of remedial or developmental learning or support. To the extent that remedial education remains a key

focus of community colleges, adjunct faculty members are a key ingredient in improving the success ratio with students in need of developmental courses.

English Departments at Community Colleges

Community college English departments serve students with a wide variety of skill levels. As community colleges are generally designed as "open access" institutions, they must have classes at varying levels to meet the needs of entering students. Many of these entering students are in need of developmental courses.

Students who enroll in developmental english require varying levels of remediation. Statistics show that 68% of students enrolled in developmental english complete the course in which they enroll (Bailey, 2009). However, when multiple courses are reviewed, the percentage of students completing all developmental coursework is only 44% (Bailey, 2009).

Studies are contradictory in their assessment of the effects of developmental English education. Two studies (Martorell & McFarlan, 2007; Calcagno & Long, 2008) have found that there is no benefit to students who complete developmental English education. These two studies note that students with low assessment scores show similar outcomes regardless of whether they enroll directly in college courses or complete developmental coursework. Calcagno and Long note no academic benefit from developmental classes; Martorell and McFarlan report that there is no beneficial effect when measured against academic or labor market success.

Moss and Yeaton (2006) note significant beneficial effects from the completion of developmental english. Significantly, Moss and Yeaton found that those requiring significant developmental education were the individuals who were most likely to benefit. This notation may explain the difference between Moss and Yeaton's findings; the studies finding no difference focused on individuals at the "margin," requiring some developmental education but not a full series of developmental courses.

Developmental students encompass the majority of new student enrollment at community colleges and are often considered "at risk." Developmental students often begin their work at community colleges with the goal of degree attainment. However, they often do not complete their goals (Adams, 2010). English departments are frequently tasked with the education of this vulnerable group.

In their survey of developmental students who had successfully completed their degree, MAUCC found that faculty intervention and involvement was rated as a top success indicator (MAUCC, 1997). Gallard et al. (2010) note that individual tutoring can have a positive effect on the success of developmental students. Greater supports for developmental students can assist with stronger levels of success.

Faculty Hiring, Recruitment, and Success Characteristics

Although there is little research addressing adjunct faculty hiring, there is a history of research about full-time faculty hiring. In the 1950s, Caplow and McGee (1958) conducted a large-scale qualitative survey reviewing hiring and selection activities in the higher education industry. The authors' research noted that candidates were

most frequently selected for employment on the basis of personal recommendation, personal characteristics, or networking contacts. Candidates were not always brought to campus or given personal interviews. The faculty hiring process at the time of Caplow and McGee's research was not conducted in a formal or rigorous manner. Based on the selection methods above, hiring institutions frequently could not be ensured that their candidate was the best selection for the position. In fact, Caplow and McGee found that only 33% of new junior faculty members in 1958 were expected to have a positive long-term effect on the department.

Burke (1988) conducted a follow-up study based on replication of the Caplow and McGee study. Burke did find a formalizing of the hiring process; the majority of faculty appointments studied by Burke were completed by the full faculty group in the hiring department. Faculty members indicated that they attempted to find the best candidate for their position in terms of the candidate's knowledge, skills, and ability. In terms of hiring impact, Burke found that 83% of junior faculty appointments in 1986 were expected to have a positive effect.

Research indicates that candidates are most likely to be successful if job candidate qualifications are matched to position requirements. Kristof-Brown et al. (2005) conducted a meta-analysis of 172 studies regarding individual and organizational employee fit. Many of the 172 studies they reviewed used regression analysis as the means of obtaining their results. The studies in this meta-analysis were not specific to the educational sector; the review was for all studies of organizational fit. Through their meta-analysis, Kristof et al. were able to correlate job performance with person–job fit; a

modest correlation of .20 was found between fit and performance. Person–organization fit had a low positive correlation with job performance but a modest correlation (.27) with contextual performance.

General human resources practice and policy work to match position responsibilities with the knowledge, skills, and abilities for employment candidates. When applied to adjunct faculty, these hiring practices currently vary dramatically according to institution and department. Owing to a lack of consistent hiring practices, educational institutions may not capitalize their strengths when hiring adjunct faculty members to the same extent that they can when hiring full-time faculty members. Accordingly, institutions may inadvertently hire adjunct faculty members who are not well-suited to their new responsibilities while overlooking individuals who may be well-qualified and equipped to effectively teach their students. Although literature about direct hiring practices for adjunct faculty is limited, some studies have researched the organizational fit of full-time faculty members.

Carless (2005) explored person–job fit and person–organization fit as elements in the job-selection process as candidates choose whether to accept or decline a job offer. Carless conducted a longitudinal study, surveying job candidates over four intervals of time: before the selection process, during the selection process, at the conclusion of the selection process, and after an actual job offer. Carless concluded that person–organization fit is important to candidates during the initial stages of recruitment. At the time of an offer, however, person–job fit becomes a critical decision factor. This study requires further research to test whether it is relevant to faculty members in higher

education. However, it may provide some initial practical guidance in the provision of realistic job previews throughout the candidate screening process.

Faculty Diversity

When completing her replication study of faculty hiring patterns, Burke (1988) asked about the impact that equal employment opportunity and affirmative action legislation may have had on the large institutions that she studied. As she was replicating a study initially conducted before this legislation was passed, Burke theorized that the legal changes may have had an impact on hiring and selection. However, legislation mandating affirmative action in 1964 and 1972 seemed to have a minimal effect on the processes that she reviewed; more than 85% of the research institutions studied by Burke indicated that they were not greatly affected by institutional affirmative action requirements. Respondents indicated that they always picked the strongest candidate, so legal obligations were seen as having little or no impact on their process.

In 1999, minorities earned 12% of the doctoral degrees awarded to US citizens or permanent residents (Smith et al., 2004). This number has dramatically increased; minorities earned 21% of all doctoral degrees awarded to US citizens or permanent residents in 2006 (National Center for Education Statistics, 2007). However, minorities are currently employed in only 16.4% of faculty positions (National Center for Education Statistics, 2007). The disparity in hiring of minority faculty members may be an indicator of problems in the selection process of our colleges and universities.

Smith et al. (2004) examined the hiring of diverse faculty members at large research universities. The authors undertook their study after noting that there was a disparity in minority hiring, even in fields where there were many scholars of color. The authors reviewed 689 searches for new faculty members, examining the job descriptions and race/ethnicity information.

In their research, Smith et al. (2004) found that hiring decisions were made at the departmental level. Only 29% of minority faculty members were hired in searches without diversity initiatives; diverse candidates were found more likely to be selected when a special hire or diversity initiative was present in the job description.

Diversity initiatives were not found to lower the quality of candidate hired; Smith et al. (2004) coded data on hired individuals and found no differences in the qualifications of minorities versus the qualifications of non-minorities. Policy implications advocate for the use of a special initiative when warranted to increase diversity in the faculty of our institutions.

Cornell and Welch (1996) theorize about a potential reason for the disparate hiring explained above. In their research of screening discrimination, Cornell and Welch note that employers can judge job applicants' attributes more easily when they belong to the same groups. Accordingly, successful job applicants frequently have the same attributes as the hiring managers. The authors indicate that this difference may not be due to racism, but rather to problems in the assessment abilities of the hiring managers.

According to Cornell and Welch, hiring managers attempt to make assessments about the character of individuals whom they are considering for employment. These

assessments are subjective. Cornell and Welch's article posits that an employer may be easier able to distinguish between a high-character and low-character individual if they are of the same background. Accordingly, those of differing backgrounds are then judged against the performance of the individual of the same background.

As a result of screening error, candidates with the same cultural background are rated along a wide distribution, whereas those of different cultural backgrounds are more likely rated as average. With a large number of candidates, the likelihood is that a candidate with the same cultural background will likely be rated highest. Cornell and Welch illustrate an example with 40 candidates, and note through probability modeling that the likelihood of an applicant from another background being hired would not occur for a million generations.

Cornell and Welch's model, while based on research in economics and psychology, requires testing to be valid. This model poses an area for future research.

Job descriptions, mentioned above as a source of information regarding job requirements in the areas of knowledge, skills, and abilities, may also be a signal to candidates regarding organizational diversity. Smith et al. (2004) note that diverse candidates are more likely to be hired when the job description used notes a value for diversity. To recruit and retain the best faculty members, new hires must be obtained from various backgrounds. A field of research may be found about the recruitment of minority faculty members. A few articles are reviewed in this literature review, as this topic is a critical element in reviewing factors that lead to the best faculty hires.

Organizational Context for Adjunct Faculty Utilization

Community college adjunct faculty members were originally sought out owing to their specific area of expertise. However, this role changed dramatically in scope and rationale beginning in the 1960s. At that time, the employment of adjunct faculty members was frequently seen as an opportunity for cost savings at an institution. This rationale for the use of adjunct faculty members continues today.

On a per-course basis, adjunct faculty members are paid less than their full-time counterparts. In addition, future assignments are not guaranteed to adjunct faculty members. Accordingly, adjunct faculty members can be added, dropped, or re-assigned within curricula to accommodate changes in enrollment.

Flexibility in cost structures, responsive scheduling, and the need for a contingent workforce within community colleges mirror the needs of higher education and also industry in general. Harris-Perelman (1997) documents multiple reasons for the advancement of the contingent workforce: a transition in the United States to a service-based economy, organizational reluctance to increase obligations to a “permanent” labor force, global cost pressure, and reduced administrative costs. These pressures are exacerbated in higher education owing to a cost structure and tuition schedule that is increasing faster than the cost of inflation. In such a structure, adjunct faculty members represent a cost savings that can potentially allow institutions to offer classes to students within a structure of cost savings.

Colleges voice respect for adjunct faculty members and sometimes recognize that adjunct faculty members must be integrated into their institutions. Harris (1980) notes, “Part-time faculty represent enrichment, diversity, scheduling flexibility, short-term contractual obligations, and a degree of economic savings, but these remain potential until there are functioning recruitment and retention models.”

Despite the need for integration, however, such actions do not always occur smoothly. To this day, there are gaps in what is known about adjunct faculty success and motivation. One recent study by Meixner, Kruck, and Madden (2010) found that work–life integration and community disconnect were both found to be primary sources of concern for adjunct faculty. One suggestion was to include a mentor for new adjunct faculty; when this option was discussed, more than 85% of adjunct faculty indicated that this support would or might be of assistance to them in integrating with their environment.

Although they are clearly a necessity for institutions of higher education, adjunct faculty members are frequently considered an inadequate substitute for a full-time faculty member in the classroom. In their book regarding higher education issues, Hacker and Dreyfus (2010) note that many parents of new undergraduate students bemoan the prevalence of adjunct faculty members in their children’s classroom. When reviewing individual adjunct faculty members, however, no individual concerns were raised. Hacker and Dreyfus (2010) found praise at an individual level, noting, “Indeed, at nearly every school we visited, when we asked students for the name of a favorite

professor, they frequently mentioned a contingent." The perception and reality of adjunct faculty teaching are not always a direct match.

Adjunct Faculty History

Adjunct faculty members have always had a role in higher education. Traditionally, the adjunct faculty role was a supplemental and esteemed role. As described by Jacobs (1998), "From the late Middle Ages onward, it was an ecclesiastical tradition to send priest–scholars to different universities to pursue their scholarly interests and to work with others." He notes that institutions used the term "visiting" to describe such scholars. Other uses of part-time faculty existed in medical schools, where practitioners were invited to serve as clinicians, and the term "in-residence" was used for scholars and well-known individuals who were willing to teach in the university on a part-time basis. Such additions to the faculty were typically sought after and well-regarded.

The employment and use of adjunct faculty members in higher education has been increasing steadily. Within higher education in general, adjunct faculty headcount has increased from approximately 22% in 1970 to about 41% in 1997 (Leslie & Gappa, 1997). This number again increased to 47.6% by 2005 (Glenn, 2008).

Adjunct faculty members have been employed at community colleges since the establishment of the institutions. Rouche, Roeche, and Milliron (1997) cite research indicating that adjunct faculty members were present in community colleges dating back

to the 1920s. The prevalence of adjunct faculty members has been increasing steadily within Community colleges; adjunct faculty members were estimated as 38% of staff in 1966, 55% in 1980, and approximately 60% in 1992 (Roueche, Roueche, & Milliron, 1997). By 2007, adjunct faculty members comprised approximately 67% of community college faculty by headcount (Eagan, 2007).

TABLE 1: Adjunct Faculty Utilization in Higher Education and Community Colleges

Year	Adjunct Faculty Utilization Within Higher Education (% of faculty)	Adjunct Faculty Utilization Within Community Colleges (% of faculty)
1966		38%
1970	22%	
1980		55%
1992		60%
1997	41%	
2005	48%	
2007		67%

When measured by credit hour, adjunct faculty use is also increasing. When measured in 1988, adjunct faculty taught an average of 7.5 credit hours per semester.

By 2004, the average credit hours taught per adjunct faculty had increased to 8.5 hours (Eagan, 2007). Accordingly, adjunct faculty use is increasing according to productivity measures.

Initially, part-time faculty members were noted as being selected for their expert knowledge of secondary education and their perceived ability to coordinate the curriculum between high schools and universities (Rouche, Rouche, & Milliron, 1997). More recently, the employment of adjunct faculty members has most importantly created a necessary cost savings for institutions of higher education. On a per-course basis, adjunct faculty members are paid less than their full-time counterparts. In addition, future assignments are not guaranteed to adjunct faculty members. Accordingly, adjunct faculty members can be added, dropped, or re-assigned within curricula to accommodate changes in enrollment.

Cost savings from adjunct faculty employment is often calculated on a per-class basis. However, because of their temporary status, adjunct faculty members are rarely involved in additional institutional responsibilities, such as committees or student advising, as are full-time faculty (Roueche, Roueche, & Milliron, 1997). When administration of a large number of adjunct faculty members is added, institutions may not always calculate the full costs of using this group of faculty members. Although institutions are still likely to achieve considerable cost savings from the use of adjunct faculty, the additional costs must be included in any estimate of savings.

Despite a role that could be described as part-time or temporary, the majority of adjunct faculty members have 5 or more years of service at their institutions. Such

adjunct faculty members are sometimes described as having an “implicit job contract” despite no formal agreement between the college and adjunct faculty member (Leslie & Gappa, 2002).

Adjunct Faculty Member Demographics

As noted by Conley (2002), almost half (49%) of adjunct faculty members are employed full-time elsewhere. The American Federation for Teachers (2010) notes in a survey of its membership that half prefer to teach part-time, whereas half would welcome a full-time teaching opportunity. Accordingly, adjunct faculty members differ in their motives for teaching and future goals for their faculty roles.

The adjunct faculty population is more heavily female than full-time college faculty. Its average age is close to that of full-time faculty, but the adjunct faculty population is more frequently older or younger than their full-time counterparts (Feldman & Turnley, 2004). Because adjunct faculty tend to enter the profession with varying goals and motives, it is difficult to attribute one set of characteristics to them. Adjunct faculty members are drawn from a population that includes beginning professionals, current practitioners, those preferring part-time work, and retirees.

Adjunct Faculty Unionization

Labor unions, who collectively bargain for many full-time faculty members, also bargain for the terms and conditions of employment of many adjunct faculty members. In a report released in April 2012, the National Center for the Study of Collective

Bargaining in Higher Education and the Professions cites that about one-fifth of adjunct faculty members are now represented by bargaining units (Chronicle of Higher Education, 2011). This compares with one-fourth of full-time faculty who are currently represented by bargaining units (Chronicle of Higher Education, 2011).

Depending on the strength of the union and the terms negotiated during collective bargaining, unionization could provide adjunct faculty with a measure of job security. Collective bargaining contracts can also structure or regulate many of the terms and conditions of employment that exist within a particular institution. Accordingly, the presence of collective bargaining will be a significant factor in the relationship that exists between adjunct faculty and the institutions that employ them.

MAUCC's adjunct faculty members are unionized through an affiliate of the American Federation of Teachers (AFT). The collective bargaining contract for adjunct faculty members includes provisions for many terms and conditions of employment, including compensation, course assignments, performance reviews, and absences. Provisions also exist in the contract for adjunct faculty needs, ranging from university mailboxes to support for disruptive students in the classroom (AFT, 2011).

Adjunct Faculty Motivation for Teaching

As noted in the theoretical constructs of this study, various motivational theories exist within the literature of human resources, psychology, sociology, and related disciplines. As noted by Chalofsky (2009), "In pre-industrial society, work was performed in the same community where people lived. Consequently, people knew one another

closely and saw the connection between their work and how this work benefitted the rest of the community." Work is now disaggregated from a community context and must be connected to motivation in a manner that is less direct. Motivational contexts, such as "meaningfulness," began to be explored by theorists such as Herzberg, Maslow, and McGregor (Chalofsky, 2009).

On a practical level, adjunct faculty motivation appears to come from various sources depending on the individual adjunct faculty member's reasons for teaching. An original taxonomy for teaching motivations came from Tuckman (1978, 1979) during her study for the American Association of University Professors (AAUP). Tuckman's original work in 1978 divided adjunct faculty members into two types: the flexibility seeker and the work seeker. She then further refined these roles and divided part-time faculty into four primary categories:

- Hopeful Full-Timer – Typically an entering professional, hopes to gain full-time employment and is starting his/her career with part-time work.
- Full Mooner – Adjunct faculty member who works more than 35 hours per week in a full-time job outside of teaching role.
- Homeworker – Adjunct faculty member who teaches part-time and has primary caregiving responsibility for parent(s) and/or child(ren).
- Part Mooner – Adjunct faculty member who works part-time (fewer than 35 hours) in another position.

Subcategories were also noted in Tuckman's work for adjunct faculty members who did not fit into one of the above roles. The subcategories noted were for semiretired individuals, students, and a catch-all category, "part-unknowners" (1978).

Tuckman delineated the role of women in adjunct faculty positions. At the time of her study, women were more heavily concentrated within the role of homeworker. Moreover, women in the "hopeful full-timer" role realized a lower salary than their male counterparts with similar ambitions (1979).

One of the most frequently cited myths about adjunct faculty members is that they are academics who serve multiple institutions while in pursuit of a full-time academic appointment. This "freeway flyer" model (Grubb, 1999) notes that adjunct faculty have less of a connection to the labor market, less time to spend with students, and less satisfaction with their status within the institutions they serve.

Demographics dispel the prevalence of the "freeway flyer" in the ranks of adjunct faculty members. More than 64% of adjunct faculty members are employed full-time within industry (Leslie & Gappa, 1997). Only 11% hold faculty appointments at more than one academic institution (Eagan, 2007), and approximately 13% report aspirations to become employed full-time at the institution(s) they serve (Leslie & Gappa, 1997). Not surprisingly, those preferring a full-time position were least satisfied with advancement opportunities, compensation, and job security (Maynard, 2006; Eagan, 2007).

Job Satisfaction and Turnover

When directly asked, the majority of adjunct faculty members state that they are satisfied with their part-time faculty roles (Kuchera & Miller, 1988). When specific job satisfaction elements are studied among adjunct faculty, the group is found to be somewhat less satisfied with the conditions of employment than full-time faculty members (Eagan, 2007). Other areas of relatively less satisfaction were salary, fringe benefits, office space, participation in staff meetings, and participation in union activities (Kuchera & Miller, 1988). Although adjunct faculty members still note dissatisfaction with benefits, the percentage has decreased from 70% dissatisfaction in 1988 to 49.4% dissatisfaction in 2004 (Eagan, 2007). Despite a large pay differential, adjunct faculty members are reported as similar to full-time faculty members in their satisfaction with salary, and 90% report satisfaction with their workload (Eagan, 2007).

Levels of job satisfaction appear to vary according to teaching motivations. While noting high overall satisfaction, the American Federation of Teachers' survey (2010) distinguished a difference in satisfaction among those who prefer part-time employment and those who were seeking full-time roles. Whereas 75% of those preferring part-time work voiced satisfaction, only 49% of those seeking full-time roles felt satisfied. Cashwell (2009) also found in her dissertation that adjunct faculty members who were seeking full-time positions were less satisfied with their positions.

LeFevre Stephens (2004) completed a quantitative doctoral dissertation about organizational climate factors that may contribute to job satisfaction. LeFevre Stephens' study was conducted with adjunct faculty members working in Florida community

colleges. This study found that the adjunct faculty studies placed a high emphasis in relationships with peers, supervisors, and subordinates, as well as in professional effectiveness. High levels of satisfaction were found in the areas of professional development and personal concern; lower levels of satisfaction were found for promotional possibilities and the political climate of the institution. Respondents in this study had lower length of service than average; more than 60% worked at their respective community college for 3 years or fewer. However, the study provides some factors that should be considered in an assessment of satisfaction.

Cashwell (2009) found two predictors of overall job satisfaction. Adjunct faculty members were more satisfied in their positions if they believed they were treated fairly by their institutions. Additionally, adjunct faculty members were more satisfied with their positions, "if they were dedicated enough to teaching to choose an academic career if given the chance to do it over again" (Cashwell, 2009).

Job satisfaction among adjunct faculty members has been studied (Harris-Pereles, 1997). However, to have a measurable impact on the college experience, there would need to be a measurable link between job satisfaction and student results and/or job satisfaction and employee retention. This link has been proven in various studies related to the general work population (Griffeth et al., 2000), and is likely to also relate to adjunct faculty members.

In 2011, Gullickson completed a doctoral research study regarding job satisfaction among online full-time and adjunct instructors in community colleges. Through his quantitative research, Gullickson found that online faculty members were

motivated by recognition, followed by accomplishment, creativity, and intellectual challenge. The surveyed faculty indicated that there were also factors that did not directly motivate. These factors, including student preparedness, interpersonal relationships, and salary, were expected parts of the position. Although they were not directly motivating, instructors were dissatisfied when they had concerns regarding these factors.

In Gullickson's study (2011), adjunct faculty members were dissatisfied when they had concerns with the ability to advance. Adjunct faculty members also were dissatisfied when they sought, but were unable to obtain, full-time employment (Gullickson, 2011).

Adjunct Faculty Utilization Impact on Student Outcomes

In general, studies measuring the outcomes of adjunct faculty have found no measurable result. Grubb (1999) cites his own qualitative work and prior research on student evaluations to note no measurable difference in the learning outcomes of students taught by outcome instructors. However, owing to the amount of time part-timers were absent from campus, difficulties were noted in collegiality and interdisciplinary work.

Differences in pedagogy have been noted in the literature. Eagan (2007) reports that adjunct faculty are less likely to use technology than full-time faculty. Lei (2008) reports that adjunct faculty members are more likely to use objective assessment of

students and less likely to use teaching methods such as cooperative learning, research, and class participation. Furthermore, no adjunct faculty member in Lei's study (2008) used the teaching and learning centers that were present at their respective institutions.

