

INFORMATION TO USERS

This reproduction was made from a copy of a manuscript sent to us for publication and microfilming. While the most advanced technology has been used to photograph and reproduce this manuscript, the quality of the reproduction is heavily dependent upon the quality of the material submitted. Pages in any manuscript may have indistinct print. In all cases the best available copy has been filmed.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help clarify notations which may appear on this reproduction.

1. Manuscripts may not always be complete. When it is not possible to obtain missing pages, a note appears to indicate this.
2. When copyrighted materials are removed from the manuscript, a note appears to indicate this.
3. Oversize materials (maps, drawings, and charts) are photographed by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. Each oversize page is also filmed as one exposure and is available, for an additional charge, as a standard 35mm slide or in black and white paper format.*
4. Most photographs reproduce acceptably on positive microfilm or microfiche but lack clarity on xerographic copies made from the microfilm. For an additional charge, all photographs are available in black and white standard 35mm slide format.*

*For more information about black and white slides or enlarged paper reproductions, please contact the Dissertations Customer Services Department.

U·M·I Dissertation
Information Service

University Microfilms International
A Bell & Howell Information Company
300 N. Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106



8618249

Cannon, Morris Clinton

**BIOGRAPHICAL DATA AS A PREDICTOR OF SUCCESS IN TEACHING
BUSINESS AND PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION**

United States International University

PH.D. 1986

**University
Microfilms
International** 300 N. Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106

Copyright 1986

by

Cannon, Morris Clinton

All Rights Reserved



BIOGRAPHICAL DATA AS A PREDICTOR OF SUCCESS IN
TEACHING BUSINESS AND PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

A Dissertation
Presented to the
Graduate Faculty of the
School of Human Behavior
United States International University

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
in Management and Organizational Development

by
Morris Clinton Cannon
San Diego, 1986

BIOGRAPHICAL DATA AS A PREDICTOR OF SUCCESS IN
TEACHING BUSINESS AND PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

A Dissertation
Presented to the
Graduate Faculty of the
School of Human Behavior
United States International University

by
Morris Clinton Cannon

Approved by:

Henry M. Reitan March 31, 1986
Henry M. Reitan, Chairperson Date

Robert L. Hollister
Robert L. Hollister

Robert H. Lauer
Robert H. Lauer, Dean

Robert D. Waldo
Robert D. Waldo

© 1986

MORRIS CLINTON CANNON

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

In this study, as in all human endeavor, many individuals were involved, not just one. I would like to acknowledge some of those who provided the inspiration, guidance, and support that made this study possible.

First, my chairman, Dr. Henry M. Reitan, offered many suggestions and much help as the study progressed and never lost his faith in me through the long period of this study.

Next are my committee members, Dr. Robert L. Hollister, who was instrumental in my entering a doctoral program, and Dr. Robert D. Waldo, who helped me in my early university teaching experiences. Both stood beside me.

Dr. Frank N. Peterson and Professor Roy J. Polley spent hours with me in discussing this study, sharing their experiences, offering encouragement, and guiding me in my academic pursuits.

Dr. William C. Orthman inspired and advised me during all of my graduate study and preparation for my career in education.

Without the help of several liberal arts and business universities, this study could not have been conducted.

I must express my gratitude to Louise Cannon, my late wife, who was my companion for thirty years and aided in the inception of this study, and to Ruth Cannon, my current

wife, for her patience, understanding, and critical review during its completion.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	x
Chapter	
1. Introduction	1
Background of the Problem	3
Statement of the Problem	5
Purpose of the Study	7
Hypotheses	7
Definitions	9
Delimiting Factors	12
Importance of the Study	13
2. Review of the Literature	15
Employee Selection	15
Use of Biographical Data	21
The College Teaching Environment	32
The College Adjunct	34
Evaluation Procedures	37
Evaluation of Educators	39
Summary	40
3. Methodology	44
Conduct of the Study	45
Operational Hypotheses	46
Subjects	47

Chapter	Page
Biographical Instrumentation	49
Rating Instruments	51
Administration Evaluation	52
Student Evaluation	53
Self-Evaluation	55
Procedures	55
The Responding Adjuncts	57
Respondents Versus Non-Respondents	57
Demographic Description	60
Analysis	62
Descriptive	63
Summary	64
4. Results	66
Teaching Experience	78
Educational Background	81
Publishing	89
Motivation	90
Professional Experiences	92
Stress	97
Military Service	99
Reading	101
Membership and Participation	104
Political Activity	106
Vacation Planning	110

Chapter	Page
Personal Data	111
Test of the Hypotheses	117
5. Summary, Interpretations, Conclusions, and Recommendations	123
Summary	123
Interpretations	128
Teaching Experience	129
Educational Background	129
Publishing	130
Professional Experiences	131
Stress	131
Military Service	132
Membership and Participation	132
Commuting Distance	133
Time Living in the Puget Sound Area	133
Other Factors	133
Conclusions	134
Recommendations	139
REFERENCES	145
APPENDICES	
A. QUESTIONNAIRE	155
B. COVER AND FOLLOW-UP LETTERS	168
C. STUDENT EVALUATION FORM	171
D. ADMINISTRATION RATINGS OF ADJUNCT FACULTY COMPARED TO STUDENT AND SELF	174

Appendix	Page
E. STUDENT RATINGS OF ADJUNCT FACULTY COMPARED TO ADMINISTRATION AND SELF	178
F. SELF-EVALUATIONS OF ADJUNCT FACULTY COMPARED TO ADMINISTRATION AND STUDENTS	182

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Rating Distribution of Adjuncts	60
2. Age of Adjuncts	61
3. Education of Adjuncts	61
4. Teaching Experiences of Adjuncts	62
5. Distribution of Responses to Questions Showing Distribution by Rating, Category, and Chi-Square Significance	69
6. Sources of Degrees Held by Adjuncts	83
7. Comparison of Business and Economics Degrees Held by Adjuncts	85
8. Comparison of Business and Non-Business Degrees of Adjuncts	86
9. Types of Doctoral Degrees Held by Adjuncts	87
10. Professional Fields of Adjunct Faculty	93
11. Adjuncts' Normal Areas of Employment	94
12. Adjunct Reading Patterns	103
13. Adjuncts' Patterns of Voting in Elections	108
14. Political Activity of Adjuncts	109
15. Discriminations Between Highly Successful and Average Adjuncts	119

CHAPTER ONE

Introduction

The increased demand for individuals who possess advanced degrees in business and public administration within the business and public sectors of our economy during the 1970s and 1980s has led to an expansion in those programs. Universities have expanded their operations to award the degrees of MBA (Master of Business Administration) or MPA (Master of Public Administration). This expansion coincides with a time when some liberal arts areas of higher education are contracting in enrollment and in faculty. The post-World War II baby boom is passing the normal college age, and governmental bodies, strapped for financial resources, are reducing funds available for higher education. The rapid post-World War II expansion of institutions of higher learning has passed its zenith; colleges and universities are forced to seek alternate sources of enrollment (e.g., new programs, non-traditional students) or retrench.

Much of the new demand has been for evening and weekend study for non-traditional students, forcing the existing full-time faculty into split teaching and administrative schedules in diverse locations or the addition of new faculty members, either full or part time, to meet the

expanded educational offerings within the high-demand areas. Part-time faculty have been used to teach an increasing number of courses (Washington State Board of Community College Education, 1984).

The campus unrest of the 1960s brought changes in courses offered, and now colleges and universities are finding themselves with an imbalance of faculty to meet the expanding MBA and MPA requirements and have restricted program enrollment. Other colleges and universities were reluctant to expand business faculty to fully staff their business and public administration programs and turned to part-time faculty as one of the solutions to the problem. If the quality of education is to continue at a high level, these part-time educators must be of high caliber not only professionally but also with the ability to teach in the classroom situation.

Beatty and Schneier (1977) reported that biographical data have been used as a predictor of success. Goldsmith (1922) noted a positive relationship between personal history and an applicant's future success. Perin (1981) found biographical data to be beneficial in predicting success in international assignments. Perhaps biographical data may be used as a predictor of success to aid colleges and universities in the selection of adjunct or part-time faculty

and as an aid in maintaining high quality education in the fields of business and public administration.

The purpose of this study was to explore elements of biographical data which might predict success in the obtaining of high-quality adjunct faculty to teach in the fields of business and public administration.

Background of the Problem

To meet the increased student demand for education in business and public administration during the 1970s, schools attempted to increase available teaching personnel pools. It was difficult to transfer academicians from one discipline to another and apply this surplus to the teaching of business and public administration. Universities sought to provide cross-training for interested faculty members for careers in business (F. Peterson, 1980).