Institutional support for professional development is not always available for adjunct faculty members. Roesche, Roesche, and Milliron (1995) noted that adjunct faculty members are less likely than full-time faculty members to receive organization support for development programs.

Some concerns have been documented in the research surrounding student performance in introductory-level classes taught by adjunct faculty members. A study by Harrington and Schibik (2001) documented that freshman students not retained in the spring semester were more likely to have been taught by adjunct faculty members. Eagan (2009) reviewed similar data for transfer and found that for every 10% increase in classes taught by adjunct faculty members, there was a 2% decrease in likelihood of students to transfer. With variations in amount of classes taught by up to 40%, an 8% difference in transfer likelihood was found. Jaeger and Eagan (2009) found a similar effect in Associate's degree completion; a 10% increase in classes taught by adjunct faculty members resulted in a 1% decrease in Associate's degree completion.

Eagan's work, interestingly, noted that individual factors were responsible for the difference in transfer rates above. According to Eagan's analysis, "neither the proportion of faculty employed in part-time appointments nor the proportion of instruction completed by part-time faculty had an effect on the transfer rate." Rather, Eagan noted that individual relationships with students were the differentiating factor.

Ronco and Cahill (2004) acknowledge an achievement gap in the classes that are taught by adjunct faculty. However, Ronco and Cahill's work attributes the difference in achievement to a difference in the characteristics of students enrolled in classes taught by adjuncts as compared with students enrolled in classes taught by full-time instructors. When student variables are controlled, Ronco and Cahill contend that student outcomes do not differ in classes taught by adjunct faculty versus classes taught by full-time tenured faculty.

A few recent works have noted concerns about outcomes when adjunct faculty members are used in "gatekeeper" courses (Glenn, 2008). Adamowicz (2007) also notes that institutions that employ a higher proportion of part-time faculty also show a lower graduation rate for the institution. These results may indicate further required research into adjunct faculty use in situations requiring close student contact.

Lei (2008) reports no difference in the level of class difficulty and notes that classwork assigned by adjunct faculty is equivalent to classwork assigned by full-time faculty. This work is supported by research showing similar scores in exit exams (Roueche, Roueche, & Millinor, 1995).

Ehrenberg and Zhang (2004) report that the usage of part-time faculty members is quantitatively associated with a decrease in student graduation rates. Analyzing data from the College Board, Ehrenberg and Zhang report:

> "Other factors held constant, a 10 percentage point increase in the percentage of faculty that is part-time at a public academic institution is associated with a 2.65 percentage point reduction in the institution's graduation rate. Similarly, a 10 percentage point increase in the percentage of full-time faculty that are not on tenure track lines at a public college or university is associated with a 2.22 percentage point reduction in the institution's graduation rate."

Although community colleges were not studied in this analysis, the results of this study present a potential concern regarding adjunct faculty use.

In short, studies about the effect of adjunct faculty use on student outcomes are contradictory and potentially concerning. It is difficult to determine a clear effect. To the extent that there is an effect from adjunct use, it is more likely to be negative.

Adjunct Faculty Utilization Within Community Colleges

According to the US Department of Education (2003), 44% of adjunct faculty members work in 2-year public institutions. In fact, 66% of those teaching in community colleges are adjunct faculty members. More than half of these adjunct faculty members in community college teach two or more classes each term (Gappa, Austin, & Trice, 2007).

The skill requirements of adjunct faculty members are often judged poorly; adjunct faculty members are frequently perceived as less academically prepared than full-time faculty members. However, a study by Leslie and Gappa (1997) found that adjunct faculty members at community colleges had similar academic backgrounds. Although the adjunct faculty members were slightly less likely to hold a doctorate degree, they were also slightly more likely to hold a professional degree.

Historically, adjunct faculty members were hired by institutions for their practical experience and expertise. More recently, adjunct faculty employment has been used by institutions as a cost-saving strategy. In their survey of college presidents, Green,

Jaschik, and Lederman (2011) noted that community college presidents cited budget concerns as the primary issue confronting their institution over the next 2 to 3 years. When asked about their strategies to address their financial challenges, 53% of community college presidents cited increasing the proportion of adjunct faculty as a cost-saving strategy that was deployed in their institution (Green et al., 2011).

Liberal Arts Adjunct Faculty Members

Part-time faculty in the liberal arts share characteristics such as length of service to their institution with part-time faculty in other disciplines. However, part-time liberal arts faculty members were singled out in reports owing to some differentiating characteristics. According to analysis of National Center for Educational Statistics data, a higher percentage of part-time liberal arts faculty serve in an adjunct capacity owing to a lack of full-time opportunity. Conley and Leslie (2002) note, “in the Fall of 1992, about 60 percent of those employed part-time in the humanities were working part-time because full time employment was unavailable, a higher percentage than in most other program areas.” Additionally, part-time liberal arts faculty were less likely than those in other disciplines to hold a faculty rank above that of instructor, and were generally likely to be employed by only one institution (Conley & Leslie, 2002). Accordingly, the characteristics of liberal arts faculty may not always generalize to a more interdisciplinary population.

Supports Available for Adjunct Faculty Members

Adjunct faculty members are often provided with fewer physical supports (eg, office space, telephones, computer resources) than their full-time counterparts. The lack of physical resources has been cited by adjunct faculty members as one of their concerns regarding job performance (Leslie & Gappa, 1997).

Future Issues

With the continued proliferation of online courses, adjunct faculty hiring and retention is no longer solely a regional issue. As noted by Green (2007), "Intuitions that have large on-line programs now compete with institutions from around the world." Community colleges also have to compete for adjunct faculty members with other community colleges and universities.

The expansion of for-profit education may also have an effect on the use, motivation, and effectiveness of adjunct faculty members. As the industry of higher education changes, the role and use of this group will continue to adjust. Use of adjunct faculty, with their strong knowledge base, is most likely to be maximized.

Summary

In his discussion of results, Eagan (2009) notes:

"…to address issues of availability and satisfaction among part-time faculty, and consequently mitigate the negative relationship between exposure to part-time faculty and students' likelihood of transferring, administrators should consider ways in which to

provide incentives for part-timers to engage with the campus as well as spend time with students outside of class."

This study builds on this literature, providing a detailed glimpse of adjunct faculty motivations and satisfiers.

CHAPTER 3
METHODOLOGY

Assumptions and Rationale for Project Design

Institutions of higher learning, and community colleges in particular, are reliant on their adjunct faculty members for ongoing operations. As noted in the prior literature review, quantitative studies currently exist about the adjunct faculty population. However, these studies are largely descriptive and do not analyze the population in detail. Other studies attempt to relate the use of adjunct faculty members to educational outcomes such as student learning. As noted in a review of these studies, many prior studies have contradictory conclusions.

Human resource literature illustrates a link between job satisfaction and employee engagement. However, I have not found literature that focuses on adjunct faculty members to describe the factors that lead to their satisfaction and/or dissatisfaction. As adjunct faculty members are multi-year contributors to their institutions and frequently teach multiple classes in a semester, an increased understanding of faculty satisfaction has the potential to provide insight about factors relating to retention and/or performance.

A case study approach regarding faculty motivators allows participating adjunct faculty members to provide in-depth insight into factors that affect their daily work. In an individual interview, adjunct faculty members were able to speak directly about any factor that they believe is important in their daily experiences as a faculty member. This methodology allows for more direct expression from participants and results in a

description that accurately describes the factors that impact adjunct faculty members' lives.

In his research, Yin (2009) reviews case study as a research method and discusses appropriate applications for case study. Case study methodology, according to Yin (2009), is most appropriate when asking explanatory questions. In an investigation of explanatory questions, case study will allow "investigators to retain the holistic and meaningful characteristics of real-life events" while answering a research question (Yin, 2009).

The questions that are answered in this research study are explanatory queries regarding the perceptions of adjunct faculty members. Accordingly, case study methodology allows an in-depth exploration of this research topic. Using this methodology, I was able to gather strong qualitative data regarding the research phenomena.

Population and Sample

Community colleges have historically been at the forefront of adjunct faculty use, and liberal arts faculty are often responsible for teaching the introductory courses that are of great interest to researchers of student outcomes. As noted in the literature review, liberal arts adjunct faculty members have some characteristics that differ from adjunct faculty members in other disciplines. Accordingly, this population was sought to compare responses within one segment of the adjunct faculty.

Owing to time constraints and the intensity of qualitative interviewing, I was able to interview a sample of only 18 adjunct faculty members. Accordingly, a purposeful sample of MAUCC's English teachers was targeted. Merriam (2002) describes a purposeful sample as "those from which one can learn a great deal about issues of central importance to the purpose of the research." To sample the population, I worked to ensure that I interviewed individuals with varying length of service with MAUCC, highest degree earned, age, and gender.

Length of service was chosen as a stratifying characteristic owing to the likely difference that respondents will have regarding knowledge of the institution. Questions regarding knowledge and use of campus resources will likely vary according to length of service. Job satisfaction is also more quickly changeable for new employees.

Highest degree earned was chosen as a stratifying characteristic because individual career aspirations about faculty appointments are directly tied to this characteristic. Feldman and Turnley (2004) noted that individuals with terminal degrees are more likely to feel "relative deprivation" from their adjunct faculty member role as they are qualified to undertake a full-time faculty role. This study wanted to ensure that those with and without terminal degrees are included in the respondents.

Age was chosen because it will also have a direct effect on future career aspirations. As noted by Feldman and Turnley (2004), "the role of age in contingent employment is mixed." Among younger workers, contingent employment can represent a good opportunity to learn a new skill to better prepare themselves for their careers or a frustrating end to an unsuccessful job search after graduation. Among older workers,

contingent employment can represent either a desirable way to wind down one's career through "bridge employment" to retirement or underemployment after a search for a permanent job has failed. Survey results collected by the American Federation of Teachers also note different motivations in teaching by age. For example, 64% of adjunct faculty members aged more than 50 years noted enjoyment as their primary motivation for teaching; only 49% of those aged less than 50 years noted this as a primary reason (AFT, 2010). This characteristic was chosen as a variable to ensure that all aspects of age are considered.

Gender is listed as a stratified characteristic, as women represent more than two-thirds of the contingent workforce (Feldman & Turnley, 2004). Stratification ensures that male respondents are adequately represented. Additionally, gender often is correlated with career goals, so it may have an impact on a respondent's identity formation, reasons for teaching, and/or job satisfaction.

Data Collection

Data collection began with a full literature review. This literature review was reviewed in Section II and was used as a basis for study design and data analysis. Following the literature review, primary data were obtained via direct interviews with adjunct faculty members at MAUCC.

Direct interviews were scheduled in a time and location that was primarily convenient to the subject of the interview. Accordingly, interviews were scheduled and completed in a variety of locations at different times. These times and locations were

determined according to adjunct faculty member availability and request. Some interviews occurred on MAUCC campus, either before or after the classes that adjunct faculty members were scheduled to teach. Others occurred in the homes of adjunct faculty members, in public locations such as coffee houses, or at other institutions where the interviewee was affiliated. These interviews were all conducted in person. Each interview was digitally recorded; a full transcription is available for 17 of the respondents. In one interview, notations and a partial transcription is available owing to recorder failure. Interview length varied and ranged from 40 minutes to 2 hours.

Owing to the intensive time demands of qualitative interviews, it was not possible to interview each adjunct faculty member within the English program at MAUCC. Accordingly, a sample of adjunct faculty members was targeted. To determine which subjects to interview, a full list of program adjunct faculty members was requested. However, MAUCC declined to provide this list for confidentiality reasons.

To meet the needs of MAUCC regarding confidentiality, adjunct faculty participation was sought via an email sent to the college's adjunct faculty listserv. A copy of this invitation is contained in Appendix B. Eleven adjunct faculty members responded to the listserv invitation and were individually interviewed.On review of the original interview pool, it was determined that male respondents and minority respondents were under-represented as compared with the population of adjunct faculty members teaching in the department. Accordingly, a second invitation was sent to the listserv, and participation was specifically requested from male and/or minority

faculty respondents. An additional seven faculty members responded to this request, including five male and one minority female adjunct staff members.

Data Analysis

As noted by Maxwell (2005), "the experienced qualitative researcher begins data analysis immediately after finishing the first interview or observation, and continues to analyze the data as long as he or she is working on the research, stopping briefly to write reports and papers." Data analysis for this paper will be conducted in this vein.

The constant comparative method was used as a method of reviewing data and comparing information to develop types, properties, and tentative hypotheses (Glaser & Strauss, 1967 as cited in Merriam, 1998). My intent in this data analysis was to use the constant comparative method to review data as they are obtained.

Adjunct faculty members were selected for this study according to the data collection methods above. Data received were recorded and transcribed. These data were reviewed and classified using the constant comparative method. Key quotes or pieces of datum will be pulled from the interviews and compared with other respondents. Ultimately, data from all respondents were reviewed for overall patterns as well as for patterns within types of respondents.

Methods of Verification

This study has a heavy reliance on triangulation, primarily triangulation of the data that are received from each of the respondents. Accordingly, there will be multiple sources from which to compare data. As noted above, I have used a constant comparative data review and have included any patterns of response received. I also compare interviewee data with data obtained from the administration regarding the population. I have described and reviewed discrepant evidence that may be obtained, and I have ensured that discrepant evidence is included in my report. Such evidence was reviewed to see how it fits within the overall data pattern, and was described in a few instances where the data did not fit. Data were also compared with similar studies in the literature regarding adjunct faculty.

Although I do not have a long-term involvement with interviewees, my involvement with this subject is long-term and intensive. I have been studying adjunct faculty engagement since the commencement of my doctoral program, and have continued to study the topic intensively throughout the preparation and execution of this study. This information has guided my questions and served as a point of comparison as I evaluated the data obtained in my interviews.

The primary threat to validity in my study was potential researcher bias. As an adjunct faculty member myself, I have distinct ideas about adjunct faculty motivation and engagement. I am aware of my perspective, however, and I am well-trained in individual interviewing. My professional and doctoral training have assisted me in ensuring my data are collected in an attentive manner.

Ethical Issues

I currently work full-time as a Human Resources practitioner within an educational institution and part-time as an adjunct faculty member at a 4-year private institution. Both of these roles had a potential impact on my positionality while conducting this study. While aware of the impact from the other roles, I intentionally conducted this research solely in the role of a doctoral student researcher. Accordingly, I have worked to ensure that data are collected in an appropriate manner and results are reported consistently with data obtained. Rather than allow my roles to negatively influence this project, I worked to use the roles to inform my knowledge and understanding of the project. The data were then analyzed to identify patterns.

As noted above, my study carries the potential of researcher bias. I have worked to avoid this concern via careful collection of data, as well as with an awareness of any potential bias during data analysis.

While reactivity is typically a concern in qualitative research, I believe that my experience and training in interviewing methodology minimizes reactivity as an ethical issue. My work experiences in social work and human resources have required me to conduct semi-structured interviews in a careful manner, and to collect both concrete and affective data in a way that does not influence the response. I believe that these skills were effectively translated to this study and the interviews contained within.

Outcome of the Study and Its Relation to Theory and Literature

This study was designed to create a comprehensive description of the adjunct faculty members in the liberal arts/English program at MAUCC. The description was then reviewed for general themes and demographic patterns that may exist in the stratified data. Through this description, the study illuminates the factors that are most likely to lead to adjunct faculty satisfaction and perceptions of their roles.

As noted in the literature review for this paper, adjunct faculty members have been studied in the past within various contexts, including reasons for teaching, job satisfaction, and effect on student outcomes. Prior studies have created a taxonomy for adjunct faculty members, determined the overall satisfaction levels of adjunct faculty, and reported conflicting student learning results from the use of adjunct faculty members. Despite these prior studies, a lack of "best practices" guidelines remains for the use of adjunct faculty members. Furthermore, adjunct faculty member perceptions are rarely studied as related to their position. A complete understanding of adjunct faculty member perceptions may allow for a recruitment and retention approach that is tailored to adjunct faculty member needs.

The data obtained in this study are reviewed through the organizational lens of organizational commitment and the individual lens of motivation. These themes are in keeping with prior quantitative research. This study aims to complete a deep review of these theories with a select group of subjects. A great deal of the adjunct faculty role is reliant on discretionary work, and student outcomes are dependent on adjunct faculty

member performance. Accordingly, a greater understanding of adjunct faculty member commitment and motivation is likely to serve a useful purpose in reviewing the adjunct faculty member role.

Adjunct faculty members are likely to play a continuing and increasing role within the higher education industry and community colleges in particular. A strengthened understanding of this population may assist our institutions in recruiting and retaining adjunct faculty members who are invested in institutional goals and dedicated to strong student learning.

CHAPTER 4
FINDINGS

MAUCC and Adjunct Faculty – General Background

MAUCC is a large urban community college serving more than 39,000 students (MAUCC, 2010). The college works with a diverse population of individuals seeking to continue their education. Some students enter the college as high school graduates seeking to prepare for a 4-year degree. Other students enter as adults seeking to further their education and/or prepare for technical workforce opportunities. The college also attempts to provide corporate education. Accordingly, the college attempts to serve multiple constituents with a variety of needs.

Across the campus, approximately 70% of students complete a semester's enrollment and persist to the subsequent semester (MAUCC, 2010). However, fewer than 10% of students complete their degree within 150% of the typical enrollment period (MAUCC, 2010). Approximately 30% of students transfer to other institutions. The majority of students do not graduate or transfer.

As noted in MAUCC's "Achieving the Dream" profile (2005), the majority of MAUCC's students require remedial or developmental education to be fully prepared for college-level work. Seventy-three percent of the college's students are minority students, and more than half are adult learners aged more than 25 years (MAUCC, 2010). Close to half of the students at MAUCC required a "gatekeeper" course such as English 098 (MAUCC, 2012). According to MAUCC's research, only about half of the students enrolling in one or more gatekeeper courses are successful in a given semester

(MAUCC, 2012). The most recent data available, from Fall 2011, indicate that 3,816 students were enrolled in English 098 as a gatekeeper course (MAUCC, 2012). Pass rates for English 098 trend lower than general pass rates, with slightly more than half of students passing this individual class (MAUCC, 2010).

The college employed approximately 395 full-time and 737 part-time faculty members during the 2009-2010 academic year (MAUCC, 2010). In 2011, there were 757 part-time faculty members reported (MAUCC, 2012). MAUCC's Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs and Dean of Liberal Studies estimates that approximately 300 of the 737 adjunct faculty members at the community college teach in the English program (personal communication, October 17, 2008).

The adjunct faculty members at MAUCC are not as diverse as the student population. According to the 2011 Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) report, adjunct faculty members were fairly evenly divided by gender (404 men and 353 women). However, more than 70% of the adjunct faculty members were white. One hundred forty-five adjunct faculty members were noted as African-American, and the remaining were characterized as Asian, Hispanic, or "other" (MAUCC, 2012). An exact adjunct population cannot be determined for the English department; the statistics are not publicly available, and the department has indicated that it does not have current data owing to continual adjunct transition.

All faculty members at MAUCC are unionized. At the time of this study, the contract for adjunct faculty members had expired. The adjunct faculty members at MAUCC were working under the terms of an expired contract. The labor contract at

MAUCC governed terms and conditions of employment and directly set expectations for adjunct faculty member class assignment. According to this contract, classes were offered to adjunct faculty members according to the seniority that they had earned at the institution. Administrative discretion in class assignment was provided but only for classes that were not accepted by union members.

The adjunct faculty population at MAUCC will differ from typical adjunct faculty members; this group is more structured owing to unionization, may be more highly compensated than other adjunct faculty groups, and has a structured employment agreement with the college, including benefits, conditions of employment, and seniority. Accordingly, MAUCC's employment agreement with its adjunct faculty may result in an experience that is different from other adjunct faculty experiences at other institutions.

Faculty hiring at MAUCC.

Minimally, adjunct faculty appointments are determined after an interview with the department chair. The hiring process in some departments will also include, at times, full-time faculty members within the department. Adjunct faculty member needs for departments in the Vice President's portfolio vary widely; for example, there are 300 adjunct faculty members on staff for the English department and only one in the Psychology department owing to the use of full-time faculty. Departments with fewer adjunct faculty members are more likely to include additional steps in their hiring and selection of adjunct faculty members. Reference checks are recommended but not required.

When hiring adjunct faculty members, the Vice President noted various areas that she focuses on: content expertise, availability during class time, and technological savvy. MAUCC's Vice President also noted that she requires a Master's degree for most assignments; specific technical classes such as auto technology or American Sign Language may allow a waiver of this requirement. Most importantly, the Vice President stressed that new adjunct faculty members must be "able to navigate the multiple mission population" (personal communication, October 17, 2008). She explained that instructors must be able to work with a classroom population that enters with varied ability, backgrounds, experiences, and expectations. The ability to teach a class to such a classroom population is paramount.

MAUCC's Vice President indicated that, at times, the hiring and selection process for adjunct faculty members may be abbreviated. For example, if the college is in immediate need of an instructor with particular skills, it may hire immediately to meet this need.

MAUCC has wide latitude in selecting and hiring its adjunct faculty members, and uses a process that is much more informal than the process used in selection of full-time faculty (MAUCC Vice President, personal communication, October 17, 2008). The college also has the ability to continue or terminate the services of adjunct faculty members during their first few classes. However, once an adjunct faculty member begins to teach classes, they accrue seniority in the Faculty Federation of the American Federation of Teachers (Faculty Federation, 2006). Accordingly, the college must ensure that they are using fair employment practices and assigning and dismissing adjunct

faculty members according to objective and/or defensible criteria. Many aspects of adjunct faculty use are planned according to the collective bargaining contract with the Faculty Federation. Adjunct faculty use is set according to contract; currently, adjunct faculty members may teach a maximum of 35% of the college's course offerings (MAUCC Vice President, personal communication, October 17, 2008). Maximums also are set for the number of courses that each adjunct faculty member may teach per year. Adjunct faculty members earn seniority through the courses that they teach, and future course assignments are given according to the seniority of current adjunct faculty members (Faculty Federation, 2006). New adjunct faculty members are added as required once the current adjunct faculty members are used. College latitude is strongest during the hiring and selection process and during the first three courses that an adjunct faculty member teaches.

Orientation for adjunct faculty members.