Universities, in expanding their business programs, also turned to adjunct or part-time teachers who had proven themselves in the business, economic, and political systems. Who seemed better able to teach a course in advanced accounting than a practicing accountant, or a tax course than a tax consultant? The manager of a small business might share his knowledge of organizational problems with students who could then offer new insights to him. A member of the state or local government might offer practical

experiences in budgeting. The additional stipend offered these professionals, the stimulation of working with students, or the concept of trying a new field of endeavor provided motivation for these persons to teach in addition to their normal positions.

Further, many schools instituted the night and weekend format because such schedules were more in agreement with the available time of these busy practitioners and students than the normal daytime class.

In addition to those actively pursuing careers in the business or public world, there are many who have retired from day-to-day operations. Some could no longer physically meet the strenuous daily schedule. Some were past mandatory retirement ages established by their professions or by law, for example, certain federal government workers who, because of the strenuous physical requirements of their professions, are required to leave them at an early age. These individuals have some of the same motivational drives as found in those currently working. In addition, the thought of continued usefulness can be a driving force.

Some of these professionals possess advanced degrees. One source of education for them was night school for basic or advanced degrees. In some cases, their employers sent them as full-time students to academic as well as to special or technical courses.

These professionals often have spent time teaching their subordinates and fellow workers on the job or in formal training situations. For example, military retirees have spent most of their lives teaching and advising. They have also had special training in teaching methods and have attended a series of formal schools interspersed with their normal assignments.

The use of adjuncts or part-time faculty, then, seems to be a benefit to both the university and the adjunct. The university is not committed to long-term tenure decisions, to revising the permanent composition of its faculty, or to the outlay of funds to support additional full-time faculty. Part-time faculty are able to teach a few classes as well as to pursue their own primary career obligations.

Statement of the Problem

It is not enough to possess academic credentials or to be motivated to teach, important as these factors are. The part-time faculty member must possess the ability to teach. Most part-time faculty members are selected on the basis of a resumé and a face-to-face interview. The resumé contains that information which the applicant wishes to display to the prospective hiring institution. The interview is the least scientific and least objective of any

selection technique, but is the most widely used selection technique, and may be the most important one, more important than the resumé in the decision to hire or not hire (Beatty and Schneier, 1977).

If adjuncts are not successful in their teaching endeavors, all suffer--the adjunct, the university, and the student, who has invested not only money but also time and energy in the course. The use of a series of unsuccessful adjuncts leads to declining enrollments and a tarnished image of the institution (Peterson, 1983; Polley, 1982; Wiegman, 1982).

Since one local university uses over 250 adjuncts in the course of each year, selection becomes even more important to the success of its program. Therefore, it appears that a valid predictor of success would be beneficial to all.

England (1971) reported that biographical data could be investigated and elements assigned weights according to their contribution to success in a new endeavor. Biographical data, when properly weighted and evaluated, may provide the information necessary to successfully select part-time faculty members.

Purpose of the Study

It was the intent of this study to examine whether biographical data, when properly weighted and evaluated, may provide the information necessary to successfully select part-time faculty members. By comparing those adjuncts who were successful part-time faculty members with those who were less successful, the study sought to identify those biographical data which predict success in the teaching of business and public administration courses by adjunct or part-time faculty at the college level.

Generally, resumés and transcripts are required to be provided by an applicant teacher, but little additional data is requested. This study assumed that more data than are normally included in a resumé are necessary to be used by an educational institution to establish a basis for the selection of successful adjunct or part-time faculty members.

Hypotheses

The concept underlying this study was that what a person does in the future is associated with what that person has done in the past. England (1961, 1971) concluded that biographical data provide an insight into past experiences and choices, and those experiences could predict future behavior. A review of the literature also indicated that

generally, within any group, there were two sub-groups, those of higher performance and those of lower performance. For this study, these groups were defined as highly successful and average and below in a college teaching situation. From this dichotomy, the following hypothesis was developed:

H: There are significant differences in biographical data between those adjunct faculty members who were rated as highly successful and those who were rated average or below.

In order to examine this hypothesis, two further steps were required. Biographical data had to be restated and examined as past experiences. Elements such as educational background, teaching, publishing, professional development, and general life experiences needed to be examined. In addition, an evaluation system had to be accepted. In this study, three different evaluations of the adjunct faculty were utilized. This restatement and these evaluations caused three sub-hypotheses to be developed:

H₁: There will be significant differences in past experiences between those adjunct faculty members who were rated by the academic administration as highly successful when compared with those who were rated average.

H₂: There will be significant differences in past experiences between those adjunct faculty members who were

rated by the students in their classes as highly successful when compared with those who were rated average.

H₃: There will be significant differences in past experiences between those adjunct faculty members who rated themselves as highly successful when compared with those who rated themselves as average.

These experiences or data elements were factored into discrete segments or categories and each sub-hypothesis accepted or rejected for each segment. In addition, comparisons were made between the ratings given by the administration, the students, and the adjuncts.

The hypotheses suggested an additional research task for this study: In addition, relationships among the three evaluation variables will be analyzed and areas where agreement or disagreement exists in significant relationships between certain biographical variables and the three evaluations will be explored.

Definitions

Key terms in this study are defined as follows:

Full-time faculty: all ranks of instructors and tenure track faculty members whose duties were teaching the equivalent of 12 semester hours per term or 24 semester hours per academic year.

Part-time faculty: all individuals who were teaching in a university educational program other than full-time faculty. These individuals were hired on a contractual basis to teach a specific course at a specific location at a specific time; an adjunct faculty member.

Adjunct: a part-time faculty member.

Supervisory personnel: the Director of Continuing Education and his primary subordinates involved in the academic content of the program, coordinators at each off-campus location, the Director of Graduate Studies, the Director and professors of the School of Business and Public Administration directly involved in the administration of the off-campus programs, and personnel in comparable positions at other institutions.

Administrators: non-teaching individuals who were directly responsible to the Director of Continuing Education and reported to him for the educational content and the administration of the off-campus program at a specific location or locations.

Highly successful: adjunct faculty members considered to be outstanding or excellent through ratings by the administration, their students, or in a self-evaluation.

Average: all other adjunct faculty in the study.

Administrative rating: adjectival ratings of the adjunct faculty by the administrators of the program.

Ratings were outstanding (5), excellent (4), good (3), fair (2), or poor (1).

Self-evaluation: adjectival self-rating of the adjunct faculty given to themselves through one of the questions in the questionnaire. Ratings were outstanding (1), excellent (2), good (3, 4, or 5--three levels), poor (6), or unsatisfactory (7).

Student evaluation: numerical ratings of the faculty by the students, utilizing the standard Student Rating of Instructor and Course form used in the off-campus program. Actual rating scores used in this study were an average of six selected elements from this form and represented those elements directly related to duties of a classroom instructor. Ratings were on a scale from 5, superior, to 1, poor, with no other numerical values given.

Biographical data: Specific items within an individual's background including, but not limited to, the following: age, sex, education, teaching experience, employment experiences, military experiences, other experiences, motivation, stress exposure, and political activity; in other words, information which could be recorded and analyzed without any classification as to right or wrong.

Delimiting Factors

This study dealt only with success in teaching business and public administration courses in the off-campus program of a private university. This university was selected because it had a large MBA off-campus program utilizing adjunct or part-time faculty and was willing to cooperate in the study. No examination was made of the on-campus program, since one of the basic documents to be used in determining success (the student evaluation form) was not used on the main campus (a different and more subjective evaluation was used on the main campus). Also, only a very small number of part-time faculty were utilized in the program. Since all on-campus part-time business faculty were determined by the Director to be satisfactory, only check data from the questionnaires were analyzed with the self-analysis of success. No attempt was made to examine other programs of the university.

Data were obtained during the Winter term of 1983. Administrative and student evaluations were provided through an office on the campus. Questionnaires were mailed to all adjuncts on a list provided by the university. No follow-up or face-to-face interviews with the faculty were permitted by the university.

Importance of the Study

Turnover of personnel is a cost of any employment function. The importance of personnel turnover was stressed by Acuff (1982:121):

Two areas of human concern--employee productivity and turnover--illustrate the employment function in financial terms. . . . The objective of the recruitment function, of course, is to find and hire the high producer consistently. Most programs to reduce and control turnover should start with improvements in the recruiting and selection process.

The financial aspects of employee turnover have long been stressed. There is an additional factor in turnover, and that is time lag from the time a new employee is hired until he is operating at high efficiency. It takes time for a new adjunct to become familiar, not only with his material, but with the students, administration, and the faculty. Until this familiarity has been achieved, the students and the institution are penalized.

In the process of educating individuals, poor faculty selection techniques are revealed in dissatisfied students and students who do not receive the proper guidance in their studies. Dissatisfied students discourage prospective new students from entering the programs. Poor selection techniques also lead to faculty turnover as unsatisfactory adjuncts are replaced with new adjuncts. The best way

to reduce turnover within the organization appears to be to improve the selection process.