As noted previously, new adjunct faculty members at MAUCC are hired to teach classes that have not been accepted by current adjunct faculty members. Frequently little time is available to prepare for the class, and no formal orientation session is presented. Most new faculty members indicated that they were provided with a prior syllabus along with the current college learning objectives. Using these documents, adjunct faculty members designed and taught their class.

Once they begin their class, new adjunct faculty members are assigned to a "learning circle" where they are paired with a small group of full-time and adjunct

faculty members who teach at MAUCC. New faculty members are required to participate in the learning circle. However, there are varied reports in regard to the level of participation in these circles.

Many adjunct faculty members report that their classroom was observed within their first year of teaching. Most frequently, this classroom observation was conducted by a fellow instructor. There were a variety of perspectives in regard to the level of assistance that adjunct faculty members perceived from these classroom observations.

MAUCC provides all of its instructors with a teaching and learning center. This center provides workshops and resources that faculty members can access to enhance their teaching and develop their skills. None of the adjunct faculty members in this study used the teaching and learning center. Most frequently, adjunct faculty members noted that they did not have time to spend to access these resources.

Collective bargaining and adjunct faculty.

MAUCC's bargaining unit contract with the Faculty Federation governs the college's responsibilities in using and/or dismissing an adjunct faculty member according to the number of units or classes that have been taught by the adjunct faculty member. During the first three classes, the adjunct faculty member can be dismissed for any reason. After additional classes, the adjunct faculty member needs to be given a reason in writing. After full membership in the union, adjunct faculty members have full grievance rights if they are dismissed by the college (Faculty Federation, 2006).

Currently, the adjunct faculty members at MAUCC are working under the conditions of an expired labor union contract. The contract expired on August 31, 2011 (American Federation of Teachers, 2011). As a current contract is not in effect, current adjunct faculty members do not have information on the compensation and benefits that will be provided for future semesters and/or contracts.

Background and Perceptions of Current Administrators

MAUCC's Vice President for Academic Affairs began her career in academia as an adjunct faculty member. The Vice President has been in her current role for 12 years. In addition to her experience as an adjunct faculty member, past experiences include full-time faculty and department chair roles, and work on the Middle States Commission for Higher Education (MAUCC Web site, retrieved September 30, 2012). The Vice President's current responsibilities include academic administration throughout the college, including developmental and general education (MAUCC Web site, retrieved September 30, 2012).

In a personal interview on May 7, 2012, the Vice President noted that she is concerned about the opinions and motivation of adjunct faculty. Although she did not have an exact retention rate, the Vice President noted that adjuncts tend to stay at the institution "unless they move away" (personal communication, May 7, 2012). The Vice President indicated that adjunct faculty in the English department do not typically have a background in developmental education. Rather, they frequently have a background in

English and need to learn how to translate their English education to a developmental population.

Quality considerations.

When asked about any quality differences, particularly in "gatekeeper" courses, the Vice President noted that she saw no difference between her adjunct faculty members and full-time employees in the English department. She noted that the right mix of instructors is needed, and noted her criteria described above.

Available supports.

Supports are available for adjunct faculty members at MAUCC, particularly in the large-volume gatekeeper courses. Textbooks and sample syllabi are provided for adjunct faculty members, and adjustments are permitted by the instructors. There are conferences available through the teaching and learning center. Additionally, mentors are available for adjunct faculty members if requested or sought. To strengthen the skills of its full-time and adjunct faculty, MAUCC uses a teaching and learning center that offers various workshops and programs throughout the academic year. In my interview with MAUCC's Vice President, she noted that the teaching and learning center also has a value as an informal resource for faculty members who use the space to interact and share experiences in their spare time on campus. MAUCC is also currently participating in a national initiative, "Achieving the Dream," and has noted faculty development as

one of its priorities in “improving student outcomes and eliminating gaps in student equity” (Achieving the Dream, 2005).

Although MAUCC has identified “student learning” as the key responsibility of adjunct faculty members, the college was not able to identify any specific goals that are set in regard to attainment of this objective. There are learning supports in place for adjunct faculty members, but these supports are generally voluntary. One required support for new adjunct faculty members is working with a faculty mentor. This objective is set during the probationary period and is a part of new faculty evaluation before the attainment of regular adjunct faculty status. Additional goals could be a potential benefit for adjunct faculty members who are teaching.

Involvement outside the classroom.

MAUCC’s Vice President noted that adjunct faculty members are encouraged to engage in the college environment. Anecdotally, the Vice President knew of only a few adjunct faculty members who are involved in college life. Few tangible rewards are provided to adjunct faculty members for involvement; only initial adjunct faculty orientation is compensated (an hourly rate stipend is provided).

Participating MAUCC Adjuncts

For this dissertation, 18 adjunct faculty members were interviewed. All 18 were responders to an email listserv that was sent by the Assistant Chair of English noting that the study was being conducted. A copy of these emails is contained in Appendix B.

The first email that was sent invited the general population. During the first set of interviews, 11 respondents were interviewed. Only three respondents were male, and one respondent was a minority. Owing to this response, the second email welcomed all respondents but noted that responses from male and/or minority adjunct faculty members were especially needed.

After the first and second invitations, 18 respondents were located and interviewed. Demographics of the respondents are below:

TABLE 2: Listing of Respondents

Adjunct Faculty Member	**Gender**	**Race**	**Age (years)**	**Highest Degree Attained**	**Years at MAUCC**
HY	M	W	50-59	Doctorate0-2	
MI	M	W	40-49	Master's	11-20
NT	F	W	>60	Master's	3-5
RE	M	B	50-59	Master's0-2	
TR	M	W	20-39	Master's	3-5
NS	F	B	50-59	Doctorate	>20
RY	M	W	>60	Master's	6-10
RD	M	W	>60	Master's	>20
MD	F	W	40-49	Master's	3-5
GS	F	B	50-59	Doctorate0-2	
LN	F	W	20-39	Master's	3-5
TN	F	W	20-39	Master's0-2	
TO	F	M	50-59	Master's	>20
RS	F	W	50-59	Master's	>20
RR	F	W	40-49	Master's	6-10
NS	M	W	40-49	Master's	11-20
TK	M	W	>60	Master's	>20
RN	F	W	>60	Master's	>20

As previously noted, specific information regarding the demographics of adjunct faculty members at MAUCC could not be obtained. However, the sample above does appear to reflect the general MAUCC adjunct population.

I invited all adjunct faculty member respondents to participate in an individual in-person interview. I offered to meet respondents at a time and location that was convenient for them. Accordingly, interviews were held at varied times and locations. All respondents agreed to meet and participate in the interviews, and all interviews were conducted between June 2012 and August 2012.

During each session, adjunct faculty members were asked to describe their experiences. Respondents were asked to focus on their experiences at MAUCC but also, at times, incorporated their experiences as an adjunct faculty member at other institutions. Interview questions were asked according to a pre-planned set of questions, as noted in Appendix A. However, follow-up questions were added to expand on the answers of respondents. Interview questions were not always asked in the order of the formatted questionnaire, as respondents were encouraged to speak about their experiences in a free-flowing manner.

Interview findings are initially organized within the context of the literature review. Questions that relate to theoretical constructs are organized within this framework.

Responses

Respondents in this survey came from various backgrounds. Demographic characteristics (gender, age, and race) and concrete characteristics (highest degree earned, years at MAUCC) were chosen for review to ensure that the sample of interviewees reflected adjunct faculty diversity. Although fewer interviews were conducted with minority adjunct faculty members and individuals with doctoral degrees, these two groups are a small percentage of adjunct faculty members in MAUCC's English department.

The analysis of interview data was sorted using a framework of satisfaction, motivation, and attitude toward students. This framework was selected based on the research questions.

During their interviews, adjunct faculty members responded to a series of questions regarding their experiences at MAUCC. These responses were reviewed individually and then analyzed for potential patterns. Questions included:

- Demographic descriptors (age, gender, race, highest degree earned, years teaching at MAUCC)
- Career goals: what circumstances led to their role at MAUCC, why are they currently teaching, general future career goals, expectations to continue teaching as an adjunct at MAUCC
- Perception of role at MAUCC
- Impressions of students
- Current satisfaction in role, including working conditions

- Perception of success in role

A full list of questions asked of adjunct faculty members is contained in Appendix A.

As previously noted, study participants came from varied demographic types. Age, gender, race, highest degree earned, and years teaching at MAUCC were reviewed for potential impact. This diversity was sought to capture various experiences that could occur within this adjunct group. A list of interviewees, by demographic category, is contained in the section above, "Participating MAUCC Adjuncts."

Career goals were reviewed in this study to determine an adjunct faculty member's initial reasons for teaching and current reasons for persistence in the role. Future goals were also used as an area of inquiry. Prior studies (Maynard, 2006; Eagan, 2007) have indicated that career goals have an impact on adjunct faculty satisfaction. Accordingly, this dimension was noted as a dimension for consideration during individual interviews.

The final types of inquiry (perception of role, impression of students, current satisfaction, and perception of success) were included to collect direct data regarding the research questions. Each participant was asked a series of questions during the interview, and expanded his/her responses through examples and individual experiences.

As each interview was completed, individual adjunct faculty responses were recorded and analyzed using a constant comparison method. Transcripts were created from audiotape interviews, and responses to questions were reviewed. Responses were

categorized and coded along each dimension. These data were then reviewed. Patterns of response were used to create the adjunct types described in these findings.

Reasons for teaching.

Respondents came to MAUCC with varied reasons for teaching. Some came to the role directly from graduate school and saw the position as an entry to a full-time career. The perception of a full-time transition was a frequent hope among those with less experience. Full-time teaching also was seen as an initial possibility by some long-term adjunct faculty members. An initial reason for teaching as described by an individual searching for a full-time role:

> "When I finished my Master's, I started applying for teaching positions trying to get some experience and hopefully work my way toward a full-time position eventually." (LN)

Some adjunct faculty members, as noted in the above discussion of the job focused, did not come to the role seeking full-time employment. Rather, these individuals saw the role as meeting a need in their life that was not being met elsewhere. These individuals came with their own life goals; adjunct teaching was a way that they could participate in paid work while still allowing time for their own goals. RR came to her role as an individual with external life goals:

> "I started in 2005; I guess I must have seen an ad in the newspaper. I don't think I went to the website. I don't remember how I originally found about it…. I was looking for part-time at that time. I had a little baby and that was perfect for me at that time."

> Some respondents in this sample came to the role because they were seeking an opportunity to make a difference within an educational context. These individuals varied in their future goals but saw the adjunct role as one in which

> they could use their skills with an eye for social justice:"I graduated college which was in 1998. I think I came back very, what's the word? I think, I think I've had the vision of oh I can, I can help change the world." (NS)

Some adjunct faculty members applied for the role owing to a disruption in a full-time position elsewhere. These individuals are attracted to the role as a part-time job or a temporary employment option:

> "I moved back to Pennsylvania to the Philadelphia area and got married. And I was looking for a job, any job in education (laughs). The economy was a mess at that time. You couldn't find a job. You had to wait for somebody to die." (RS)

Finally, some adjunct faculty members applied to their positions/roles without a clear expectation of future goals. These adjunct faculty members appear to be "lost in the weeds," and only later incorporate their adjunct faculty member role into their daily life:

> "I don't have a family and so you know those years are behind me and why not, what else am I doing on a Monday or Wednesday evening in the early primetime? I mean there's nothing on television that I am interested in so why not be here and working with people like this is a very, it's good for me." (RY)

> "This isn't something you get started in, you end up in it." (HY)

> Despite their varied reasons for teaching, each of the adjunct faculty members teaches within a program and classroom that has similar responsibilities. Once hired, adjunct faculty members make sense of their position/roles in various ways. Individuals viewing the role as a job are generally extrinsically motivated and describe their experiences in terms of the material reward that they receive from the role:"I came in all honesty because I like to eat twice a day and I would like to live inside." (RE)

Some respondents talked about the outcomes that they see in working with their students. These individuals frequently find that they are not able to effect the outcomes that they would like within their current adjunct faculty member role:

> "I stay more for the theology of it than the reality, because I think that it's very – I don't deny it's tough, a lot of people get through the cracks." (MI)

The hiring process.

When asked initial questions about how they found their current position, respondents consistently described being hired just before the start of a new semester. The adjunct faculty members interviewed for this research were remarkably consistent when describing their new hire experiences, and there was no variance according to the adjunct's reason for teaching. New adjunct faculty members were often telephoned and/or interviewed and asked to begin a class with little or no notice. At times, they were asked to begin a class that had already started:

> "Saw an ad for a job opening.... I applied, was given the job, um, to teach English, which was quite a surprise to me because on my resume there's absolutely nothing to indicate I have a capacity to teach English." (NT)

> "On a whim, it was actually a whim. I had sent my resume, and I was hired within a week. I was teaching by the end of the week." (TO)

> "Either someone had some emergencies that had come up, they were just two classes right there for me, and so we all just felt well this is marvelous. I was actually shocked when they just snapped me up so quickly. They took my word; I said, look I do have a PhD." (GS)

MAUCC does currently list part-time faculty openings on its website. However, the only respondent who indicated that he applied online noted that he was not successful in this process. Rather, he obtained his position after personal follow-up:

> "I filled in a computer form and I sent it in and I heard nothing and there was no follow up or follow through, so then I wrote a, uh, letter, a handwritten letter, directly to the head of the English department and got a call the next day, which shows me something about our new computer age." (RY)

Given the above hiring cycles, there is little or no noted application of person–job fit or person–organization fit as related to the position. The expectations of the position, as well as future career opportunities resulting from the role, do not appear to be evident to the newly hired adjunct faculty members. The hiring process appears to be geared, at the entry level, to meeting an immediate need that is not filled through the existing workforce. Given the constraints of the process above, there does not appear to be enough initial information regarding the position for a newly hired adjunct faculty member to evaluate whether the role will eventually assist the new hire in meeting the goals that the individual has targeted.

Newly hired faculty members are often asked to teach the developmental student population, regardless of prior background or training in this area. Accordingly, new adjuncts react as best as possible to develop a class and teach a population that is in need of a lot of assistance:

> "I have always thought it was weird that as an adjunct I am teaching a low-level, entry-level classes. Here I am someone that doesn't really, I know more now, but at the time I don't know a lot about the culture of the college. I don't know what's what, who is who, resources or curriculum tracks, and it's so very little. Yeah, you are giving me the newbies. It's kind of like, 'oh you just got your nursing degree, take care of the newborn.'" (NT)

> "I didn't do much…. I mean every teacher has this sort of bag of things that they can do on the first night of class for any course, you know. You get to know people, have them write about themselves, it was an English class. I had never taught English before." (RS)

Adjunct faculty members with many years of experience often described a classroom environment where significant modifications were made to enable students to learn the curriculum within the classroom. Newly hired adjunct faculty members are

rarely starting with a background in developmental education and may take years to master the skill set that is needed to engage with their student population. Accordingly, newly hired adjunct faculty members are entering their classroom with multiple challenges to overcome.

Perceptions of climate.

In terms of physical needs, adjunct faculty members voiced few concerns. A lack of concern was largely owing to adjunct faculty members providing their own materials as needed. Two respondents noted that they were concerned with a lack of materials and classroom space. The remainder either indicated that they had the materials that they needed, or that they brought their own materials but did not have too much of a concern about this.

> "The teaching situation is – it is literally like, hey, so here's class. You have to get the books for it because we don't have them. You'll have to order them. You have to get them for yourself. You don't ever have any chalk in the morning, which if you have a morning class you have to go find a chalk supply. And here's your learning objectives, do what you can." (TR)

> "There's no projector, there was no easel. There was like one of those – and then every time we went the chairs would be arranged differently. Sometimes we had no tables. I mean what can you do but laugh and just figure something out." (TN)

Respondents, by and large, noted a number of positive things in their organizational climate:

- Administration is available if/when a need arises or a meeting is requested.

- Team grading, where other faculty members are available to review a paper that is considered marginal and/or from a student who may complain, is used and seen as a support.
- The role is seen as relatively autonomous.
- Classroom observations occur at times and are generally welcomed.
- Compensation, relative to other schools and adjunct faculty positions, is seen as strong.

There were also organizational factors that were seen as a challenge to the role of the adjunct faculty members:

- Compensation, relative to the full-time faculty members, was seen as inequitable.
- Adjunct faculty members noted that they were frequently asked to participate and were unable to do so owing to a lack of time availability.
- Adjunct faculty members voiced confusion about the selection process for full-time positions at their institution. There was no clear understanding of how this role would or would not lead to a full-time opportunity.
- Classes were universally described as assigned late, generally speaking and relative to adjunct faculty class assignments at other institutions.
- "Learning circles," where instructors meet with each other to develop and strengthen teaching skills, were largely seen as ineffective.
- There was little understanding of or concern regarding students who drop a class to which the faculty member was teaching.

- The controls used by the administration (eg, syllabus review) were not perceived to add qualitative value.

These perceptions will be described in detail below.

Description of students.

When discussed as a group, adjunct faculty members described their students as a highly motivated group of adult learners. Adjunct faculty members with future career expectations and those with a focus on the job spoke highly of their students:

> "It's been my favorite school to teach at…. I find that the students just have more life experience. They're a little less naïve about the world. And so even though their writing isn't as strong as some students I've had elsewhere, their critical thinking is better. Their discussions are better. They have more to say." (LN)

> "I found that I really like teaching at community colleges. The students are motivated. I taught – I've taught mostly at community colleges. I taught one semester at a 4-year college, um, and the contrast between the students and their attitudes about education was extremely obvious to me. The students at the 4-year school seemed to feel very entitled. I got the impression a lot of them were on loans or on their parents' money. Where students at community colleges a lot of them have been through more rough situations, and a lot of them are paying for school themselves, a lot of them are working and going to school at the same time. They've made mistakes in their schooling and they're going back to school and that really changes, I think, the motivation behind their learning. So I found that enjoyable to work with." (LN)

> "I was surprised, pleasantly surprised by the students, downtown because I had stereotypical expectations of what that would be like…the kids down there were just fantastic." (RY)

With this motivation, however, the MAUCC students are coming into the classroom with a strong need for basic skills. Most adjunct faculty members, regardless of their individual reasons for teaching, identified skills needs within their student population:

> "Students that I have gotten like immediately are coming in, their skills' level is extremely low, extremely low." (GS)

Respondents described a wide range of students who varied in their rationale for attending community college. Most students, however, were in need of assistance with aspects of college, ranging from basic learning to academic supports.

> "We've got a pretty broad range especially right now because a lot of students are coming back to school who already have college degrees or they've been laid off from jobs and they're coming back to take like pre-nursing classes or get into the nursing program. So it varies and it's a pretty diverse group. Generally it's students who are, you know, need some remediation in terms of their reading and writing and critical thinking skills, don't have any real experience with, you know, college-level courses or someone in their family who is successful, gone to college. Uh, so you have to teach them everything, you know, from square one, not just reading, writing, and thinking but how to take notes, how to be a college student, how to interact with your instructors, how to find a way around the bureaucracy of the community college, things like that." (NS)

> "The skill set will range from shouldn't even be in this developmental class to their reading and writing skills are may be seventh- or eighth-grade level." (NT)

> "You've heard of the five-paragraph essay. My students are, are unprepared for that. They don't…a lot of times they don't reach that level I mean, to give you an example, um, I, one student misspelled 1 million things. I got tired of correcting him because there is nothing wrong with him other than laziness. So finally I wrote on the top of his paper (spells out) PLEEZ LERN TWO SPEL. I gave him his paper back and he said, 'Look J, you misspelled the word "two"'…when you're operating that low…. See they're not low IQ, they are low scholastically OK. They're, they're not stupid because I hear them thinking. You know, and they, they do think competently but they don't think academically. There is no, there's very little applied learning." (RD)

Adjunct faculty members noted that some supports were available for students. MAUCC's primary support mechanism was its "learning lab," where students were provided with individual instruction. Attendance at the learning lab was required for developmental students and optional for other students. When used, adjunct faculty noted that the learning lab could offer a significant benefit to students:

> "I always find that's the best way to help them, that one-on-one interaction with a professor or with a tutor. I could tell when a student had gone to the tutoring center because I could see the improvement in their organization and their grammar, things like that." (LN)

Frequently, adjunct faculty found that the learning lab was not a practical option for students, as it did not have weekend hours and had limited evening hours. Some adjunct faculty noted that they spent significant time with their students providing individual instruction. Such individual instruction was often provided by adjunct faculty members as a substitute for the learning lab when students were not able to use the lab. Some adjunct faculty members were unlikely to have a willingness to provide such instruction, and other adjunct faculty members noted that this was something that they would provide or suggest to students.

Some adjuncts referenced differences in the student cohorts at different campuses and/or the student cohorts who take classes in the compressed cohorts that begin a few weeks later in the semester. When differences were noted in the student population, there were often comments regarding the full-time instructors being able to select the classes that presented less of a challenge.

> "These classes that fill up at the last minute, they get a different sort of cohort of students…the students are a lot more challenging than the full-time instructor whose class has been filled up a long time ago. Their students have higher reading scores; they behave themselves better in class. (Their) classes are easier to teach, their classes take less energy." (NS)

> "They need an advisor, surrogate parent, they need a social worker at times, they need a counselor at times, they need a support system." (NS)

> "Oh, it is, it is constantly discouraging. When you have students who just aren't making it and don't seem to care, you feel like you're sort of dragging them along all the time, um, and at the same time trying to be positive with them and keep telling them these are the things that you're doing right." (RS)

> "Most of what I teach in the class in terms of grammar and things like that I learned in the fourth grade." (MD)

One instructor, when referring to differences between campuses, was vocally discriminatory in his description of the students he taught. The quotes below note a bias that this particular instructor brought forth into his classroom:

> "Blacks are better because, the blacks know they know nothing. The whites think they know something, so they're a little bit harder to teach. You know, because uh, the white attitude is 'I've done it wrong all my life and I'm still here. How wrong can it be?' Black, or the white attitude would be 'I know how to speak English. I know how to write English. Why am I here?' OK, the black attitude is 'you are the god, you give me what you think I need.' That's easy to teach. You know, that, that attitude, you know." (RD)

> "Koreans are very easy to teach because even though they're not smarter, um, eh, their parents kick them in the a, uh, the backside. What makes them great students is that, uh, they'll make every stupid mistake once. They'll never make the same mistake again, and that's what makes a perfect student. And that's the Korean student. So, you know, 'I made that mistake, and I won't make it again.' You know, and that's not IQ, that's their parents being motivated for them, you know, because there's a lot of competition with Koreans." (RD)

There did not appear to be a mechanism to identify or address discrimination in the classroom, as vocalized by the adjunct faculty member above. Despite the fact that adjunct faculty members were not as diverse as the students they taught, cultural sensitivity and related training were not noted as part of the hiring or orientation process. There was also no notation of screening for such issues once a faculty member was teaching in the classroom.