Emphasis has long been placed on the academic qualifications of faculty members. While not eliminating academic qualifications, this study concentrated on several representative elements in the adjuncts' backgrounds, including academic qualifications, to aid in the selection of highly qualified part-time or adjunct faculty members.

CHAPTER TWO

Review of the Literature

The review of the literature on the subject of biographical data and college faculty was conducted to assist in the identification of factors and skills which are relevant to part-time teaching. This chapter presents a review of the use of biographical data in the selection process, some specific aspects of teaching at the college and university level including the use of adjunct or part-time faculty, and evaluation procedures. Special attention is given to literature on the successes and failures that relate biographical data to future high performance in several given fields of endeavor. Additional attention is given to the needs of higher education for quality faculty members, those who have the ability to teach, in the 1980s and 1990s. This chapter examines the employee selection process, the use of biographical data, the college teaching environment, the college adjunct or part-time faculty member, and evaluation procedures.

Employee Selection

In today's complex society, traditional selection techniques are proving inadequate. The cost to society and to individuals when selection procedures lead to errors in

selection is high (Beason and Belt, 1974). Employee turnover has been cited as one of the reasons that U.S. industry has not kept pace with foreign industry. Little effort has been made to determine the financial impact of employee turnover, but the cost is estimated to be high (Schuler, 1984). In education, the cost of poor teaching employees is not only measured by a lack of revenue to the institution but also, more importantly, in poor instruction of students, disgruntled students, and a reputation as a low-level educational institution (Nicholson, 1982; Peterson, 1986; Tucker, 1985). Since costs surrounding the selection of the wrong individual are high, as are the costs of turnover, all organizations need to select the right individual for the position.

In the 1920s, standard selection techniques were based primarily on letters of application, submission of a photograph, letters of recommendation, and an interview. These methods were a step ahead of selection by chance, but only slightly (England, 1971).

In today's world, the resumé has become a major tool in the selection process. Resumés contain information which the applicant would like the organization to know. The applicant puts forth his case as impressively as possible. Since the applicant is in control, he can put forth his qualifications to his advantage. He stresses the

strong points and makes no reference to the weak or derogatory ones. Letters of recommendation have limitations because they also furnish data which the applicant would like the new organization to know; they tend to withhold uncomplimentary information, and they are selective in the information presented. Such letters come from those selected by the applicant to present those qualifications favorable to him. These factors are understandable, since the applicant desires certain actions, but they may preclude the selection of the best applicant (Beatty and Schneier, 1977). In addition, Nash and Carroll (1970) reported no consistent or sizeable relationship between present job success and a check of references, with most correlations near zero.

The interview has been the most widely used technique to select employees. Few have been hired without at least one interview. Interviewers may have introduced their own personal biases into the situation, and therefore, the interview may be subjective and suspect. Interviews have been susceptible to errors because they rely to a great extent on human judgment. Examples of such errors include overemphasis on negative information or establishment of a halo effect around the applicant, similarity of characteristics and backgrounds of the interviewer and the interviewee, or even the nonverbal aspects of the interview

(Beatty and Schneier, 1977). Goldstein (1971) reported that studies have questioned the accuracy of data collected in the interview. He showed that data can also be hidden in an interview, since there is great pressure on the applicant to obtain the position.

Application blanks have been used to obtain data pertaining to prospective employees (Beatty and Schneier, 1977). Hershey (1971) pointed out that this first contact with job prospects could be utilized to improve the data collected. In one of the most complete studies on selection, Guion (1976) stated that personnel history questionnaires can be collected at the time of hiring.

Verification of reference data has frequently been difficult. The costs to verify data from the applicant's background have been expensive and often not undertaken (Beason and Belt, 1974). There have been legal complications in the collection and use of information about current and prospective employees. The Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) laws raised legal issues surrounding pre-employment testing, applications, interviews, and all other selection techniques (Higgins, 1976; Minter, 1972). There is a need to search for better ways of selection to predict success but which stay within the current legal framework (Mobley, 1974).

Clarke (1972) reported that objective selection techniques are now available. Industrial psychology has added new vistas to personnel selection through the use of psychological measures to predict job performance prior to hiring (Korman, 1971). Successful selection and promotion of individuals requires prediction of performance. Past performance and past behavior are important considerations, but isolating those factors which predict successful performance is crucial (Thompson, 1970). Testing as a selection technique has been criticized by the Supreme Court as being discriminatory and its use is now limited (Buel, 1972). Assessment centers offer much in the prediction of success in employment but are expensive (Beatty and Schneier, 1977). Their nature and costs, however, lead to the conclusion that they have limited, current applicability to the selection of adjunct faculty members. Improvements in the interview, the application blank, and the obtaining of references have been introduced. Employers have also increased their understanding of the complex procedures of selection (England, 1961, 1971).