Frequently, students would drop out of a class that they started within a given semester. Throughout MAUCC, approximately one-half of students fail to complete a "gatekeeper" class in which they are enrolled within a given semester. The adjunct

faculty members interviewed appeared to average around that number. However, individual estimates varied widely, ranging from less than 10% in some estimates to more than 80% in others. Some adjunct faculty members noted low attrition rates:

> "I start every semester with 25. Usually I have one to three that drop. So it's not a big percentage." (RS)

> "I start with 18 and end up with 15." (RR)

Teachers who were less connected to their students noted a higher percentage of students who drop classes:

> "It's not cool, not good, 20 students per class, and I would say maybe by half the mid-term, mid-term is like the seventh week, somewhere between the seventh week and the tenth week, I may have maybe as little as 50% left or maybe 70% maybe, but usually it is 50%, 50% that is left." (NS)

Of all adjunct faculty members, one individual who noted that she wanted to make a difference noted the most alarming pass rate:

> "098 in the fall started with 23 students, finished with 10, and of those four passed. I mean I was horrified at the beginning when I was looking at finals and I just thought, 'Oh, this is terrible, I'm a terrible teacher.' And everybody else would look – 'Yeah, that's about right. That's how many usually pass, yeah.'" (MD)

Adjunct faculty members do not have much information on the students who drop their classes. None of the adjunct faculty members interviewed appeared to have an understanding of whether the dropout rate in their classroom is consistent with the rate that would normally be expected:

> "We'll see when students drop, I really don't know why they drop, one young man I was really disappointed that he dropped. I can see his face and I told him get here on time or you are going to fail us, you are missing a whole lot of my classes and you are going to fail. His name was Nick, and he came on time, did the work, had about a B average, and dropped the class." (RE)

> "One of the senior teachers came in to review my class, and she thought I was doing a very good job. What she exclaimed was, she kept talking about my

> retention rate. I thought, am I gaining weight from water? She was talking about that at this late in the season that so like 22 out of 24 students in a night class were still there, and she thought that was amazing, me I don't know, I am just going and doing my thing and another class where I was brought." (RY)

Some adjunct faculty members noted that they use the lower class size that results as an opportunity to work with the students who remain.

> "When students leave and you're and maybe I only have 10. Now I can spend more time I get to hear more of the challenges, I get to know what is going on and I can give you need this, you need this, you need this and so that I find is possible because I just had 10 students OK to work with and so that is the great part." (NS)

In sum, the adjunct faculty members interviewed perceived that their students were motivated to succeed yet missing some of the skill sets that would be essential for them to do so. Dropout rates appear to average around 50% but vary widely in the estimation of individual adjunct members. Adjunct faculty members who were less satisfied with their roles and had not met career aspirations reported a higher dropout rate than job-focused adjunct faculty members. Respondents did not have any detail regarding student drops and do not know why they are experiencing drops or whether the rate that they are experiencing is average.

Supports, such as a learning lab for individual tutoring, were available for students. However, these supports were not seen as extremely helpful to the students. Rather, adjunct faculty members believed that they were responsible to teach the students given skill sets beginning at the level at which they came to the classroom. Adjunct faculty members varied in their willingness to provide out-of-class instruction to

students; whereas some noted that such instruction was typical, those who were less satisfied did not note such availability.

Attitude toward student learning.

Six of the adjunct faculty members interviewed described a positive focus on student learning. These adjunct faculty members were able to describe the learning objectives of the English curriculum, and noted how their classes should fit into the student learning sequence. In their descriptions, adjunct faculty members who were focused on student learning noted various methods that they used to engage students and impart learning objectives.

> "I'm giving so many short assignments, and I'm pretty religious in, um, you know writing back to my students, comments, and trying to create new worksheets and that sort of thing. So I'm very conscientious about it. It probably drives them crazy because they're not used to that. The other thing I should mention that I've started to do in the last, I don't know, 5 or 10 years, is to do like a rubric for every assignment. It's something that I saw my own kids were getting in high school. It's something that I saw teachers use in elementary school, but I think that that idea has sort of worked its way up. Um, so when I give an assignment I give them a list of things I would like to see, and for some of the things it's a checklist of, you know, 5 or 10 things. For when I have them do annotated bibliography, the list is like 20, it's a list of 20 things and each one is worth five points. So it's – you know, is the MLA bibliography correct? Did you use standard margins? Um, did you remember to double space? This may sound pretty juvenile but it's the kind of things that students just wouldn't think of to do." (RS)

Seven adjunct faculty members described a moderate or neutral focus on student learning. These adjunct faculty members had varied reasons for teaching. For these adjunct faculty members, focus was placed on concrete objectives such as class attendance; less emphasis was placed on the student curriculum or learning objectives.

Adjunct faculty members with a moderate or neutral focus on learning fell into one of a few types:

1. Adjunct faculty members who were teaching at several institutions described a low level of focus on MAUCC guidelines. For these individuals, the English curriculum at MAUCC was not always distinguishable from the curriculum or guidelines at other institutions. Accordingly, they would focus efforts on general English improvement skills. Additionally, time management was frequently a concern for these individuals:

   "Well I just learned last week that I think I'm not doing what I'm supposed to do. I think they want us to have them writing persuasive essays using like basically doing work-cited pages and things and I never did that. Because I understood my role to be like let's get them to write a five-paragraph essay. And let's get them to write a persuasive five-paragraph essay, because that's always harder." (TN)

2. Adjunct faculty members sometimes brought a personal focus to their English classes at MAUCC. For these faculty members, classes were designed based on the skills that the individual adjunct faculty member believed was essential for their students to learn. In some cases, these adjunct faculty members noted that they were not aware of the MAUCC learning objectives for their classes. In other cases, the adjunct faculty member was aware of the learning objectives but modified the objectives to meet his/her class design.

   "I can't talk about a 1,000-word composition with somebody that can't write a sentence and so that is what I try to do. I try to individualize as much as I can. Which works with an inquiry and it works with the kind of teaching I do but doesn't work very well with the – a lot of people would

> see me as permissive because I, for instance, believe in unlimited revisions, which makes a hell of a lot more work for me. But I figure that if I give these guys a limit in revisions they may learn something, they may actually take a piece of writing and get it to acceptable level. But if I say you are only allowed two revisions out of whatever you write this year, they are going to flunk. And I'm not here to flunk them. If somebody passed them along before they should have been passed along, it has become my problem. So my problem is try to make up for that. So I do the best that I can." (RN)

Three of the four adjunct faculty members with unmet expectations in the study noted little to no concern for student learning. For these individuals, the adjunct faculty role is limited to required classroom activities:

> "I don't do prep. I never have to do prep. The most that I do is drive to school…. I really don't work, I don't work 40 hours a week. There's no way that I even come close. I think the most I every work, eight classes three hours a week so that's 24, I would say the bulk of the semester I work 24 hours a week and then there's a couple weeks where I work 30 or 35." (HY)

In sum, adjunct faculty members varied in their focus on student learning and willingness to engage with students outside of their classroom environment.

Teaching methods.

Literature regarding adjunct faculty members indicates that this group of individuals often uses fewer instructional methods, such as class participation. However, interviews conducted with MAUCC adjunct faculty members indicated significant use of classroom discussions and participation. Instructional support is provided at MAUCC through the use of "teaching circles," as well as portfolio submissions and classroom

observations. All adjunct faculty members described suggestions that they received regarding teaching methods, and also noted that they bring their own experiences to class with them:

> "I'm in a position where I really like what I'm doing. I don't need to keep doing this, but I do because I really like it. That's a different position than I think probably with a number of other people. So I'm grateful for the opportunities that I've been given here. What I do here informs what I do during the day. What I do during the day informs what I do here. I might try something out here that I then transfer to the high school where I teach. Or I might try something at the high school, and enhance it for here. So for me, it's a continuum." (TO)

As noted above in attention to student learning, one thing that appeared to vary widely is individual effort outside of the classroom. Some adjunct faculty members described significant effort outside of class, whereas others noted that they spend little time, if any, on work outside of class. Student assignments are often designed by instructors within the context of instructor effort outside of the classroom. One adjunct faculty member described re-reading multiple versions of student assignments and giving weekly papers. This individual adjunct faculty member is an individual with a high focus on student learning:

> "There are some students that I'm very specific in what I want in a thesis sentence, and if they come to me with an attempt and I work with them back and forth, back and forth, and in some cases I just have to say look. Take what you're doing, you have the right idea, use this thesis sentence, um, it'll get you to where you're going. So I help them organize their material. Um, and I just have to trust that the next time they do a paper they'll be able to do it. Um, or if it is slightly disorganized they're going to hand it into a teacher and a teacher's going to find it acceptable anyway. Um, and different teachers have different standards about, um, how closely they examine the logic of a paper, especially for undergraduates." (RS)

> "I probably spend more time teaching my course than I should. Um, right now I'm teaching – in the spring semester I taught one class, and it means that every evening I sit down and correct papers for an hour or two for three, four, or five

> evenings a week. So just the tediousness of these constant assignments and correcting assignments and trying to get good feedback and giving papers back and the next week there's another assignment." (RS)

Other adjunct faculty members described a different level of effort in their work both inside and outside of the classroom. Some noted that owing to time constraints, they were not able to put in as much effort as they would like. Others devised deliberate strategies to limit the amount of time that they needed to spend outside of class. These limiting individuals were unsure of their reasons for teaching or being disengaged from the role:

> "Well, yeah, I mean I set limits for myself where I feel like, hey, for the amount of work that I – the amount of money that I'm getting paid, the benefits I have, and what the students need, I've done enough work today. I've done enough work this week. Yes, I could go to the library. We're reading something by Gary Solo, I could go find out more things about him, bring more things into the class, I could spend more time on these papers, but I just don't feel like there's any reward for doing it, any benefits for doing it. So in terms of setting limits I have sort of an internal clock and when I hear that buzzer ring, I'm like OK, that's all I'll take for now." (NS)

> "I don't like reading the papers. I don't like the grading. I don't like the administrative function. I don't think that there is anything unusual about that. I kind of see show business when the lights go on and I perform, but then there is all of this preparation and stuff like that, that I don't like." (RE)

> "I try to teach the developmental class. I would rather do, I would rather do the developmental classes than the 101, 102 sequence, it's easier…. The goal of those classes is to write a five-paragraph essay…, so…throughout the entire semester I'm never working at more than one paragraph level." (HY)

> "I had a lot of fun and the students had a lot of fun and they learned a lot about marriage but I'm not sure that I don't feel like I did as good of a job as I wanted in terms of teaching them analytical writing. But then I realized that I did teach it but that just wasn't the focus because my teaching – teaching writing is rather boring and dull." (RE)

> "You know, I don't know what they take away. I don't know what they take away but I do know that they like coming to my class. If they have to go to school, they like coming to my class and I get that feedback from them. I mean they, they really like it cause I'm funny, you know, and I talk at, not as a teacher. But am I effective? In maybe one or two students I'll see it but I don't know about the rest." (RD)

Perception of role.

For some adjunct faculty members, their role was defined according to the college learning objectives. However, most respondents indicated that they believed the learning objectives only gave them a starting point with which to work:

> "I work under the direction of the English department. So I don't have to worry about there being any discussion that oh you're not doing the right thing and I'm like oh, oh yes I am cause you see this syllabus I have. I have 10-page or 11-page syllabuses. Every little subtitle according to the syllabus checklist just like a, I just gave out our last essay. It came straight from the department head, from the English department." (NS)

> "They give me some sort of three-page formal outline of what you're supposed to accomplish, I think I read it once and then I never bothered to check it again. I just do what I do." (HY)

> "There are guidelines of things that they want you to cover in a generic sense. But the mechanism to getting there I think is left up to me." (RE)

> "There's certain things that each course wants the students to master in terms of whether it's using research or using a thesis statement, using specific examples, things like that. And then they don't give us a whole lot of guidance usually of how to deliver that. Each teacher kind of has their own method." (LN)

Many adjuncts defined a set of additional objectives that they needed to impart on students:

> "For me teaching English is, is not just about the grammar and those kinds of things. One of the things that I tell the students all the time is that as long as you've got a good grammar book and access the Internet and so forth, you can find a lot of these answers when you need them, right when you need them. So

> don’t even try to remember some of this stuff. If it's not sticking with you don’t try and remember, just do it in the final stage, just say OK, I know I have a problem in parentheses or something, and put that on your checklist at the end. So I don’t think it's as much about teaching that level of detail.” (MD)

> “All these students come in with such a high level of anxiety, because they haven't been in school for so long. They've never been in college. You might be the first person, they're working full time, so I look at my job as like, ease the tension, make them feel welcome, make them feel safe.” (TN)

Some adjuncts, although they believed they were putting in their best effort, noted that they found it challenging to meet the college learning objectives:

> “They expect too much now, all of us in teaching want the best outcome. This is why we teach, we want to share some skill sets so our students could have it and go on and hopefully be good citizens of the world or whatever. But if we don’t have those supports, how can we get there, how can we, we can’t.” (GS)

One adjunct, while acknowledging that he was aware of college learning objectives, noted that he deliberately avoids using them in his class:

> “Essentially I’m keeping two sets of books. In other words, I’m giving, I’m sending them, you have to send, uh, a syllabus. Well, I send them every year, every term, the syllabus they want.” (RD)

A theme that arose from these interviews is wide variations in the level of responsibility that adjunct faculty members feel toward student learning and success. Some respondents described themselves as spending multiple hours per student outside of class each week, grading multiple papers and/or meeting individually with students on a regular basis. Other respondents viewed their role as specific to the classroom, and did not allow or provide time for any work outside of the classroom. In a couple of interviews, the role within the classroom was also altered from the role that was defined by the college class objectives.

Variations in responses regarding student learning followed patterns regarding adjunct faculty categorizations. Adjunct faculty members with unmet expectations were likely to spend very little time or energy on student learning objectives; faculty members who were focused on the job or focused on student learning spent a great deal of time and energy. Other types fell in between these extremes.

Despite their own personal reservations about the learning objectives, many adjunct faculty members voiced concerns that students sometimes reach classes that they teach at the credit level without the necessary skills to succeed. There appears to be an acknowledgment of the need for skill set development at each level of the curriculum. However, at the point of individual classroom management, many adjunct faculty members voice difficulty in reaching these objectives while at the same time balancing the academic skills gaps and social needs of an under-prepared student population.

Organizational Commitment Analysis

By far, the most common level of organizational commitment was the calculative level (HY, TR, RY, RD, TN, TO, LN, RS, RR, TK). Most of the adjunct faculty interviewed noted that they approached their position as a job, and stayed for the organizational rewards that they received:

> "I may be dedicated, but my dedication is a byproduct or indirect facet of the fact that I need a paycheck, does that make sense?" (HY)

Depending on the individual interviewed, the nature of calculative commitment differed. For individuals who were seeking full-time roles, calculative commitment may

be an individual's taking on part-time teaching and seeking opportunities at the school to showcase their talents. For individuals who teach as a second role, additional income was voiced. Some individuals voiced that the role was their best option. Finally, some individuals noted that they had other interests outside of work (acting, philanthropy, family obligations), and a part-time teaching role at MAUCC met their needs at this time.

A few respondents could be classified as using moral commitment (NT, MD, GS, RN). Altruists were focused on moral commitment, as was one retiree with individual motivation and one individual who was "lost in the weeds." These individuals came into the role at MAUCC and had a personal objective to strengthen the skills and learning of MAUCC students.

Finally, four respondents showed signs of alienative commitment (MI, RE, NS, NS). All four voiced various levels of dissatisfaction in their role, yet noted that they had to stay because they believed there were no other alternatives at this time. These individuals were highly likely to show signs of alienative commitment as described by Harris-Pereles (1997).

Security.

All interviewed adjunct faculty noted a lack of security within their positions. Although a few of the long-term adjuncts believed they would receive classes each semester, they noted that sometimes they could be dropped from a class at the last minute because a full-time faculty member selected to teach at that time and location. Those without seniority voiced concerns that they might not receive classes in any given

semester. Relatively few classes appear to be offered to adjunct faculty members in the summer. All respondents noted that they received class assignments each semester right before the start of classes, and some noted that they could receive cancellations up to and including the first night of class. Some noted that this pattern contrasted with other schools, where assignments could be given up to 6 months in advance:

> "It's weird the way they schedule. On the one hand when you're in, you're in, right? You're considered as part of one of these union pools so they have to look at you first, and that's cool but what's not cool when MAUCC, they won't schedule their adjuncts until 2 weeks before the semester." (HY)

> "I just found out yesterday, yeah, that there is a pretty good chance that there won't be any courses for me here in, uh, September." (RE)

> "One time I walked into the classroom and I was handing out my syllabus, it was the September of – 6 years ago. I was handing out my syllabus, and another teacher came in and said, "What are doing?" and I said, "I'm handing out my syllabus," and she said, "This is my class," and so I went to the English department, and lo and behold they had mailed me something saying that I was too low on the totem pole and I had gotten moved down. So I was pissed. That was the semester I bought my house, I was really counting on the money." (RR)

Classes that are offered off-site to specific student populations sometimes face the same scheduling concerns:

> "A, a prison program that she put together…her biggest concern was that she never knew when she was going to be able to teach…because they would wait until almost the first day of class and say 'OK you can teach in your program.' And you see a prison is a prison. Joanne, she could not call up the warden and say 'OK I can come now'…everybody is left hanging." (GS)

Competence/support.

As noted previously, adjunct faculty members often begin their position without a great deal of notice or time for preparation. Once at MAUCC, there are wide

perceptions of opportunity for on-the-job supports. The job-focused and newly hired adjunct faculty members tend to feel supported:

> "I've had professional support and encouragement…there will sometimes be students who are so troubled that we're really not prepared. This is not the place for them. I had a couple situations where the department chair was very supportive." (TO)

> "I feel supported." (TN)

Those with unmet expectations tend to note a lack of support:

> "There is absolutely zero support. I mean it depends on – I mean since I've been there, there have been several department heads, there have been multiple changes in order of personnel in terms of especially in like advising and counseling. So, um, partly it varies year to year depending on who's the department head, who's the assistant department head, who's the secretary. Um, so if you have a conflict with a student, you know, there have been some department heads that you know if you go to them they're going to back you up and support you, and others you know they're going to support the student and they're not going to support you, so you're just going to avoid having to go out of your way to avoid having any problems. Or, if you do have a problem you just cave in with the student, you know, and give them what they want. But there's no support." (NS)

> "I put the total focus just on the students, not nothing on the administration, I can tell you that because the administration makes it very difficult, a really lack of support." (NS)

> "There's a lot of adjuncts who are doing the same things the students are, they go to work all day and then they show up in the evening to teach or they show up on Saturday to teach, and particularly when you do evenings and that sort of thing you get very little support." (MD)

In interviews with adjunct faculty members, it appeared that there were various expectations of what supports should be offered and available. Some found current college efforts, such as standard syllabus language, portfolio development, and learning circles, helpful, whereas others viewed them as a waste of time. As currently designed,

MAUCC requires experienced faculty participation in supports that may primarily benefit less experienced faculty. There are often more expectations at MAUCC than at other institutions as perceived by adjunct faculty members:

> "They do require certain things, like your teaching circles, that other schools maybe don't. They require you for your first 2 years to submit a teaching portfolio that includes a number of documents and syllabus sample assignments, sample graded paper, and then observations, somebody has to observe you, and you have to observe someone else, and I've never had any other school require that. But I feel like it's helpful. And for the extra money, worthwhile to put in that little bit of extra effort." (LN)

When supports were sought, there is some evidence that they were made available to adjunct faculty. For example, TO noted in her interview that she scheduled a meeting with a department administrator to review her lesson plans and classroom approaches. Many adjunct faculty members noted that they had completed or requested a classroom observation. When asked if administration was available, most respondents answered affirmatively. Accordingly, it appears that support is available for adjuncts, but often is not offered proactively. Were the support to become proactive, some experienced faculty might voice concerns with a possible infringement on autonomy.

Teaching autonomy.

MAUCC is perceived to provide a great deal of teaching autonomy. All adjunct faculty members interviewed described MAUCC as providing a basic structure for classrooms and then allowing the individual instructor to customize the class to meet

his/her own personal preferences and the learning needs of the students. Some adjunct faculty members perceived this balance as structured for the learning environment, whereas others noted this policy as one of benign neglect by the administration. Attitudes toward teaching autonomy tend to break down by categorization, with strivers and the job-focused adjuncts viewing this autonomy in a positive light:

> "I think they're very good. My communication comes mostly from the department. Um, the department head is very good with keeping us informed, telling us what they want, explaining about the hiring process, sending us the forms on time. As I mentioned earlier about letting us know what they want taught, um, they're not overly concerned with how you get your students to the end point, so you know I have flexibility in how I teach the course. But they do let me know, this is what we'd like our students to know when they leave, when they leave the course." (RS)

> "That's one of the things that's been great about teaching here. When I hear about people I know who teach at other postsecondary institutions, it's like it's one of those points of gratitude. We are pretty much able to construct the courses according to our own likes. I've never had anyone challenge me on the quality of material I present to the students." (TO)

> "They gave me a standard syllabus and they said now this is what we want, like the outcome. But they said how you get there is your business, which is really hip…. I guess the openness and with the individual creative respect that the English department had for professors to be able to do the thing that they think would help the students. I really appreciated that." (GS)

> "Last week was my third time ever on campus. I do everything by myself, like I make my own rubrics and I find my own articles, and so I just wanted to talk to her a little and see what some of the other teachers are doing and so that was really helpful." (TN)

> "You have a lot of freedom, teach whatever book you want." (RR)

Cynics appear more negative about the administration and perceived academic autonomy:

> "Part-timers are gravy. OK, uh, we're like an afterthought. Postscript. And that's fine with me. Because I'm used to being alone and learning to do on my own. You know, I'm not dependent on them for anything." (RD)

One concrete downside to the academic autonomy vocalized is that it may lead to less standardization in the classroom environment. The lack of standardization could present a challenge when working with developmental students who are in need of basic skills development. One adjunct faculty member voiced some concerns with colleagues who may not diligently prepare students:

> "The same way that I am criticizing full-time faculty I think that I should be held accountable as well, and I believe I should be observed at least every year, if not every semester, if not for a full class session. I should be also held accountable for more than just did my students succeed or fail. What am I doing in that classroom?" (NT)

Connection.