Legal issues are entering the selection process (Beason and Belt, 1974; Mobley, 1974). Beason and Belt stressed the costs of selecting the wrong individual and also the possibility of legal actions arising from charges of illegal discrimination in the selection process under

EEO. Mobley reported that rulings under the Civil Rights Act and subsequent guidelines have held that testing is a legal method of employee selection but that the tests have to be shown to be related to job performance. Higgins (1976) showed that compliance with the equal employment opportunity laws was an involved process. Ledvinka (1977) demonstrated that the EEO laws did not directly prohibit employers from seeking any specific information, but that authorities at the state and federal levels looked at certain types of inquiries with suspicion. Mobley (1974) challenged those involved in the selection process to continue to search for valid predictors of success and also to better utilize their own personnel resources.

A new look at the hiring procedure is required, according to Clarke (1972). Clarke suggested that since today's employer is faced with more complex operations, and since new employee selection techniques are needed to match employees to jobs, the development of objective selection techniques that have acceptable validity needs to be examined.

Success in the university environment has been the object of several studies. Calhoon and Reddy (1968) reported extensive studies to predict success for college students. Of 15 studies of grades, four showed correlation, four some correlation, and seven no correlation. In

eight studies of participation in extracurricular activities, five showed correlation, while three did not. Other studies of athletic participation, employment while in college, and college majors showed similar erratic correlations.

The review of literature revealed that current selection techniques are no longer satisfactory. Faculty have been open to employment by chance with little predictability of success. Current procedures are open to question under current legislation pertaining to EEO. New techniques should be found.

Use of Biographical Data

Attempts to use biographical data as a predictor of success are not new. Studies by Goldsmith (1922) in the use of a personal history blank to predict success of salesmen showed a positive relationship to the future success in hiring of salesmen. Goldsmith attempted to score the personal history section of an application used to hire salesmen. The scoring had to accomplish two functions, namely, eliminate failures while not eliminating successes. The study, which included 502 personal history blanks, examined nine significant items in the applicant's background: age, education, occupation, marital status, insurance carried, full or part-time work sought, clubs to which the applicant

belonged, confidence, and life insurance experience. Goldsmith concluded that a positive relationship existed between background information of an applicant and success in employment by a life insurance company.

In one of the most comprehensive studies of biographical data, England (1961, 1971) showed that one of the best predictors of how one will behave in the future is how one has behaved in the past. Aspects of an applicant's total background should be related to whether he or she will be successful in a specific position. England found a wide variety of items to be predictive of success in differing types of jobs. In the 1971 study, he examined personal history items in several categories: personal, including age, marital status, dependents, residence, sex; general background--occupation of parents, military service, family adjustments and successes, and employment of spouse; education--self and wife, type, courses taken and liked, levels of education, and grades; employment experiences--type, tenure, reasons for termination, salary, and number of jobs; skills--number and types of machines operated, ability to read blueprints, ability to repair own car, and training; socioeconomic level--financial status, responsibility, number of creditors, number of accounts, debts and the amount of loans in relation to income, intrinsic possessions, and expected earnings; social--club memberships and

offices held and church membership; interests--hobbies, sports, and most important source of entertainment; personal characteristics--willingness to relocate, confidence, basic personality needs, and job preferences; and miscellaneous, availability source of references, and number of references. England concluded that from these data elements a weighted application blank could be prepared which would enhance the selection process.

Also of significant importance is the work of Owens (1976). Owens examined a series of studies on the use of biodata (biographical data) in a number of situations. His study of the use of background data showed that biographical data may be better accepted than other psychological selection procedures. He pointed out that "what a man will do in the future is what he has done in the past" (Owens, 1976:625). He examined many studies in the use of biographical data and concluded that the studies were reliable and valid and that biographical data may be a way to validate other selection methods to ensure compliance with non-discriminatory legislation and even aid in assigning people to work groups. His conclusion was that biographical data offer great promise in the field of personnel actions.

The military services have had considerable success when incorporating biographical data in their selection

techniques during World War II and in subsequent selection processes (Owens, 1976). Average validities of 0.35 to 0.40 were reported by the Air Force in predicting success in training of student pilots. Studies of background data in the Israeli army showed positive correlations for success as measured by rank attainment (Nevo, 1976). Data from the Israeli Biographical Information Inventory were used to predict military success for 390 male and 524 female soldiers. Military rank was chosen as the criterion for success. Thirteen variables were used. Significance at the .01 level was reported.

Albright and Glennon (1961) found 43 personal history items which differentiated employed petroleum research scientists who were desirous of advancing in the supervisory hierarchy from those who were content with nonsupervisory positions. The Strong Vocational Interest Blank as used with 484 items covering various background topics to 141 employed petroleum research scientists. After refinement, the group was narrowed to 130 individuals who were hired after World War II. Significance was noted at the .05 level. Albright and Glennon concluded that items in the personal history of individuals which discriminated at the entry level would continue to discriminate as individuals moved up the organizational ladder.

Similar results were shown in a study of 157 pharmaceutical scientists from a 160-item biographical inventory (Tucker, Cline, and Schmitt, 1967). Several biographical characteristics were identified which were predictive of performance. Cross validities of .36 and .42 were obtained in the prediction of creativity. A study of 354 NASA scientists again showed that the biographical approach had significant results in identifying scientific talent (Taylor and Ellison, 1967). The original instrument contained 300 multiple choice items but was modified as it was used in various NASA locations. Cross validities of .41 to .49 were achieved in the creativity sections. Tucker, Cline, and Schmitt concluded that significant results were demonstrated in the identification of scientific talent in a variety of situations.

Studies of 132 male research personnel showed 50 out of 118 items in a biographical history to be significant in identifying creative research personnel (Buel, 1965), while seven criteria cross-validated at levels beyond .40 in a study of 333 working physicians (Loughmiller et al., 1973).

In an effort toward the better utilization of engineers and prevention of job shifting, Klimoski (1973) found that a biographical data bank helped define basic career patterns in engineers holding research and development, management, and non-engineering positions. Life experiences

of students and other background data showed a pattern leading to an interest in engineering (Kulberg and Owens, 1960). Kulberg and Owens studied 111 mechanical engineering freshmen at Iowa State College using the Strong Vocational Interest Blank. Ninety-four percent of the students were found to have had common biographical backgrounds. Seven individual characteristics and six characteristics of their parents were reported to be significant. The 252 response options yielded 756 correlations ranging from +.22 to -.35. Eighteen of these were significant at the .01 level and 64 at the .05 level.

Not all of the studies reviewed were in the fields of scientific activity. Biographic data were found to be a superior predictor of future work behavior as measured by the length of employment in tests of female clerical personnel in a medium-sized insurance firm (Cascio, 1976). The application blanks of 160 employees, 80 minority and 80 non-minority, divided into long and short term tenure, were examined. Sixteen items were selected that previous research had indicated were valid predictors of success. Ten of these items survived item analysis with validation scores of +10 to -29. The mean scores for the short-tenure groups were -10.8 for the minority group and -10.5 for the non-minority group. Differences in the scores between minority and non-minority groups in both the short and long

term tenure groupings were not significant, but those between long and short tenure groups of both minority and non-minority groupings were significant to the .001 level.

In another study, although the sample was small (only 20 of approximately 200 salesmen employed), a study of food company salesmen divided into those who were successful and those who were separated from the company indicated that only one background factor might not be a predictor, but two or more factors present provided a better predictor (Harrel, 1960). Significance for the successful salesmen was at the .05 level and at .01 for the salesmen who were fired. A study of the performance of 658 middle managers concluded that personal history items were indeed significantly related to performance ratings of middle managers (Kavanagh and York, 1972). Twenty-four of 41 personal history items were found to be positively related to position criteria selected. Life experiences can be predictive of subsequent managerial success for college-educated women and men (Ritchie and Boehm, 1977). In a study of insurance salesmen, Tanofsky, Shepps, and O'Neill (1969) studied six variables to predict success in that field. Age, education, marital status, and sales experience proved to be low predictors of success, but prior salary was a high predictor.

Perin (1981), in a sample of 188 out of a population of approximately 350, used 102 items of biographical data for evaluation. He found that certain biographical data distinguished between workers who would successfully complete an overseas tour with a major manufacturer from those who would have to be returned to the United States before the end of a normal assignment. There were six elements found common to those who completed and seven found common to those who did not complete their assignments.