Although perceptions of autonomy were consistent at MAUCC, adjunct faculty member perceptions of connection within MAUCC varied. Such perceptions fell into four types:

- Some noted that opportunities were available, and that they participated.
- Some noted that opportunities were available, but they did not have time to participate.
- Some stated that there were no opportunities available.
- A few indicated that they had no interest in participating in any opportunities.

Ability to participate.

Adjunct faculty members frequently believed that they were limited in their ability to participate in activities at the college. Many noted that there were developmental

opportunities of interest, networking options, and/or volunteer assignments that could improve their eligibility for future full-time opportunities. However, they often did not have time to participate in these opportunities.

Some who did have opportunities to participate voiced that they did not feel welcome if they went to a meeting or MAUCC event. Both cynics and altruists describe their attempts to participate, and noted that they were not fully engaged at meetings and events:

> "The way that the college manages the department, everything about the college, it has defined and told me 'Oh no you are different.' So oh no, so I know I'm different cause the colleges have told me I'm different." (NS)

> "If you show up as an adjunct at a department meeting or a committee meeting, it's – everyone's just going to look at you wondering what the hell you're doing there, and you start to feel the same thing because most of the full-time staff don't even go to that. So if you go as a part-timer you're almost always going to be the only part-timer there, and they're probably wondering what the hell you're doing there, you know." (NS)

> "The students are cool, OK? And I feel beholden to the students. The culture of academia, like my circle of colleagues, I ignore them and when I can't ignore them, they annoy the crap out of me. They don't get it. Even when they claim to get it, they don't get it. They're like 'I work so hard,' you know? I'm like, 'no, no, you don't work hard at all.'" (HY)

> "But I am not on committees. I am not there at lunch time. I am not there, you know, and adjuncts are not seen as a resource…. I am not asked and when I volunteer, it's been like 'oh yeah we would love to have you and I will follow up' and somehow it just doesn't happen, which is very strange to me." (NT)

Value to administration.

All adjunct faculty members, including those who were positive about their role, believed that they were highly replaceable and did not have an individual value to the administration:

> "If I quit tomorrow, they'd say 'fine, we have other people who are cheaper, waiting in the wings' (laughs), and it wouldn't matter to them one way or the other. I will say that when I passed the 25-year mark, I was invited to (main) campus for a breakfast, and they gave us a 25-year pin. Um, that's the first time I had ever gotten any recognition from the higher-ups or even contact from anybody other than the department head. And it really wasn't much. You show up, you eat your breakfast, they call your name, you go up and they hand you the pin, and you sit down. There were a lot of people who didn't even bother to go." (RS)

> "Although MAUCC has been very nice to you, but I don't know if they necessarily care whether you are there one minute or not." (TR)

> "You're replaced in a second. I mean, if you take a look at their brochure of the part, part-timers, yeah, you'll have three in this department, five in this department, and 124 in English." (RD)

> "The former, the older staff, full time too, they know me and I think that I feel valued by them. As far as these young people are concerned, I don't think that they know me from Adam. And I don't know much about them either."

> "That question of administration, whether the administration values us, the current contract fight that's going on makes it perfectly clear that they don't think anything of us." (MD)

> "Don't become an adjunct faculty. Don't, don't, don't, don't." (NS)

Concerns about value spilled over into comments about compensation. Although most adjuncts noted that MAUCC pays higher than other schools with similar roles, many believed that the overall compensation was unfair when viewed in a comparative manner. Adjuncts were remarkably consistent in this area, noting that they

remain at MAUCC owing to the comparatively high salary for adjuncts, yet believe it is not proportional to the job:

> "Being an adjunct is the education equivalent of slave labor. Now I am not knocking MAUCC, MAUCC from what I understand is probably the best paying adjunct in the area, OK, and you get the health benefits. So it is not a knock against MAUCC, it has to do with education in our society that is not valued." (RE)

> "We're like really the migrant workers of teaching. People will say, 'Oh, there's positions at (peer institution),' and then everybody applies there. I honestly don't know. I guess I feel kind of stuck, and at the same time I don't feel stuck because I don't hate it. But I don't see anything else that I can do." (TR)

Engagement and effort.

Adjunct faculty members varied widely in the effort that they put forward into their roles. Similar to attitude toward student learning, some adjunct faculty members noted that they felt an obligation to their students, and would go above and beyond their perception of the prescribed adjunct role. Others noted that they were hired solely to teach and would purposely dedicate minimal hours outside of the classroom. A third group noted that they were limited in the amount of preparation that they could do outside of the classroom owing to other teaching assignments or their obligations outside of the MAUCC teaching role. The newly hired and the job-focused adjunct faculty members are likely to voice engagement and be willing to put forth additional effort:

> "I do read the literature on how to teach. I'm not required to do that. Uh, I go to a few teachers meetings. I don't have to do that. I do those on my own. Um, and, um, I've had the experience of running meetings. Um, I've had the experience of teaching that communication course. Um, so even though I've had very little formal training in how to teach a class, um, I'm probably as good as you can get, and you know can lead a group, know what adult learners need, know what they need, that sort of thing." (RS)

> "If you have to work someplace else, then you cannot give the kind of attention that we would." (GS)

Those with unmet expectations and some who are lost in the weeds are less likely to voice engagement or willingness to put forth effort:

> "I don't really feel though that like they pay us for the amount of time that we actually do put in – I mean if I have – even as an adjunct, if I have two separate classes that are not linked, so I've got 40 students, say, at the beginning of the semester, and if I'm trying to spend a half hour with each of them every week in addition to all of the other prep." (MD)

> "I get like $73 per contact hour there. It's like, well that's good. I mean you shouldn't count it by contact hours because you spend so much time lesson planning and correcting papers and writing syllabi and things like that, but when push comes to shove, I get $73 there. I get about half that here. I got even less than that at Harcum and USP, and that's why I'm not at Harcum or USP anymore. USP's right around the corner from my house. I can't teach there for $10 an hour. Keep my kids in childcare. It's ridiculous." (RR)

> "Academia is a sweet gig for a musician. Nobody is paying attention. If I need to cancel a class because I had a gig the night before, no problem. If I need to leave 20 minutes early, no problem. My schedule is flexible enough." (HY)

For adjunct faculty members teaching at more than one part-time job, the multiple roles had a discernible impact on their ability to teach within the context of MAUCC's learning objectives. Many believed that, when teaching at various schools, they were challenged in remembering and matching the set learning criteria at the individual school:

> "The explosion of all of this part-time work, so much part-time work, and so what happens as adjunct faculty you bundle this part-time job, this part-time job, if you have all of these part-time jobs and all this part-time work. Then here at MAUCC it makes it kind of easy because you just run around here like a chicken with his head cut off. Now if you are not able to get the part-time work here at MAUCC, then you must go either here or go to another university. Or you either will do part-time work in business or you will either do part-time work in non-profit and you will either do part-time work in health care, and so really what you are doing you are bundling a variety of work together." (NS)

> "You work in multiple schools so you have multiple curriculums, multiple department goals, multiple learning objectives, or whatever. If you remember the lingo of each school and you spend eternal time prepping or traveling. I feel like I do a lot of traveling to schools. So you're really just crunched for time and then when the summer comes it's like what am I going to do for money. And then you spend August kind of biting your nails hoping your classes don't get canceled. And then the same thing happens over Christmas, I would say." (TR)

Satisfaction

A few of the adjunct faculty members at MAUCC voiced strong satisfaction throughout their interview responses. These individuals appeared to fall into one of two types:

1. Newly hired adjunct faculty members who had expectations for the future
2. Job-focused individuals who use the job as a means to satisfy other central aspects of their lives

For the two groups above, the adjunct role appeared to meet a need that they had. With those seeking full-time roles, the position is seen as a method of developing skills and preparing for this upcoming possibility. For those with other central aspects of their life, the role allows the adjunct to supplement income, work casually during retirement, or obtain work while pursuing a different career goal. All individuals who voiced consistent satisfaction in the role used calculative commitment. Participant responses varied according to future career goals.

A small group of adjunct faculty members voiced dissatisfaction. Of those who were vocally dissatisfied, one had unmet expectations for the role and one was unable

to teach to the expectations that they had for their students. Reasons for dissatisfaction were related to unmet expectations for the position.

Some individuals expected a full-time opportunity because of their educational history. With an earned doctorate and success in the classroom, there was a feeling that an opportunity for full-time employment should have arisen.

> "I mean it's not really fair. It's a little unsatisfying in that other instructors teaching the exact same classes aren't teaching them better than I'm teaching them, probably even worse, keeping office hours, not going to departmental meetings, and getting full-time salary and benefits, and vacation days. You know, the biggest thing is the psychological comfort of knowing you have a permanent, full-time job that's an ongoing thing and at the end of every semester you're not back at square one every time. You're out of work again unless we really need you and if so we'll call you." (NS)

> "I know what I'm doing when I teach writing. Plus I can do all the, you know, advanced stuff. Also, I know I've only been at MAUCC for a year, but I'm been at Bucks County for six, and so, rhetorically, you tell me how you, I mean I don't think that I should get the job, but the interview, right? I would think that that would at least get me an interview, but it doesn't and I don't get interviewed. So, I have no idea. I could be getting, I could be getting eighty-sixed because of that whole damaged goods idea. I've been an adjunct for so long, there must be something wrong with me. But that didn't answer the question of if something's wrong with me, why do they keep hiring me as an adjunct?" (HY)

Some positive comments that were received regarding satisfaction:

> "Very satisfied and I really like it and I've really had a lot of fun. I really feel valuable to the students, the kids – the students know that they need what I've got and it's like they're little sponges, they're just soaking it up. Not all, but, and they're so interesting and they've been around the block a time or two and they've got these great stories and I'll go home and kick up my heels and have a cup of tea and read their journals and I'm like 'wow!' I love it, I love teaching here." (RR)

> "I really enjoy doing this. Yeah. No, it's – and it's a situation in which you – as long as you're giving them good advice, you know you have the real possibility of making some difference in their lives." (MD)

Finally, there is a group of adjunct faculty members who voice satisfaction but do not appear satisfied in their responses/answers to interview questions. Some comments that were made voiced ambivalence toward current adjunct roles:

> "I think if I had my druthers I would probably have learned to make this work and so I would probably say OK I would do this, but you know I am also a screen writer and some other doors might open up in film." (RE)

> "I don't know. Beats data entry." (HY)

Sometimes, personal stories would present the opportunity for personal satisfaction and/or dissatisfaction. Personal stories were found across all adjuncts, regardless of their current motivations or reasons for teaching. Some personal accomplishments from individuals:

> "One personal triumph I'd say is G. G was, by his own admission, a former thug who according to him wanted to get educated. He got through my developmental class by the skin of his teeth, he probably shouldn't have, I probably shouldn't have passed him; however, I made a judgment call and it was – MAUCC has this middling grade called marginal pass (MP) for developmental class; it's pass, fail, and marginal, making progress. And making progress means they have to take the class again but it doesn't penalize their financial aid. I probably should have given him an MP, but I didn't, and the reason I didn't was I was pretty certain that if I did that and made him take it again, he'd drop out and go back on the streets. So I passed him and I told him that I would kick his ass in 101, like up and down I'm going to kick your ass, so you better have your shit together. And I was this blunt. I gave him, he didn't have any money, and I gave him two of my writing pens, I get them for free, so. Um, I told him he could email me if he ever had any trouble. He emailed me once. I ran into him at the gym of all places, working out at the Y. 'What's up, man? How'd you do?' 'I got an A plus.' 'How'd you do in 102?' 'I got a B plus.' So that was awesome, that was super cool. So, G." (HY)

> "There was another student who, oh my God, he knew his skills were not that good. He even came to me, he said, 'look my last teacher, my last writing teacher told me that, uh, I just got by by the skin of my teeth or whatever.' He said, 'so do you mind if I redo this?' I said no, actually I encouraged him…. I can't even count how many times he was redoing his papers so often, it was getting on my

> nerves. So he wanted the grade, and I was like, no not again, didn't I just grade this? I was getting confused, but he ended up with an A; it was just so wonderful to see his effort really pay off." (GS)
>
> "I had a young lady, very young, three kids, and she worked very hard. She really wanted to get an A in the course. I told her in the beginning that she was not going to get an A in the course because she just wasn't quite up to that. But she worked very hard, she was willing to do work over whatever so that she could improve the grade, and when her final she got a draft of her final paper in at the right time, and I edited the draft for her and I gave it back to her. And her book bag was stolen out of her car that day with the edited draft, so in order to make the time line she handed in the unedited paper. And I told her that if she wished…you can come sit at my house, we will edit it again and then you will redo it and turn it in and then I will give you the final grade…and she did it and she was in and out of this house about four times and turned that paper in and got a B in the course. And she was very happy and so was I, and so that is a story that makes me feel good." (RN)
>
> "My eighth graders have a really time expressing emotion, and but these students were all at the end of every class, 'Thank you so much.' So yeah, they definitely – because they recognize, you know, I work during the day too and I'm coming to teach them so they know." (TN)
>
> "I've had other students in the past too tell me that they have gotten good grades on a paper in another class and that is a very satisfying feeling as well, to know that they applied what they were learning in my class." (LN)
>
> "Every year I think that it is my last, we will see if they offer me something decent this year, but I am 80 and but I hate to give it up, I hate to give it up. I really do enjoy it." (RN)

There were many situations that led to dissatisfaction or disappointment. These situations were frequently centered on a student issue. However, some adjuncts had personal pet peeves about the role or situational factors that caused dissonance for them in the position:

> "I believe and I still believe that we as African Americans, we were never intended to be educated. And we were brought here to work and I think that that continues and there's not an urban school system in America that works…. I've seen middle class white kids…who, um, are kind of dumb. Not stupid but dumb, and they are being miseducated." (RE)

"Tenured full-time faculty member, you can even kill somebody and still have a job. The only you can't do is not show up at all for your classes. You can show for 10 minutes and leave, you cannot show up at all, but otherwise it's a guaranteed employment, and the pay is good, get your full-time tenure…get rid of tenure." (NT)

"I got to know what some of their troubles were, struggles they were. I mean some of these students were facing, 'well my son was just killed' and my, you know – and I am like well fuck, sorry. And you are here in class, I don't say that, but yeah you know Philly you know the climate here, I mean it's, so or I have got one young man, 'well I didn't have the money for my apartment so I am going to try to live with an uncle.' Now I was almost to afraid to ask 'well where are you living now?' It is all kinds of – they're facing really overwhelming challenges and still coming to school. So to fail a person like that it's been very difficult for me, but I have failed them." (GS)

"What do you say when someone comes into your class…I had this happen, a woman said 'I just quit prostituting'…and I had to fail her. Do you know what that did to me fail her…it's no question she works so hard, but her skills were just so low." (GS)

"I have never shared an office in my life. I don't want to share one now…I can't do that." (GS)

"The discouraging thing is, and I don't know what the answer to this is, the students who really try, just like the gentleman that I just talked about who really, really tried but they just don't get it. And what is worse most of these students are poor, they do not have much money so we are talking about they have to take out more loans to repeat a class that they have already taken. So it's hard, that's very discouraging, and I don't know how to fix that except to say to the student that whole acronym if at first you don't succeed, I mean that really is the key. You have to try, and try and try until you do. But that's discouraging, it's hurtful because I know all of the students won't try again." (GS)

"Evidence that not all of my students are leaving my class and continuing to improve, and I don't know if that's because of other professors or if that's just personal lack of motivation or whatever." (LN)

"At least five times a semester I think this is terrible. I'm never doing this again. I need to find a full-time job. And then I have that student who is so excited about their improvement, and I think, OK, this is why I do it so I just keep going, so who knows. We'll see. If I keep doing this forever, hopefully not as an adjunct." (LN)

> "You can come here at MAUCC or you can have the degrees. You can actually have work experiences, let's say with teaching, and then still not be considered, not very valuable candidate to be considered for a position." (NS)

General feeling about full-time faculty.

In general, adjunct faculty noted that there should be more full-time faculty lines and less of an emphasis placed on adjunct hiring. While they saw themselves as competent and engaged instructors, they believed that the system of reliance on adjunct faculty was not good for students.

The adjunct faculty perception matched the literature regarding perception of adjunct faculty. While adjunct faculty, in general, are seen as detrimental to student learning, individual adjunct faculty members are praised and are sometimes seen as the best teacher that an individual student may have.

Special Circumstances at MAUCC

Role of the union.

MAUCC adjunct faculty members are represented by a union. Accordingly, wages, salaries, and working conditions are negotiated through a collective bargaining agreement. In general, perceptions of the union were very positive:

> "We have a good union so I have been here for over 30 years. I am paid very well." (RS)

> "The union has also prescribed that I can't have more than 25 students in my class. I'm sure the administration would like to see 40 students in every class just because of the economics of it. Um, but you know now – it's an education issue that in writing classes ideally there should be, ideally there should be 18 students. But it's a union issue that there cannot be more than 25 students." (RS)

Comments regarding compensation and benefits were also frequently linked to the union status of the adjunct role:

> "I've found that MAUCC pays higher than any other school that I've ever taught at, which I like." (LN)

> "We always would like to be on more of a par with the salary that the full-timers get, and the union works very hard and I have to say that at MAUCC we are better off than any other community college that I know of. But that is not to say that there isn't a lot of ground that could be gained." (RN)

There were no negative opinions voiced about the union, even when adjunct faculty members were discussing the fact that they do not have a current contract. Some longer-term adjunct faculty recalled past labor strikes, but perceived the union actions as supportive of their role and position. The feeling of all interviewed adjuncts is that the union is supportive of their role.

Concerns of violence.

Although not specifically asked, many adjunct faculty members voiced concerns over the conduct of students in their classrooms. They were often concerned for their own personal safety and/or the safety of others in the classroom. Concerns of violence proved to be a stressor to many, and there were concerns that the response of MAUCC administration was not always a tact that would improve a potentially violent situation:"Wrote an essay about like she got kicked out of school because she punched her principal in her face. She got arrested. She ran away and then the end was like, and what I learned from this experience that cops are pigs and they're only out to get you. I was like, what? That doesn't make any sense. Really, you learned – you escaped from jail, you physically assaulted somebody, and it's the police who are wrong? Like, what? And yeah." (TN)

> "A counselor had advised me to kick him out of the class, which in retrospect was not a good idea. I told him to pack up his stuff and leave the class. And he got up and I went to the other side of the classroom, got some distance between us, continued the class acting like nothing was going on, but I could see him

> wrestling with himself to hold himself back and charging at me. Thank God he was able to pull himself together and just leave the classroom. But I could really sense that he was within a second or two of attacking me. And you know that's out – things like that happen not a lot, but they unfortunately that happens." (NS)

One adjunct faculty member noted that he started his classes by teaching in a more authoritative manner to avoid potential issues regarding violence:

> "Maybe because I am 6'2'' and a black man, and I don't have a lot of the problems in my class with a lot of the students…. I purposely try to be intimidating because if they want to drop out 4, 5, or 6 weeks into the semester for nothing, they've wasted my time." (RE)

In addition to direct concerns regarding violence, many of MAUCC's students are faced with life circumstances that require them to deal with violence in their personal lives. Some adjunct faculty members voiced concerns that these personal circumstances often prohibited students from learning during the time that they were in classes:

> "If you are worried about violence in your neighborhood or in your home, it is rather hard to concentrate on what is the difference between a declarative sentence and, you know, the best of us can't do it. We just can't, so then this actually means that the students aren't able to really show me their very best because they're not able to function at their very best." (GS)

In general, adjunct faculty members believed that there were significant external concerns in the lives of students that frequently had a negative impact on the learning environment. Violence was a particular concern to adjunct faculty members. In addition to creating a potential learning impediment, violence also directly impacted the classroom on occasions where it presented a safety concern to adjunct faculty members.

Inappropriate use of adjunct role.

Some of the adjuncts interviewed voiced behaviors that are outside the realm of appropriate teaching. As noted above, one of the instructors voiced blatantly

discriminatory comments. This same instructor noted that he deliberately uses two separate syllabi, so that he can teach classes with one while meeting college regulations with the other.

One of the adjunct faculty members interviewed noted that he has had interactions with students where he discusses sexual matters:

> "Students have been coming to me to confide in me about issues, like this one young lady I had; she is virgin and so she wrote her paper, she is Islamic Muslim, she is 20, and so she wrote about, she did her research around marrying as a virgin and all that they may or may not mean. And so she came in and confided in me about her beliefs, her virginity, the kind of guys that she meets, how do I handle it, yada, yada, yada. And so I have a lot of students who now call me and confide in me. Drexel has an independent rap session that I just started, and students come and we sit around and talk about all kinds of things. And different kinds of stuff that is going on in their lives, and so that is where I am getting a kind of satisfaction because I feel like I am helping people for the first time ever." (RE)

> "I had a woman, had been married 12 years, two kids, she is 6'2'' and her husband is 5'5". And we talked a lot about marriage, or she talked about it in context of, you know, my class and the context of her relationship. I had another guy who was married 10 years and got a divorce, and he talked extensively in class about open marriage. That I remember he kept saying that I had to get married to get an STD, and so now he is dealing with someone and they have an open relationship and so we had conversations like that." (RE)

In light of the adjunct faculty role of English instructor, the comments above appear to be out of the range of appropriate faculty behavior. The interviewee, however, viewed these situations as the time in his role where he was most satisfied. It did not appear that this faculty member viewed his actions as inappropriate, or was concerned about the way in which his actions could be perceived.

Perceptions of success.

Adjunct faculty members overwhelmingly believed that they were successful in their roles. However, their definition of success varied dramatically. Some viewed success as being able to teach the five-paragraph essay. Others viewed success as positive student evaluations or evidence that their students enjoyed the class. Some viewed success as completing their role so that they were able to return for another session.

One challenge in perceptions of success is that adjunct faculty members did not generally consider the fate of students who had dropped their class. For example, NS noted that he was successful and most of his students succeeded in his class. However, when specifically asked about those that dropped, he replied:

> "In general there's a usual amount of attrition and dropping. I've never really tracked it, but I'd say just roughly, I'd say, a third of students drop out or don't pass, yeah. Again, as an adjunct, you know, um, you might you might have different pass rates."

Even among those who remain and pass the class, there appeared to be variations in how well the students were prepared to handle future classes and/or expectations:

> "I worry about the students who have the low B averages because I know that if they do go on to Temple or La Salle or Drexel or wherever that, um, they might run into a writing teacher or a teacher in any course that, um, you know, just really throws their work back at them and says this is not acceptable and you have to do better than this. Um, so I worry about those low B students also." (RS)

Emotional reactions.

When asked to reflect on their roles during the interviews, some adjunct faculty members voiced emotional reactions regarding their role:"They better

> keep you rowing those oars, down in the hull because all the upper decks are taken by more important people obviously. I do have a little resentment. We are the lowest rung of the ladder. I guess you know and slave mentality. We get to love our masters after a while." (RY)
>
> "Most of the time I just don't let myself, I don't go there because nothing but madness lies that way, this raw, unbridled anger lies that way and that's not cool. So I ignore them for the most part." (HY)

Retention of adjunct faculty members.

From the above information, there are complex issues surrounding adjunct faculty members' perceptions of their jobs as well as their intentions to continue in their roles. Some adjunct faculty members appear to continue their position because of positive factors related to the role. Other adjunct faculty members appear to stay owing to a perceived lack of other employment options.

MAUCC's role design in regard to autonomy is likely a positive factor in adjunct faculty retention after an introductory period. Some factors that likely lead to concern are student violence, lack of growth opportunities, and a perceived lack of support from the administration.

Summary of findings.

Adjunct faculty member satisfaction appears to be related to position expectations as related to perceived realities of the work. Adjunct faculty members who voice and display satisfaction are comfortable with the role and the way that the role fits into their life. Some who are satisfied find that they enjoy the role's autonomy and control. These faculty members generally have other aspects of their life that are central

to them; their adjunct faculty member role is not central to their life circumstances. Other satisfied faculty members are relatively new to the role and believe that the role will lead to future opportunities.

Those who are dissatisfied voice a mismatch between their role expectations and their experiences in the role. These individuals generally came to the role with hopes of full-time employment and/or beliefs that they would have a different impact in the lives of their students. Many of these adjunct faculty members voice their unhappiness in the role and often note that they complete the functions but are disengaged outside of the classroom.

A few adjunct faculty members voice satisfaction, yet answer detailed questions with evidence of discord. These individuals appear to continue to put effort into the role, yet note that the role has not met their expectations. Each of these individuals noted that they are seeking opportunities elsewhere.

Educational attainment appears to have little impact on the satisfaction or retention of adjunct faculty members. Gender does appear to play a role within this small sample; with one exception, male adjunct faculty members voiced dissatisfaction. Age and/or years in position appears to have some impact but is related to future goals. Throughout this interview sample, future career goals seems to be most related to satisfaction or dissatisfaction.

Diversity of adjunct faculty members could be a potential concern for MAUCC. Given that faculty members have a 16.3% diversity rate compared with a student diversity rate of more than 70%, it would appear that MAUCC may want to advance

efforts to attract and retain diverse students. While study respondents were limited in regard to diversity, they mirror the overall diversity at MAUCC. Two of the three minority respondents voiced dissatisfaction in their interviews. In regard to adjunct faculty member satisfaction and retention, additional review and emphasis may needed in the area of faculty diversity.

MAUCC is likely to face continued challenges in regard to affordability and accountability. As budget supports reduce and financial aid reductions and restrictions continue, an ongoing reliance on adjunct faculty members is likely.

This study provides some anecdotal support for a link between job satisfaction and student results, as well as between job satisfaction and retention. However, this study does not directly measure such a linkage. Future study in this area would be advantageous in regard to measuring the impact that adjunct satisfaction has on the success of the college.

One area that MAUCC may want to review is potential strategies for reduction of students who drop developmental classes. Additional attention on the part of adjunct faculty members could be a potential support for these students. Student retention in classes could be a source of support to MAUCC in light of declining government support.

One source of support for adjunct faculty members that may be within MAUCC control is scheduling classes and/or adjustments. If scheduling assignments could be streamlined and/or the timeline for scheduling be moved forward, adjunct faculty members are likely to respond favorably. Given MAUCC's union contract, adjustments in this area are likely to require management/union discussion and cooperation. Such

changes, however, could provide a low-cost source of support with minimal financial impact.

Interaction Between Continuums

Motivation and satisfaction.

Externally motivated adjunct faculty members typically voiced dissatisfaction with their role. These individuals noted that the adjunct faculty member role is not a highly compensated position. Additionally, individuals noted that the role is often not held in high prestige, does not come with a full-time equivalent of health and welfare benefits, and often is unpredictable in terms of scheduling and class offerings. Accordingly, it is likely difficult for an individual seeking external rewards to find satisfaction in the role.

In many cases, externally motivated individuals started their role as an adjunct faculty member with hopes or expectations of full-time employment. Accordingly, these individuals did not intend that the adjunct faculty role would continue on an ongoing basis. As full-time opportunities failed to materialize, these individuals voiced significant dissatisfaction.

Internally motivated adjunct faculty members were sometimes satisfied with their role. However, not all internally motivated faculty members were satisfied. Although all internally motivated adjunct faculty members noted that they enjoyed teaching and student interaction, there were often concerns that interfered with full satisfaction. Some concerns of note:

1. Adjunct faculty members generally believed that they were not fully compensated for the role that they play. Although the adjunct faculty members indicated that they do similar work to that of full-time faculty members, they note that their pay is not commensurate.
2. There was a frequent concern in regard to recognition by the MAUCC administration. Despite being invited on the surface to committees, for example, there was a general feeling that the adjunct faculty members were not wanted at these meetings or as participants in the life of the college.
3. There were consistent concerns raised in regard to class scheduling at MAUCC. Despite periods of service, adjunct faculty members voiced that they did not receive class schedules until a few weeks before the semester. Should there be a time that they were not asked to teach for a semester, they would lose seniority and further scheduling opportunities.

In short, the externally motivated adjunct faculty faced natural barriers to satisfaction in their role. While internally motivated adjunct faculty members would normally have a high level of satisfaction, they believed that conditions at MAUCC weakened the natural satisfaction of the adjunct faculty role.

Satisfaction and student learning.

Without exception, adjunct faculty members with a strong commitment to student learning also noted strong satisfaction with the adjunct faculty role. Individuals who had a moderate commitment to student learning were less satisfied.

Adjunct faculty members without a demonstrated commitment to student learning were generally the least satisfied. These faculty members were typically less engaged in their adjunct role and were more likely to be teaching owing to a perceived lack of other opportunities.

Motivation and student learning.

Intrinsically motivated adjunct faculty members generally were the individuals who displayed some level of interest in student learning. These adjunct faculty members typically placed an importance on their role in the classroom.

The type of interest in student learning varied among intrinsically motivated adjunct faculty members. Some adjunct faculty members displayed a concrete knowledge of MAUCC's curriculum and objectives, while other adjunct faculty members created individual goals for their student learners. Regardless of which path these individuals chose, each placed an emphasis on his/her students' English skills and used the class as a method of skill development. Each also voiced a strong willingness to use out-of-class time to facilitate student learning needs.

All three extrinsically motivated adjunct faculty members voiced little concern for student learning. For these individuals, their role as an adjunct faculty member served only to meet a financial need. These individuals participated in student learning, and sometimes voiced that they needed to meet MAUCC expectations. However, this participation was done solely as a method of retaining employment in future semesters.

Summary of analyses.

A great deal of overlap can be seen in a comparison of motivation and interest in student learning. In general, adjunct faculty members with the greatest interest in student learning are intrinsically motivated. Those with the least interest in student learning are extrinsically motivated. Extrinsically motivated individuals participate in student learning but do so as a means to continue their position and retain external rewards.

Adjunct faculty members who voiced satisfaction typically noted that they were intrinsically motivated and interested in student learning. In general, the more satisfied an adjunct faculty member, the more likely the adjunct is intrinsically motivated and interested in student learning.

Despite strong intrinsic motivators and an interest in student learning, the adjunct faculty role was viewed as problematic by several adjunct faculty members. While voicing a level of satisfaction, these adjunct faculty members continually noted concerns throughout the interview. These individuals noted that they were committed to teaching but found so many challenges in the adjunct role that they were negatively impacted. The level of concern voiced by adjunct faculty members varied; some adjunct faculty members noted that they were still highly satisfied despite concerns, whereas others noted that they enjoyed teaching but were dissatisfied with their role. All adjunct faculty members interviewed noted some level of concern with the adjunct role.

Response Patterns and Interactions

As interviews were completed, each category above was reviewed to ascertain potential patterns of interaction. Some similarities could be seen throughout the types. These similarities will be noted throughout the responses in this section. When reviewed as individuals, however, career goals appeared to be the category that had the most impact on an individual's teaching experiences.

Individual reasons for teaching and individual motivations were the most important characteristics in determining adjunct faculty member type. As described by individual adjunct faculty members, there are varied personal reasons why individuals begin and continue their adjunct faculty role. Individual adjunct faculty member motivation for teaching appears to determine an individual's expectation for the adjunct faculty role.

As reviewed in this analysis, adjunct faculty members will be divided and described according to five main types: strivers, cynics, the job-focused, altruists, and those who are individually motivated and/or "lost in the weeds."

Strivers.

In my sample, three individuals could be described as strivers. These individuals came to the adjunct role with goals of advancing their career and/or obtaining a full-time faculty role. Strivers are typically young; two strivers fell into the 20- to 39-year-old age category, while one was older. One striver was male and two were female. All three

strivers had fewer than 10 years of experience working at MAUCC. All strivers in this sample were white, and all had less than a doctoral degree.

Strivers come to the adjunct faculty role with a calculated commitment and a mixed internal/external motivation. Strivers are internally attracted to aspects of the teaching role but extrinsically motivated to obtain a full-time teaching role. When initially hired, strivers often spend a great deal of time and energy ensuring that they are strong instructors. They show interest in student progress and are invested in success and learning within their classroom.

A challenge within this population of strivers is the likelihood of success in finding a full-time opportunity. Of the strivers in this sample, none had completed a doctoral level of study. Other strivers have completed a Master's degree. The strivers in this sample did not articulate an awareness of the potential number of full-time opportunities that may arise, and were not able to describe the degree required or the skill set that is desired for full-time opportunities. If strivers are not afforded the opportunity to advance their goals, they are likely to transition into cynics.

Sample Striver – LN

LN is a 25-year-old woman who was hired at MAUCC shortly more than a year ago. LN became an adjunct faculty member after the completion of her Master's in Fine Arts (MFA) degree. When describing her decision to enter the MFA program, LN notes that she did not enter the program with a particular career field in mind. Rather, LN found that many individuals graduating from her program became teachers after they

earned the degree. LN decided to try this career path and noted her expectation that successful adjunct work will lead to full-time employment. She has been teaching at various schools for approximately 5 years.

LN has taught at a few institutions since completing her graduate degree and is currently teaching at three or four schools per semester. LN notes her work in striving toward a strong student learning experience for her students, and notes that she places an emphasis on everything in her classroom, from class assignments to seating arrangements. She also notes that she spends as much time as possible in preparing her class and responding to her students.

There are various challenges to LN's status as an adjunct. Scheduling can present a concern, as her classes are frequently at various locations and can range in times from early morning to evening classes. As much as she is able, LN attempts to create a schedule that works efficiently. Some strategies that LN uses are to select classes at schools that offer more than one class, seek online classes, or request a schedule that focuses on one area of the city on a given day of the week.

The adjunct role presents a financial concern for LN. LN describes benefits such as health insurance as minimal, and notes that the pay for her work is much less than she would be receiving on a full-time basis. Moreover, LN's pay is never guaranteed; there have been occasions where a class is canceled at the last minute. In situations such as class cancellation, LN does not receive any pay for her preparation and is usually unable to substitute the missed class with other paid employment.

LN believes that her chances of finding a full-time position at MAUCC are strong, and bases this belief on her class scheduling to date. LN has been given two classes per semester, as well as a summer class. She notes:

> "Right now I think it's fairly likely that I would get two classes a semester. I also have a summer class there this year, which I was surprised to be offered in my first year teaching there. I know summer classes are hard to come by. Um, so as long as those opportunities continue, I'd like to stay there."

The potential for LN to move toward cynicism is already present in LN's interview:

> "There are not nearly as many full-time positions as there are people looking for the full-time positions. So it's, uh, the kind of thing that at least five times a semester I think this is terrible. I'm never doing this again. I need to find a full time job."

At this time, LN notes that she is working hard to find a full-time role that will allow her to teach at one institution. While noting current hardships, LN believes that her current work will be worth it once she is able to interview for a full-time opportunity. LN's current hard work is done with the intent of opening doors to full-time employment.

Cynics.

Cynics, in this analysis, may be described as former strivers who have been unable to meet the goals that they have set regarding full-time employment. Cynics are older than strivers and have more years of experience in teaching at MAUCC. There are four cynics in this sample; all are over the age of 45 and all have more than 10 years of teaching experience at MAUCC. Two cynics have earned a doctoral degree, while the

other two have Master's degrees. One cynic is an African-American woman; three are white men.

When cynics describe their early experience at MAUCC, it sounds similar to that of strivers. These individuals typically start their teaching experience with a combination of interest in the role and a desire for a full-time teaching opportunity. There is typically a strong initial focus on student learning.

When full-time opportunities fail to arise, the cynic begins to disengage from the adjunct faculty role. While continuing to accept adjunct faculty assignments, the cynic will reduce the time that is spent on the adjunct faculty role. Frequently, cynics will describe themselves as dissatisfied; all four cynics in this study noted that they were highly or somewhat dissatisfied with their role. Cynics note that they feel a lack of support from the administration, lack of opportunity within the role, and do not feel valued in the role. Despite these negative feelings, cynics note that they do not believe they have significant job opportunities outside of teaching. Accordingly, they note that they plan to continue to teach within their adjunct role.

As the cynic is, to some degree, disengaged from his or her adjunct role, there is less of a commitment to student learning than with the striver. Accordingly, the institution loses the ability to capitalize on the years of learning that the cynic has accumulated in working with the student population. The cynics interviewed in this study expressed a willingness to perform their jobs to the extent necessary to continue their employment. However, their interest in student learning had been dulled by the lack of fulfilled expectations over many years.

Sample Cynic – NS

NS is a doctoral-educated, African-American woman between the ages of 50 and 60 years. Linda has been teaching at MAUCC for more than 20 years. While currently an adjunct, NS describes a number of attempts that she has made toward full-time employment. These attempts have not worked out:

> "That was my dream then. OK, got the degree. But as you know, being adjunct yourself, reality sets in, OK? Um, no matter where I applied for work, either I, either I, didn't have the right experience, or I didn't have enough experience, you name it. It was all various reasons as to, 'Oh yes, yes you have a degree. OK not only do you have the degree in this subject area and yes you have a variety of work experience, and yes you have work experience teaching at a community college, but all of that said and done we're still not going to offer you a position.' OK, so reality of life, reality of life sets in, alright so, so I mean life is setting in, one must still continue with life so I continued to work here and work at MAUCC."

NS's initial description of her role at MAUCC reads similar to that of our strivers. NS fell into the teaching position by accident; she was tutoring at the time, and a teacher did not show up on the first day of class. NS was given that class and struggled through without prep time. She enjoyed teaching and hoped that the job would lead to a full-time career.

NS earned her doctorate with the hopes of opening doors at MAUCC. Although NS would not directly address the question of barriers in her interview, she did note that she has applied for full-time positions and not received interviews. NS notes that she continues to teach her students to the best of her ability because she wants them to

have the opportunities that should be afforded to them with their education. However, she acknowledged a deep sense of discouragement:

> "Now I am definitely discouraged. You know what I would tell anyone because I've…don't become an adjunct faculty, don't, don't, don't , don't…my expenses already I have cut them to the bare bone where you can't cut anymore…you bundle this part-time job, this part-time job if you have all of these part time jobs, and all this part-time work. Then here at MAUCC it makes it kind of easy because you just run around here like a chicken with his head cut off now."

NS remains at MAUCC in a part-time capacity but notes that she is counting the days until she reaches age 65. She notes that she would be a better teacher if she were in a different employment arrangement, as she would be able to focus more on her students.

Job-Focused Adjuncts.

On the surface, a job-focused adjunct faculty member appears similar to that of a cynic. The job-focused adjunct is an individual with several years of experience who has come to the job with specific goals. The job-focused adjunct differs from the cynic, however, in the type of goal that he/she originally sought. Adjunct faculty members who are focused on the job typically come to the role with specific outcomes outside of full-time employment.

There are six job-focused adjuncts in this study. Two of the job-focused individuals are men and four are women. All of these individuals possess a Master's degree. Each of the job-focused adjuncts notes that they teach part-time at MAUCC but have other aspects of their lives that are central. Their role at MAUCC is a position that enables them to support the central parts of their lives.

The job-focused adjuncts were all clear in regard to the expectations of the adjunct role and voiced the willingness to exert the effort that was needed to meet their goals in the classroom. This group of adjunct faculty members fell in between the strivers and the cynics in regard to their willingness to give extra time to their role. Five of the job-focused individuals brought extensive experience (more than 20 years each) to their adjunct role. While the remaining job-focused adjunct faculty member was new to MAUCC, she came into her role with extensive teaching roles elsewhere. Accordingly, she was able to bring her experience into the classroom while avoiding the disengagement that haunted the cynics.

While most of the job-focused adjuncts appear ideally suited for the adjunct faculty member role, one of the job-focused voiced a calculated effort to exert minimal effort on his role at MAUCC. Although this category of adjunct faculty members may generally provide a strong match, it is important to ensure that individual job-focused adjunct faculty members are placing an appropriate emphasis on this role in their lives.

Sample Job-Focused Adjunct Faculty Member – TN

TN is a white woman, aged between 30 and 40 years, with a Master's degree. TN's primary job is as a teacher in the K-12 educational system. She had a layoff from her primary position and sought an adjunct faculty role as a source of additional income. TN has enjoyed the adjunct role since beginning this role. She likes the additional income and has also found that the role allows her to strengthen her curricular teaching as she works on similar material with a different audience.

TN spent a great deal of time in her interview talking about methods to teach her students. TN notes that she has a great deal of satisfaction in the role and hopes to continue to teach in an adjunct capacity. As she has a full-time role, she does not have an interest in full-time employment.

Despite her strong stated satisfaction, TN voices some of the same concerns as other adjunct faculty in regard to class scheduling. Because she is not dependent on her adjunct classes for primary income, class scheduling changes are viewed by TN in terms of challenges with class preparation:

> "I work full-time during the day, so when they call me 10 days before or 7 days before, I don't really have much time to fix it, so I've just been essentially doing that."

TN notes that she puts a great deal of effort into her class preparation, and evaluates each of her lesson plans after class to determine whether changes should be made in the future. TN recently has made an effort to reach out to her department chair and request a class visit/evaluation. Her motivation for requesting this visit was to determine whether there were any pedagogical changes that could be made to her class:

> "I met with Cindy last week, just to sort of put a name to a face and like I said, that was – last week was my third time ever on campus. I do everything by myself, like I make my own rubrics and I find my own articles and so I just wanted to talk to her a little and see what some of the other teachers are doing and so that was really helpful. And I – she told me that – she didn't tell me I'm doing it wrong, but she suggested another way to approach the class and that sort of helped."

In her interview, TN spoke about incorporating her middle school classroom experience into a college curriculum, and vice-versa. She noted on several occasions

that she reached out for assistance in tailoring her classroom to an adult population. She noted that she spent extensive time in the creation of rubrics and stated that she brought her own supplies to the classroom to ensure that she had the teaching materials that would be needed for her class. TN noted that the learning center is not convenient for most of her students, so she makes individual appointments to assist them in meeting their learning goals:

> "Because I don't even think – I mean I don't really know a lot about the teaching center, but I'm assuming it's not open at 8:00 at night. So and most of them, like I said, they all work during the day."

In short, TN has incorporated her role as an adjunct faculty member into the rest of her life. TN does not have unrealistic expectations of the future of the adjunct role and places an appropriate emphasis into the role responsibilities. TN has a clear understanding of the needs of her students and appears to make efforts to meet these needs within her classroom environments.

Altruists.

A small subset of the adjunct population voiced an altruistic rationale for teaching throughout their interviews. There were two individuals within my interview sample that can be classified as altruists. Both altruists were female adjunct faculty members with Master's degrees. One fell into the 40 to 49 age category, and the second into the 60 and older group.

Both altruistic respondents noted that they have incorporated teaching into their lives because of a strong desire to teach students. Both of these adjunct faculty

members cited the needs of students within a community college setting. One altruistic respondent worked part-time as a grant writer in addition to her adjunct role. The other had worked in a number of career paths and was planning a return to school to pursue new opportunities related to social services. Both of the respondents with altruistic motives voiced a strong level of concern with the working conditions at MAUCC. Although they both noted that they appreciated the individual role and the interactions with the students, they had concerns in regard to the assessment of learning between classes, and the learning and progression of students.

Although it initially appears that the altruistic adjunct faculty member would be a strong match to the adjunct faculty member role, there is a strong possibility of these individuals becoming dissatisfied with the role as it is currently designed.

Sample Altruist – MD

Throughout her adult life, MD has worked in multiple positions ranging from grant writing to non-profit administration. MD applied for her teaching position as a part-time opportunity that she could use while working in other part-time capacities. MD notes that she is attracted to the teaching role at MAUCC because it fulfills her "sense of justice":

> "I know why I'm doing this. I mean it's very much out of the sense of justice…to some extent I was just plain lucky. And, um, you know, so, so I've never had to live through what many of these students had to live through."

MD spends a good deal of time at MAUCC on committees ranging from student services to reviewing other instructors' syllabi. MD has also researched her future opportunities at MAUCC. MD has found that she enjoys teaching and would like to move forward in a full-time role at the institution. However, she does not believe that her Master's degree will be competitive in regard to applying for full-time English opportunities. Accordingly, she has sought teaching opportunities in other departments in the organization. MD believes she will be teaching within the Women's Studies area in the future, and has been interacting with the faculty and administration in this area. She hopes that her teaching and work experiences may lead her to a full-time opportunity in a department such as this.

MD voiced concerns in several moments during her interview. These concerns were largely directed toward the administration and a belief that the adjunct population was valued:

> "They do a really, really bad job of communicating that stuff to the faculty, particularly adjuncts, because the adjuncts are often – I mean for me I have – I'm not trying to lead a fancy lifestyle or whatever, so for me I can do this job as a part-time job and have my other part-time work and I'm fine. But there's a lot of adjuncts who are doing the same things the students are, they go to work all day and then they show up in the evening to teach or they show up on Saturday to teach, and particularly when you do evenings and that sort of thing you get very little support."

Course scheduling was again a concern for MD, as was the variability of semesters where classes are not guaranteed despite many years of service:

> "For Spring semester I only found out what I was teaching Monday morning at 9:05 at 2:30 on Friday afternoon."

MD shows an avid interest in teaching at MAUCC and facilitating student learning. However, she voices many concerns in regard to the structure of the adjunct role. Issues are also evident in regard to MD's ability to meet the student learning goals that are set for her position. While MD describes herself as satisfied in her role, she notes many concerns that influence her ability to perform her job.

Mixed motivations.

While most adjunct faculty members closely match the types above, three individuals noted mixed reasons for teaching. These individuals could be categorized as "in the weeds," or unsure of their reasons for teaching or goals for moving forward. Two male adjunct faculty members fell into this category. Both individuals were within the 50-60 age demographic. Owing to life event changes, the individuals noted that they were teaching at this time but unsure what their future plans are. The reaction of these individuals toward their roles varied.

One female adjunct faculty member also had a mixed motivation for teaching. This individual noted that she had been a full-time faculty member but had lost a tenure review owing to personal issues that interfered with her work. This individual was unsure of her future plans and voiced that she was currently adjunct teaching while she determined her future career goals.

Sample Lost – RE

RE started his career with a full-time corporate role. He was laid off from his original job after 2 years. While he found a second corporate role, he found that the second job was not a match for him. He has not found a satisfying full-time role since that time:

> "I knew going in that the chemical company, before I went there, that it was a bad match, but I needed the job…I was still looking so. And I left there on my own, and from that point on it has been scramble ever since, and so, uh, I tried to get back in corporate America, and I look back on it now and I realize that I had no place there, but that is what you go to school for. And various ways and forms to get a professional kind of job, and so it has been scramble ever since."

RE notes that he never intended to be a teacher, and that he has taken teaching jobs owing to opportunity and financial need:

> "This is my second tour of duty at MAUCC…this time I came, in all honesty, because I like to eat twice a day and I would like to live inside…that's really why I'm back, and there was some circumstances in my personal life that just turned everything up down financially and I had to scramble to get jobs."

RE notes that during his first set of classes, he did not enjoy the teaching role. He notes now that he has embraced teaching and engagement with his students. However, RE does not enjoy the administrative aspects of his role:

> "I don't like reading the papers. I don't like the grading. I don't like the administrative function. I don't think that there is anything unusual about that. I kind of see show business when the lights go on and I perform, but then there is all of this preparation and stuff like that, that I don't like."

When asked how he sees himself, RE notes that he is a filmmaker. Because he is not sure whether he will ever be self-sufficient on income from filmmaking, RE notes that he may need to continue to teach. However, he does not see teaching as his primary career aspiration.

Final Classifications of Participants

Study participants were classified as noted in the below table:

Table 3: Demographics of Participants, with Classification

	Gender	Race	Age	Highest Degree	Years at MAUCC	Study Classification
HY	M	W	50-59	Doctorate	0 -2	Cynic
MI	M	W	40-49	Master's	11 - 20	Cynic
NT	F	W	60+	Master's	3 - 5	Altruist
RE	M	B	50-59	Master's	0 - 2	Lost
TR	M	W	20-39	Master's	3 - 5	Striver
NS	F	B	50-59	Doctorate	≥ 20	Cynic
RY	M	W	60+	Master's	6 - 10	Lost
RD	M	W	60+	Master's	≥ 20	Job
MD	F	W	40-49	Master's	3 - 5	Altruist
GS	F	B	50-59	Doctorate	0 - 2	Lost
LN	F	W	20-39	Master's	3 - 5	Striver
TN	F	W	20-39	Master's	0 - 2	Job
TO	F	M	50-59	Master's	≥ 20	Job
RS	F	W	50-59	Master's	≥ 20	Job
RR	F	W	40-49	Master's	6 - 10	Striver
NS	M	W	40-49	Master's	11 - 20	Cynic
TK	M	W	60+	Master's	≥ 20	Job
RN	F	W	60+	Master's	≥ 20	Job

Periodic adjustments to motivation.

Individuals, at times, describe changes to their motivations for teaching. For example, all current cynics described themselves as strivers at the beginning of their adjunct faculty member role, and were discouraged when they failed to obtain a full-time position. In contrast, those that are currently job-focused may have started their position “in the weeds,” and mapped a career path once teaching. Accordingly,

individual adjunct faculty members may view their position differently according to their individual needs at a given point in time.

Given the demographic patterns of the participants in this study, it is possible that a flow chart could be developed to characterize a typical progression in adjunct faculty motivation. The striver classification and/or altruist classification may be typical starting points for adjunct faculty motivation, while the cynic role may be a typical end point. However, this study does not provide enough data to create this progression. Progression of adjunct faculty motivation may be an area for future inquiry.

Potential Outliers

As noted above, some adjunct faculty members noted that they were motivated to teach but dissatisfied with their role as an adjunct faculty member. Although committed, these individuals did not voice a strong level of satisfaction as would generally be expected.

While most adjunct faculty members fit the pattern of category overlap, one individual adjunct faculty member (RD) did not match the pattern. This individual noted strong satisfaction in his role and internal motivation yet without any connection to student learning. Rather than being motivated by the students, this individual notes that he is motivated by the work itself. This adjunct faculty member notes that he sees teaching as a way to perform and entertain his students:

> "You know, I don't know what they take away. I don't know what they take away, but I do know that they like coming to my class if they have to go to school, they like coming to my class and I get that feedback from them. I mean they, they really like it cause I'm funny, you know, and I talk at, not as a teacher. But am I

> effective? In maybe one or two students I'll see it, but I don't know about the rest." (RD)

As no other adjunct faculty members fit this individual's pattern of responses, this individual appears to be an outlier.

CHAPTER 5
CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

Adjunct faculty members who participated in this study had personal stories when asked to describe their teaching experience. Each participating adjunct faculty member described an individual life history that included his/her teaching experiences. While each experience can be seen as unique, there are also broad commonalities that surround their described teaching experiences.

Based on shared commonalities, I have created a categorization that links an individual's reason for teaching to his/her satisfaction in the role and attitude toward students. These linkages, to varying degrees, apply to the sample individuals whom I have interviewed for this study.

An adjunct faculty classification for this study was developed and described in Chapter 4. I applied this categorization to the answer of each individual research question in this study. A response to each individual research question is below:

How do adjunct faculty members teaching developmental English at MAUCC describe their satisfaction within their current organizational roles?

The majority of interviewed faculty members described themselves as satisfied within their adjunct faculty role. When individuals noting partial satisfaction were included, 16 of 18 respondents noted some level of satisfaction.

As noted in Chapter 4, individuals classified as strivers or job-focused most frequently noted a strong level of job satisfaction. For these two groups, the adjunct

faculty member role was functionally connected to their lives and their career/work goals. For those seeking full-time roles, their work as an adjunct faculty member provided a method of developing skills and preparing for this upcoming possibility. For those with other central aspects of their life, the adjunct faculty member role allowed the adjunct to supplement income, work casually during retirement, or obtain work while pursuing a different career goal.

Although verbally noting full or partial satisfaction when asked directly, many adjunct faculty members described dissatisfaction in their responses to other interview questions. It was not unusual for individual adjunct faculty members to describe an environment in which they were satisfied with the position yet believed that they were not valued by the administration at MAUCC, were underpaid relative to full-time employees, and were often unable to attain their learning goals. Some adjunct faculty members noted only limited areas of dissatisfaction, whereas others responded with strong levels of dissatisfaction throughout their interviews. Accordingly, although most individuals verbally described satisfaction, varied levels of dissatisfaction were expressed in part of most adjunct faculty interviews.

Only two individuals vocally noted direct dissatisfaction with the adjunct faculty member role. Both of these individuals described career expectations that were unfulfilled. These adjunct faculty members were teaching for a number of years and believed that they were overlooked for full-time teaching opportunities.

In sum, a small portion of adjunct faculty members can be described as fully satisfied in their role. A separate small group can be described as completely

dissatisfied. The vast majority of adjunct faculty members appear to be partially satisfied. Common areas of satisfaction relate to student interaction, autonomy in designing and conducting classes, and compensation as related to adjunct faculty positions at other institutions. Common areas of dissatisfaction relate to opportunities for career progression, value by the administration, and compensation and/or status as related to full-time instructors.

How do adjunct faculty members teaching developmental courses in a community college perceive their responsibility toward student learning and academic success?

Six of the adjunct faculty members interviewed described a positive focus on student learning. These faculty members currently came from the altruist or job-focused groups, although one was categorized as "lost in the weeds." These six adjunct faculty members were able to describe the learning objectives of the English curriculum and noted how their classes should fit into the student learning sequence. In their descriptions, adjunct faculty members who were focused on student learning noted various methods that they used to engage students and impart learning objectives.

Seven adjunct faculty members described a moderate or neutral focus on student learning. These adjunct faculty members had varied reasons for teaching and included all strivers, two remaining job-focused individuals, two adjuncts "in the weeds," and one cynic. For these adjunct faculty members, focus was placed on concrete objectives such as class attendance; less emphasis was placed on the student curriculum or learning objectives.

The remaining five adjunct faculty members interviewed for this study noted little to no concern for student learning. The majority of these individuals were cynics and voiced dissatisfaction throughout their interview. These individuals did not feel an obligation to participate in student learning outside of required classroom activities.

In additional to stated intentions or attitudes, adjunct faculty members also described wide variations in the concrete effort that they put forward into their roles. Some adjunct faculty members noted that they make concrete efforts beyond their perception of the prescribed adjunct role to facilitate student learning. Others noted that they were hired solely to teach and would purposely dedicate minimal hours outside of the classroom. A third group noted that were limited in the amount of preparation that they could do outside of the classroom owing to other teaching assignments or their obligations outside of the MAUCC teaching role. Strivers and the job-focused adjuncts are likely to voice engagement and be willing to put forth additional effort, whereas cynics or those "lost in the weeds" were least likely to voice such willingness.

For adjunct faculty members teaching at more than one part-time job, the multiple roles had a discernible impact on their ability to teach within the context of MAUCC's learning objectives. Many believed that, when teaching at various schools, they were challenged in remembering and matching the set learning criteria at the individual school. Accordingly, the part-time nature of the adjunct faculty role often limited adjunct faculty member engagement. This limitation was voiced by adjunct faculty members regardless of stated levels of responsibility toward students.

In sum, adjunct faculty members varied in their focus on student learning and willingness to engage with students outside of their classroom environment. Job-focused adjuncts and altruists were most likely to engage with students, whereas cynics were least likely.

How do MAUCC adjunct faculty members describe their motivation within their current role?

Initial adjunct faculty member motivation can be viewed according to the adjuncts' reasons for accepting their adjunct faculty member role. Some adjunct faculty members came to this role directly from graduate school and saw the position as an entry to a full-time career. Other individuals came with their own life goals and viewed adjunct teaching as a way that they could participate in paid work while still allowing time for these external goals. A few individuals accepted the adjunct faculty role because they were seeking an opportunity to make a difference within an educational context. Finally, some individuals described a disruption of other employment and/or lack of concrete career goals for their future.

The above initial reason for teaching frequently changed for adjunct faculty members. For example, individuals who initially sought full-time opportunities often did not find these expectations realized. Accordingly, continued teaching might become over time motivated by financial need and/or lack of other opportunities.

Individuals with their "own goals" were most likely to continue to teach for the same reasons that they accepted the adjunct faculty member role. These individuals accepted the role with an expectation of ongoing part-time employment. Because the part-time teaching role continued to meet their initial expectations, these adjunct faculty members were able to maintain a consistent level of motivation.

When viewed along an extrinsic/intrinsic continuum, most interviewed adjunct faculty members described some level of external motivation. As the adjunct faculty role served as a method of financial support for most individuals, external motivation is an initial reason that many accept the adjunct faculty member role.

Levels of internal motivation could be found in interviews with altruistic adjunct faculty members. Individuals classified as "own goals" also described elements of intrinsic motivation. Adjunct faculty members who included intrinsic motivational factors in their reasons for teaching were most likely to note that they felt a high degree of responsibility toward student learning.

Perceptions of the organizational environment were viewed differently by adjunct faculty members, despite the presence of a similar adjunct faculty role. Some adjunct faculty members reported a supportive environment, whereas others believed that there was little to no support. Supportive measures in place at MAUCC, such as learning circles and classroom observations, were sometimes seen as helpful. Other times, the measures were not helpful owing to scheduling difficulties and/or perceptions of an unsupportive teaching circle. There did not appear to be any verifications of effectiveness or participation in activities such as support measures.

How does adjunct faculty member perceptions of satisfaction, instructional effectiveness, and motivation relate to personal background?

As noted in adjunct faculty member classifications, personal background has a direct impact on satisfaction, instructional effectiveness, and motivation. Individual reasons for teaching appear to have the most direct impact on individual adjunct faculty experiences, whereas adjunct faculty member demographics are less directly related.

In my research findings, I have classified adjunct faculty members according to their reasons for teaching. Individuals who are identified as "strivers" are typically extrinsically motivated through their future career aspirations. Strivers note satisfaction with their adjunct faculty member role but also note that they have an expectation of a future full-time role.

Although strivers aim for instructional effectiveness, many of them are unable to focus solely on their role at MAUCC. Strivers typically are working in multiple part-time roles to provide adequate financial support for themselves. As a result, there are frequently time limitations on each adjunct faculty role that strivers accept. Additionally, when strivers teach for multiple institutions, it is often difficult for these individuals to familiarize themselves with the needs of institution and apply institutional learning objectives.

When adjunct faculty members face unmet expectations in their role, they may be classified as cynics. Cynics are extrinsically motivated by the financial aspects of the role. They note that they complete required tasks in the position but do not place

additional effort into working to meet learning objectives for students. Some cynics voice dissatisfaction in the role. Although others state that they are partially satisfied with their position, their responses to related interview questions note a strong level of dissatisfaction.

Altruistic individuals, while often financially and extrinsically motivated, also voice an intrinsic motive for teaching. These altruists are attracted to the role by the possibility of having a positive educational impact on students. Altruists initially appear to be ideally suited for the adjunct faculty member role. However, altruists can become less motivated when their goals are not met and they do not have as great of an impact as they would like. As a result, altruists often note levels of dissatisfaction in their adjunct faculty role.

Individuals who teach for MAUCC but who have other personal roles that are important to their lives, are classified as job-focused. The job-focused adjunct faculty members were all clear in regard to the expectations of the adjunct role, and voiced the willingness to exert the effort that was needed to meet their goals in the classroom. These individuals can be classified with a primarily external motivation. However, these individuals show intrinsic motivation in their efforts to engage with students in regard to learning objectives. Job-focused individuals are likely to remain satisfied in their role. Job-focused adjuncts in this study also had a significant number of years of seniority in the role, with the majority noting more than 20 years each of experience.

Relationship of This Study to Prior Literature

As described in the literature review for this study, higher education has increasingly been using adjunct faculty members. The need for adjunct faculty members is part of the industry's organizational context and is fueled by trends such as financial pressures on higher education, tuition increase pressure, the business model of higher education, and increasing disaggregation of the faculty role. Within the community college environment, adjunct faculty members provide institutions with the majority of institutional staffing. To meet the needs of community colleges, adjunct faculty members will continue to be relied on to provide students with necessary instruction and support.

This study's literature review noted a significant need for developmental education within a community college setting. While more than half of students require developmental education, fewer than 25% of these students are able to complete their Associate's degree within a 2-year timeframe. Developmental education is an area of concern for community colleges and students, as well as governmental organizations providing financial support. Developmental classes are most commonly taught by adjunct faculty members, such as the individuals interviewed in this study. Accordingly, a study of the perceptions and motivations of these adjunct faculty members will provide additional information that can be used in review of these critical classes.

Prior research has been conducted in regard to categorization of adjunct faculty members. These categories were established more than 30 years ago. Recent literature has reviewed job satisfaction among adjunct faculty members and the impact of adjunct

faculty members on student learning outcomes. Most specifically, recent studies have found potential negative impacts when adjunct faculty members were used in introductory-level classes or "gatekeeper" classes.

Within the organizational context described above, this study was designed to expand on current studies of adjunct faculty members. By reviewing their satisfaction, role expectations, and descriptions of their responsibility toward student learning, this study attempts to describe the perceptions of adjunct faculty members regarding their roles. As a qualitative review, this study is able to examine these perspectives in detail.

Through an analysis of the interviews, this study has created a new categorization of adjunct faculty members. The study has also allowed a description of the adjunct faculty member experience within a developmental English department in one institution. This study adds to current literature by providing a detailed qualitative description of the motivations and expectations of adjunct faculty members teaching a vulnerable student population.

Limitations

This study was designed as qualitative research and required individual interviews with adjunct faculty members teaching developmental English at MAUCC. Owing to the nature of this research, there were a limited number of participants. Participants were limited to one institution and did not include representation from other programs at the institution. Accordingly, results from this study may not be generalized to other programs or institutions.

Interviews were all conducted during a 2-month period in Summer 2012. Responses during this time could be influenced by the organizational environment during this particular time period. Of particular note is the union contract at MAUCC. During the period, adjunct faculty members at MAUCC were working under the terms of an expired union contract. Union communications and/or a lack of progress in contract negotiations could have had an impact on individual faculty member responses.

As noted the categorization, individual adjunct faculty members varied in their responses to interview questions. Some individual adjunct faculty members closely fit the categorization, whereas others fit in some areas and could be seen as outliers in other areas.

Despite the above limitations, this study adds to our existing literature regarding the satisfaction and motivation of adjunct faculty members. This study provides an analysis of the perceptions and motivations of adjunct faculty members teaching developmental classes in a community college environment. The study establishes a categorical analysis that confirms and updates prior research, and provides a starting point for dialogue with this critical, yet often overlooked, group of faculty members.

Implications for Practice

The adjunct faculty members interviewed in this study voiced significantly different reasons for teaching. When initially hired, strivers noted that they were

seeking full-time teaching opportunities within a community college environment. However, individuals participating in the full-time hiring process noted that full-time faculty members typically possessed a doctorate degree and a significant amount of professional experience. To avoid dissatisfaction, administrators at MAUCC would be well-advised to provide job seekers with a realistic job preview in terms of role responsibilities and potential future career responsibilities. Although this job preview might discourage some potentially strong candidates, it could potentially provide a buffer against a workforce with long-term issues of disengagement. This implication is of special significance in a union environment that mandates continual class offerings to unionized adjunct faculty members.

As described in literature and interviews for this study, there are few formal processes in regard to adjunct faculty hiring at MAUCC. Individuals who were "lost in the weeds" and individuals with extensive obligations at multiple schools may not always be the strongest candidate for a vacant adjunct faculty position. A comprehensive adjunct faculty member hiring process could assist organizations such as MAUCC in hiring and selecting the best candidates for the adjunct faculty member role. Such a process would likely be initially time-consuming. However, this process would likely assist MAUCC in developing a strong talent pool and having less reason to resort to a last-minute hire.

Specifically during the selection process, MAUCC would be well-served to allow as much time as possible for applicant selection. One possibility would be the pre-selection of new adjunct faculty members in anticipation of future openings. Pre-

selection would allow MAUCC to advertise for its need, interview prospective applicants, and select candidates whose interest and expectations best match the organization and the role. A full selection process would allow MAUCC to find and hire strong candidates for each need that could arise.

Faculty diversity was noted as a concern by minority participants. Statistics for MAUCC confirm that the faculty members at the institution are far less diverse than the student population. A complete hiring and selection process would allow MAUCC to search for diverse candidates who are interested in opportunities at their institution.

If a selection process were developed as above, newly hired adjunct faculty members could experience additional time before their first class session. Accordingly, selected candidates would have time for course development. Orientation activities could also be provided to newly hired individuals.

As described by MAUCC administrators and study participants, there are no orientation activities. These activities are a crucial component to the onboarding of new adjunct faculty members. The newly hired should be given specific instruction regarding the college, their department, and programmatic learning objectives. Information in regard to teaching methods and expectations would be helpful to this group.

All adjunct faculty members described a high degree of autonomy in the role. Although this autonomy is likely an asset for experienced instructors, it appears that additional ongoing support would be beneficial for adjunct faculty members who are

just beginning in their role. Additional support would also assist in ensuring that all adjunct faculty members are working toward the same learning objectives and are engaged in student learning outcomes.

Initial and ongoing training appears to be needed regarding cultural sensitivity. As previously noted, adjunct faculty members at MAUCC are less demographically diverse than the students whom they teach. Some of the comments voiced by participants in this study show a lack of cultural sensitivity. It is essential that adjunct faculty members enter their classrooms with an ability to understand their students and interact appropriately. In addition to training, MAUCC should consider a monitoring mechanism to ensure that classroom environments do not experience discrimination or cultural bias.

As described by adjunct faculty members in this study, MAUCC showed several strengths in regard to providing a strong environment for its instructors and students:

- MAUCC requires new faculty to participate in "learning circles." Learning circles were designed by MAUCC as small groups composed of a combination of full-time and adjunct faculty members. The groups were charged with meeting on a periodic basis, discussing best practices for teaching, and providing a resource to each other for support and learning. All interviews noted that there was some classroom observation component, and that they were able to find helpful suggestions through their learning circles and classroom observations.

- Team grading was noted as an asset and support by several adjunct faculty members. According to these responses, team grading provided a way for them to assess their grading of a questionable assignment. Additionally, this support provided assistance in situations where they expected a student to contest their grading.
- Most adjunct faculty members described administrators as available when needed.
- Compensation, as related to other adjunct faculty positions, was seen favorably.

One noted area of concern – scheduling – would be a practical area of impact that MAUCC may wish to consider reviewing. All adjunct faculty members in this study noted scheduling as a concern and stated that class scheduling at MAUCC occurred significantly later than scheduling at other institutions. Scheduling delays could provide a barrier for MAUCC if valued instructors accept positions elsewhere and are unable to teach at MAUCC as needed. The delays also are cited as a reason for dissatisfaction among many. Improvement in this area may provide a significant benefit to MAUCC with little related cost.

Periodic follow-up is recommended between MAUCC administration and adjunct faculty members. The needs of adjunct faculty may vary as they experience changes in their lives and their career expectations. Follow-up from administrators could come in various forms, including increased classroom observation or individual outreach. By

keeping in touch with adjunct faculty members, MAUCC may be able to determine potential barriers that impact faculty engagement and effort toward students.

From a practical standpoint, institutions such as MAUCC are charged to provide evidence of positive student outcomes in a time of budgetary constraint. A practical reading of this research shows potential deficiencies where additional support is needed. There are also areas where resources are being provided, yet the impact of these resources is limited. MAUCC should consider a review of resources and work on providing those that will have the most impact. These resources should then be provided for adjunct faculty members and assessed for use and impact.

Given budgetary constraints, there will be resources that are requested yet cannot be offered. When there are gaps in resources, a clear communication to adjunct faculty members would serve to notate this gap and allow the adjunct faculty member to seek the resource elsewhere. For example, adjunct faculty members in this study often noted that students fail academically owing to a lack of social supports outside of the classroom. Although these supports will not generally be offered to students through the community college, adjunct faculty members could refer students to a support hotline or local resource that could assist. Such efforts in communication, although beyond the general responsibilities of the community college, could provide a motivational support for adjunct faculty members who are interested in providing support to their students.

Implications for Future Research

As noted in the section above, this study is limited to the one department in one community college. Accordingly, results may not be generalized to other departments and/or other institutions. Future research in different venues would serve to strengthen and/or disprove the results and categorizations obtained in this study. Qualitative research could be conducted in different programs within a community college environment. The phenomena could also be studied in different environment, such as private or public institutions.

A different method of research could seek to attract individuals who did not participate in this study. There were 18 participants in this study, from a prospective pool of more than 300 adjunct faculty members. Future research that is able to attract additional voices could serve to confirm the types found in this study. Such research could also find additional types that may exist in the adjunct faculty member population but did not participate in the study. Given the small sample of this study, a wide variety of response was found. It is worthwhile to determine whether there are additional experiences within the full population.

This study notes a potential connection between motivation and attitude toward student learning. Future research regarding this relationship would be beneficial. If these two factors are connected, efforts toward support of internal motivation could be of impact to institutions employing adjunct faculty members. Additionally, if a connection between these factors is established, institutions might want to consider

screening adjunct faculty member candidates regarding intrinsic motivational factors toward the adjunct faculty member role.

The qualitative research above is presented from a practical perspective and reviewed through the lens of organizational commitment. There are a number of other perspectives that could provide insight. In particular, a review of this phenomenon from a social justice perspective could address potential inequities in regard to student experience and/or adjunct faculty member use. This phenomenon could also be studied from the lens of motivational and/or identity theory.

There are various avenues for further research in regard to adjunct faculty member motivation and satisfaction. As this research is cross-sectional, there is no ability to describe adjunct faculty motivation over time. Future research could obtain such data and develop a flowchart of changes to adjunct faculty member type.

Research regarding methods of support and development for adjunct faculty would be particularly worthwhile at this time. With additional knowledge, support and development could be optimized for this group. If support and development could be linked to student outcomes, a budgetary argument could be made for such efforts in a time of financial constraint.

As noted above, this study has provided an analysis of the perceptions and motivations of adjunct faculty members who are currently teaching developmental English classes in a community college environment. Given the challenges of our educational institutions and the importance of developmental education, the teaching role of such adjunct faculty members must be optimized. Further research will continue to be needed in this area of higher education.

REFERENCES

Achieving the Dream (2005). College profiles. Retrieved November 16, 2010 from http://www.achievingthedream.org/ABOUTATD/COLLEGEPROFILES/PENNSYLVANIA/CCOFPHILADELPHIA/default.tp

Adams, C. (2010, September 15). Remediation demands stretching resources of community colleges. *Education Week*, *30*(3), 8-9.

American Association of Community Colleges. (2011). 2011 fact sheet. Retrieved October 2, 2011 from http://www.aacc.nche.edu/AboutCC/Documents/FactSheet2011.pdf

American Federation of Teachers. (2010, March). American academic: A national survey of part-time/adjunct faculty. Retrieved November 16, 2010 from http://www.aftface.org/storage/face/documents/aa_parttime_survey.pdf

American Federation of Teachers. (2011). Adjunct/visiting lecturer collective bargaining agreement. Retrieved November 25, 2011 from http://aft2026.org/ptvl06-11final.pdf

American Institute for Research. (2011, October). The hidden costs of community colleges. Retrieved November 13, 2011 from www.air.org

Bailey, T. (2009, Spring). Challenge and opportunity: Rethinking the role and function of developmental education in community college. *New Directions for Community Colleges, 145,* 11-30.

Bailey, T. (2003). Community colleges in the 21st century: Challenges and opportunities. *CCRC Brief.* New York, NY: Community College Research Center.

Bailey, T., Jenkins, D., & Leinbach, T. (2005, January). What we know about community college low-income and minority student outcomes: Descriptive statistics from national surveys. Retrieved online from http://www.eric.ed.gov/PDFS/ED484354.pdf

Bailey, T., Jeong, D., & Cho, S. (2010, September). Student progression through developmental sequences in community colleges. *Community College Resource Center,* 45.

Bailey, T., Leinbach, D., Scott, M., & Leinbach, T. (2004). The characteristics of occupational students in postsecondary education. *CCRC Brief No. 21.* New York, NY: Community College Research Center.

Bailey, T., & Weininger, E. (2002). Educating immigrants and native minorities in CUNY community colleges. *CCRC Brief No. 13.* New York, NY: Community College Research Center.

Beckford-Yanes, C. (2005). *How adjunct faculty's professional work experience affects the community college learning environment* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Colorado State University, Fort Collins, CO .

Brint, S. (2003). Few remaining dreams: Community colleges since 1985. Community colleges: New environments, new directions. San Francisco, CA: Sage.

Burke, R. (1988). *The new academic marketplace*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Burley, H. E., & Butner, B. K. (2000). Should student affairs offer remedial education? *Community College Journal of Research & Practice*, *24*(3), 193-205.

Calcagno, J., & Long, B. (2008). Evaluating the impact of remedial education in florida community colleges: A quasi-experimental regression discontinuity design. NCPR brief. National Center for Postsecondary Research. Retrieved December 30, 2011 from www.ERIC.ed.gov

Caplow, T., & McGee, R. (1958). *The academic marketplace*. New York, NY: Basic Books.

Carless, S. (2005). Person-job fit versus person-organization fit as predictors of organizational attraction and job acceptance intentions: A longitudinal study. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, *78*(3).

Cashwell, A. (2009). Factors affecting part-time faculty job satisfaction in the Colorado community college system (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Colorado State University, Fort Collins, CO .

Chalofsky, N. (2009). Meaningfulness, commitment, and engagement: The intersection of a deeper level of intrinsic motivation. *Advances in Developing Human Resources*, *11*(2), 189-203.

Cohen, A., & Brawer, F. (2008). *The American community college*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

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

Cornell, B., & Welch, I. (1996, June). Culture, information, and screening discrimination. *Journal of Political Economy, 104*(3), 542-571.

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

Eagan, K., & Jaeger, A. (2009, March). Effects of exposure to part-time faculty on community college transfer. *Research in Higher Education*, *50*(2), 168-188.

Ehrenberg, R.G., & Zhang, L. (2004). *Do tenured and tenure track faculty matter?* Cambridge, MA: National Bureau of Economic Research. NBER Working Paper No. W0695.

Etzioni, A. (1961). *A comparative analysis of complex organizations*. New York, NY: MacMillan Publishing.

Etzioni, A., & Lehman, E. (1980). *A sociological reader on complex organizations*. New York, NY: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Faculty and Staff Federation of the Community College of Philadelphia. (2006). Adjunct/visiting lecturer collective bargaining agreement 2006-2011. Retrieved November 16, 2010 from http://aft2026.org/ptvl06-11final.pdf

Feldman, D., & Turnley, W. (2004). Contingent employment in academic careers: Relative deprivation among adjunct faculty. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *64*(2), 284-307.

Fernandez, K. (2011, February/March). The revenue imperative. *Community College Journal, 81*(4), 26-29.

Flum, H., & Kaplan, A. (2006). Exploratory orientation as an educational goal. *Educational Psychologist*, *41*(2), 99-110.

Fowler, F. (2009). *Policy studies for educational leaders: An introduction.* Boston, MA: Pearson Education.

Fry, R. (2011, August 25). Hispanic college enrollment spikes, narrowing gaps with other groups. Retrieved from www.pewhispanic.org

Gallard, A., Albritton, F., & Morgan, M. (2010, Fall). A comprehensive cost/benefit model: Developmental student success impact. *Journal of Developmental Education*, *34*(1), 10-25.

Gappa, J., Austin, A., & Trice, A. (2007). *Rethinking faculty work*. San Francisco, CA: . Jossey-Bass

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

Gappa, J., & Leslie, D. (1997). *Two faculties or one? The conundrum of part-timers in a bifurcated work force.* Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.

Glaser, B., & Strauss, A. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory*. Chicago, IL: Aldine Publishing.

Glenn, D. (2008, April 4). Keep adjuncts away from intro courses, report says. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, *54*(30).

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

Green, K., Jaschik, S., & Lederman, D. (2011). Presidential perspectives: The 2011 inside higher ed survey of college and university presidents. *Inside Higher Ed,* retrieved on March 7, 2011 from www.insidehighered.com

Griffeth, R., Horn, P., & Gaertner, S. (2000). A meta-analysis of antecedents and correlates of employee turnover: Update, moderator tests, and research implications for the next millennium. *Journal of Management*, *26*(3), 463-488.

Grubb, W., & Associates (1999). *Honored but invisible: An inside look at teaching in community colleges.* New York, NY: Routledge.

Gullickson, L. (2011). *Herzberg's theory of motivation as applied to community college full-time and adjunct online faculty* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of South Dakota, Vermillion, SD.

Hacker, A., & Dreifus, C. (2010). *Higher education? How colleges are wasting our money and failing our kids – and what we can do about it*. New York, NY: Times Books.

Harrington, C., & Schibik, T. (2001). *Caveat emptor: Is there a relationship between part-time faculty utilization and student learning outcomes and retention?* Long Beach, CA: AIR Annual Paper Forum.

Harris, D. (1980). From the president's perspective: Using part-time faculty effectively. *New Directions for Community Colleges, 8*(13-16).

Harris-Pereles, K. (1997). *How the nature of the work relationship between the worker and the organization for which the work is being done affects work attitudes and behaviors: A comparison of traditional and contingent workers* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Temple University, Philadelphia, PA.

Ingram, W. (2004). *Economic development in the state community college system. Fifty state systems of community colleges*. Harrisburg, PA: Readiris.

Jacobs, F. (1998). Using part-time faculty more effectively. *New Directions for Higher Education*, *104*, 9-19.

Jaeger, A., & Eagan, K. (2009, January). Unintended consequences: Examining the effect of part-time faculty members on associate's degree completion. *Community College Review, 36*(3), 167-194.

Kristof-Brown, A., Zimmerman, R., & Johnson, E. (2005). Individuals fit at work: A meta-analysis of person-job, person-organization, person-group, and person-supervisor fit. *Personnel Psychology*, *58*(2).Kuchera, M., & Miller, S. (1988). The effects of perceptions of the academic job market on adjunct faculty: An identity-theory analysis. *Sociology of Education*, *61*(4), 240-254.

Landrum, R. (2009). Are there instructional differences between full-time and part-time faculty? *College Teaching, 57*(1), 23-26.

LeFevre Stephens, L. (2004). *Policy and organizational climate factors and their relationship to job satisfaction of adjunct/part-time faculty in north central Florida public community colleges* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Florida, Gainesville, FL.

Lei, S. (2008, Spring). Assessment techniques of instructors in two community colleges in a state-wide system. *Education*, *128*(3), 392-411.

Leslie, D. (1995). The part-time faculty advantage. *Metropolitan Universities, 6*(2).

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

Leslie, D., Lellams, S., & Gunne, G. (1982). *Part-time faculty in American higher education.* New York, NY: Praeger Publishing.

Lock, E. A., & Latham, G. P. (2002). Building a practically useful theory of goal setting and task motivation: A 25-year odyssey. *American Psychologist*, *57*, 705-717.

Maehr, M. L., & Zusho, A. (2009). Achievement goal theory: The past, present, and future. In K. R. Wentzel & A. Wigfield (Eds.), *Handbook of motivation at school* (pp. 77-104). New York, NY: Routledge.

Martorell, P., & McFarlan, I. (2011, May). Help or hindrance? The effects of college remediation on academic and labor market outcomes. *Review of Economics and Statistics*, *93*(2), 436-454.

Maslow, A. (1943). A theory of human motivation. *Psychological Review*, *50*, 370-396.

MAUCC. (1997). Beating the odds: Reasons for at-risk student success at the Community College of Philadelphia. Retrieved March 3, 2012 from http://www.MAUCC.edu/vpfin-pl/ir/ir_reports/ir_report_093.pdf

MAUCC. (2009-2010). College facts. Retrieved November 16, 2010 from www.MAUCC.edu/site/about/facts/php

MAUCC. (2012). College facts. Retrieved March 3, 2012 from http://www.MAUCC.edu/VPFIN-PL/ir/index.HTM

MAUCC. (2012). IPEDS human resources report. Retrieved September 30, 2012 from www.MAUCC.edu/VPFIN-PL/ir/IPEDS/humanresources.pdf

MAUCC. (2012, June). An analysis of early alert risk assessment in gatekeeper courses. Retrieved September 30, 2012 from www.MAUCC.edu/VPFIN-PL/ir/ir_reports/ir_report_229.pdf

Maxwell, J. (2005). *Qualitative research design: An interactive approach.* Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

Maynard, D. (2006, February). Are all part-time faculty underemployed? The influence of faculty status preference on satisfaction and commitment. *Higher Education*, *55*, 139-154.

Meece, J. L., Anderman, E. M., & Anderman, L. H. (2006). Classroom goal structure, student motivation, and academic achievement. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *57*, 487-503.

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

Merriam, S. (1998). *Qualitative research and case study applications in education.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Merriman, C. (2010). *Adjunct faculty organizational sense of belonging and affective organizational commitment* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Old Dominion University, Norfolk, VA.

Moss, B., & Yeaton, W. (2006). Shaping policies related to developmental education: An evaluation using regression-discontinuity design. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 28*(3), 215-229.

National Center for Education Statistics. (2002, March). Part-time instructional faculty and staff: Who they are, what they do, and what they think. Washington, DC: US Department of Education, NSPF, (93).

National Center for Educational Statistics. (2011, November 1). IPEDS data center for Community College of Philadelphia. Retrieved from http://nces.ed.gov/ipeds/datacenter/Snapshotx.aspx?unitId=adacb0adaeb4

National Commission on Excellence in Education (NCEE). (1983). *A nation at risk: The imperative educational reform* (Report No. 065-000-00177-2). Washington, DC: Government Printing.

NCSL Fiscal Affairs Program. (2010). State funding for higher education in FY 2009 and FY 2010. Retrieved from www.ncsl.org

Pearch, W., & Marutz, L. (2005). Retention of adjunct faculty in community colleges. *The Community College Enterprise, 11*(1), 29-44.

Pennsylvania Budget and Policy Center. (2012). Budget analysis: Governor's proposed 2011-2012 budget. Retrieved online from http://pennbpc.org/budget-analysis-governor%E2%80%99s-proposed-2011-12-budget

Pennsylvania Commission for Community Colleges. (2010). 2011 on campus. Retrieved online from www.pacommunitycolleges.org

Quinley, J., & Quinley, M. (2000). Four-year graduates attending community colleges as serious credit students. *CCRC Brief No. 10.* New York, NY: Community College Research Center.

Reeve, J. (2009). Why teachers adopt a controlling motivating style toward students and how they can become more autonomy supportive. *Educational Psychologist, 44*(3), 159-175.

Ronco, S. L., & Cahill, J. J. (2004). *Does it really matter who's in the classroom? Effect of instructor type on student retention, achievement and satisfaction*. Paper presented at Annual Forum for the Association for Institutional Research, Boston, MA, May 2004.

Roueche, J., Roueche, S., & Milliron, M. (1995). *Strangers in their own land: Part-time faculty in American community colleges*. Washington, DC: Community College Press.

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

Schmidt, P. (2011, November 18). Part-time faculty are catching up to full-timers in union representation. *Chronicle of Higher Education.* Retrieved November 25, 2011 from www.chronicle.com.

Schultheiss, O. C., & Brunstein, J. C. (2005). An implicit motive perspective on competence. In A. Elliott and C.S. Dweck (Eds), *Handbook of competence and motivation.* New York, NY: Guilford Press.

Schunk, D., & Pajares, F. (2004). Self-efficacy in education revisited: Empirical and applied evidence. In D.M. McInerney & S. Van Etten (Eds.), *Big theories revisited* (pp. 115-138). Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing.

Serban, A., & Burke, J. (2008). The impact of state budget cuts on public higher education 1990-96: The cuts are clear; the consequences are cloudy. AIR 1998 Annual Forum Paper. Unpublished manuscript.

Smith, D. G., Turner, C. S., Osei-Kofi, N., & Richards, S. (2004). Interrupting the usual: Successful strategies for hiring diverse faculty. *Journal of Higher Education, 75*(2), 133.

State of Pennsylvania, Governor's Budget Office. (2012). 2012-13 governor's executive budget. Retrieved March 22, 2012 from http://www.budget.state.pa.us/portal/server.pt/community/current_and_proposed_commonwealth_budgets/4566

Stickney, L. (2008). *Contingent workers and competitive position: The effect of contingent worker use on organizational performance* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Temple University, Philadelphia, PA.

Theis, R. (2003). *Mapping the geography: A narrative of long-term English adjunct teaching* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Indiana University of Pennsylvania, Indiana, PA.

Tuckman, B. (1979). Part-timers, sex discrimination and career choice at ca-year institutions: Further findings from the AAUP survey. *Academe, 66*(2), 71-76.

Tuckman, B. (1978). Who is part-time in academe? *AAUP Bulletin*, *65*, 305-315.

Umbach, P. (2006). How effective are they? Exploring the Impact of contingent faculty on undergraduate education. *The Review of Higher Education,* 30.2.

U.S. Census Bureau. (2011, June). School enrollment in the United States: 2008 population characteristics. Retrieved from http://www.eric.ed.gov/PDFS/ED520731.pdf

U.S. Department of Education. (2006). *Action plan for higher education: Improving accessibility, affordability, and accountability*. Washington, DC: National Center for Educational Statistics.

U.S. Department of Education. (2004). *National study of postsecondary faculty*. Washington, DC: National Center for Educational Statistics.

Wentzel, K. R. (2001). The contribution of social goal setting to children's school adjustment. In A. Wigfield & J. S. Eccles (Eds.), *Development of achievement motivation* (pp. 222-246). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Wigfield, A., Tonks, S., & Eccles, J. S. (2004). Expectancy value theory in cross-cultural perspective. In D. M. McInerney & S. Van Etten (Eds.), *Big theories revisited* (pp. 165-198). Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing.

Yin, R. (2009). *Case study research: Design and methods.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

APPENDIX A

INTERVIEW PROTOCOL

1. Thank you for meeting today. I would like to start by talking about what led you to MAUCC and to your adjunct faculty position at this time. Can you give me a bit of information about your background and what led you to this job at this time?

    a. Record gender of adjunct faculty member.

    b. Past education, past work experience, motivation (what led you to this job at this time), current work outside of MAUCC.

    c. Information on how individual found current position (hiring and selection process).

    d. Review longer-term career goals.

2. Expansion on current adjunct faculty member role.

    a. Review and reflect their perceptions on role.

    b. Ask for a little more information on areas that can be expanded.

    c. What is the college's expectation of you as an adjunct faculty member? What goals are assigned to you in your adjunct role?

3. Move into experiences at MAUCC as an adjunct faculty member – information.

    a. Number of classes taught.

    b. Times of year teaching.

    c. Type of class taught (remedial, major, introductory).

    d. Why have you decided to accept this position at this point in your career?

4. Discussion of students taught – what is faculty member's impression of the

students who are typically in his/her classes. Does the adjunct teach developmental students? What does the adjunct perceive as the difference in teaching developmental sessions as opposed to general English sessions?

5. How would you describe your current level of satisfaction with your adjunct faculty position at MAUCC? What would you say is working well in your department? What might not be working as well as you would like?

   a. If not addressed above, discuss conditions of employment – compensation, benefits.

   b. If not addressed above, discuss department communications and working conditions – office space, ability to participate in governance and functions.

   c. If not addressed above, discuss department expectations – curriculum, work expectations.

   d. If not addressed above, discuss interpersonal communications within department – with supervisor, administration, full-time faculty, other adjunct faculty members, department staff.

6. What academic supports are you aware of that are available to you? What supports do you find most helpful? Do you find that there are areas that you could use more support in?

7. Do you perceive that you are able to meet the goals that are set in this role? If so, how do you do so? If not, what factors interfere in the ability to meet your goals?

8. Do you feel valued as an adjunct faculty member at MAUCC?

9. Can you tell me a story where you felt strong job satisfaction in your position at

MAUCC? Is there a story where you felt discouragement?

10. How long do you expect to work in your current role? Are there supports or employment conditions that, if changed, would entice you to stay longer than you currently expect?

11. What conditions exist that support your continued work at MAUCC? What helps in your daily experience?

12. What are the costs of this job?

13. When do you feel successful in your role as an adjunct faculty at MAUCC? What are your strengths and weaknesses in this position?

14. Is there anything that I forgot to ask you about?

15. Contact information if anything else.

APPENDIX B

INVITATION SENT TO ADJUNCT FACULTY MEMBER LISTSERV

To adjunct members of the English Department:

The following is a message from a doctoral student in Educational Administration at Temple University, Joanne Zeas, who is researching the motivations and experiences of adjunct instructors in English at community colleges. Her project has been approved by her dissertation committee at Temple and cleared by the Office of Academic Affairs as within the Mission of the College.

Participation in Ms. Zeas' research is purely voluntary and anonymous. The College and the Department neither encourage nor discourage your working with Ms. Zeas.

If you have any questions, please let email me directly at (XXXXX)@MAUCC.edu.

Assoc. Dept. Chair, English

_____

Dear Adjunct Faculty Member,

My name is Joanne Zeas, and I am a doctoral student at Temple University. I am completing a dissertation that focuses on adjunct faculty members who teach English at a community college. I would very much appreciate your help in my understanding of your important role.

During the summer, I would like to meet with you to discuss your experiences as an adjunct faculty member at MAUCC. I am hoping to obtain your perspective about your reasons for teaching and current perceptions of your role.

I can schedule to meet you at a time that is convenient to your schedule. Interviews will be confidential, and will be recorded anonymously. A $10 Amazon gift card will be provided in appreciation of your participation. The interview should take no more than one hour of your time, and will not require any additional time or participation.

I do not have any information in advance by which to contact you directly. Therefore, I ask that you reach me at (215) 962-0516 or joanne.zeas@temple.edu to participate.

Thank you for your time and consideration. I look forward to meeting with you!

-- Joanne Zeas