The National Institute for Staff and Organizational Development (NISOD) (1982) asked their master teachers, teachers who had been nominated by their institutions for their excellence in teaching, to respond to an opinion survey. The sample, though limited, enabled the NISOD to create a profile of master teachers. Among the elements of this profile were a number of personal traits identifiable in most of the teachers. They were dependable, productive, cheerful, generous, creative, and decisive. Thirty percent lived in cities of at least one million, 20 percent in cities of at least 500,000, and 10 percent in cities of at least 100,000. These characteristics show common biographical background data.

Since the legality of testing has been questioned by the Supreme Court and the EEO Commission, some alternatives to the use of testing would be useful. Buel (1972) offered

the use of biographical data as an alternative to testing. Biographical data have been shown to be predictors of success. Multiple choice formats in the collection of these data have made selection of "correct" responses difficult. A separate study can be made for each position and separate data elements considered important for that position as long as sufficient study has been made of the position and the elements selected.

Much attention has been given the use of weighted application blanks (WAB) in which the responses to certain questions on an application are selected as predictors of success and then weighted according to their usefulness in the prediction of success. Such a checklist proved valid in a early test in one store employing women sales clerks, but not in another (Mosel and Wade, 1951). Novak (1970) found significant items when using this method in six groups of hospital employees when measuring against long-term service. Significant items included age, marital status, education, and years of experience. Roach (1971) found that recurring cross-validations of the WAB are necessary, since samples of employees hired at varying times showed a loss of predictability in the method. He scored 199 clerks hired for full-time employment using a scoring key developed from 440 clerks hired two years earlier. The comparison showed a drop from .46 cross-validation to .29.

Roach suggested that scoring keys be validated at regular intervals. Schwab and Oliver (1974) suggested that items used in WAB be reviewed and that studies of non-correlation be published.

A major problem in the use of biographical data is the selection of the proper items. In one study, reported church attendance appeared to be the only factor related to long-term tenure among male salespersons (Schuh, 1967a). In another, where the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire was administered to a group of 475 employees of a discount chain, several discriminate findings were developed, but biographical data alone were not successful in predicting termination. The variables selected might have been the cause of the failure to predict (Taylor and Weiss, 1972). It was concluded that caution had to be used in the selection of variables considered significant. Coleman and Riley (1970) conducted a test of executives in the farm machinery industry to develop profiles of high and low growth executives and listed six elements of each profile. The two elements common to both groups were high intelligence and tough-mindedness. An unresolved question in that study was whether these two represented errors in the test or were elements common to all executives, either high or low growth.

Rawls and Rawls (1974), in concluding an article on trends in management selection, stated that biographical data have emerged as the single best predictor of success when examining managerial effectiveness. Reilly and Chao (1980:18) concluded that although biographical data had not been explored to the same extent as testing, it appears to be a fair and impartial selection tool and that objective items such as marital status, number of dependents, and age "have consistently shown to be valid predictors, particularly of tenure."

According to Guion (1976), personal history data provides the best predictions of success. However, Asher (1972) reported that there can be improvements in the collection of biographical data through the use of hard or verifiable information and not the type of questions calling for the expression of an opinion or non-verifiable answers.

The literature revealed that biographical data could be used as a predictor of success in several fields. Writers also cautioned readers to ensure that the correct variables were selected for study or use, variables that were applicable to the position and that were cross-verified on a regular basis. When proper variables were selected, high rates of prediction of success were achieved.

The College Teaching Environment

U.S. colleges have not been realizing their full potential (Scully, 1984). The National Institute of Education called on universities and colleges to set higher standards for graduation. Their Study Group on the Conditions of Excellence in American Higher Education (1984:35) introduced their report as follows:

The Nation has been conducting a paradoxical debate on the quality of schooling. While all sides have assumed that we must become a society in which learning never ends, the debate always seems to stop at the border of high school graduation, as if learning itself ended at that point. But more than half of our students voluntarily cross that border, trusting that what awaits them on the other side is worthy. What they will find is a system of higher education that is by far the largest, most complex, and most advanced in the world. The nation has entrusted this system to extend both the franchise of learning and the frontiers of the universe itself. But our students will find that this great national resource has not realized its full potential.

The report continued, stressing the need to offer high quality programs to students. The study group considered the costs of education as a factor in quality education, and educational institutions were urged to conduct programs within reasonable costs. The study group reported that three out of five American high school graduates were enrolled in college programs. Only one in eight highly able high school seniors chose not to attend college. Of those who started college, only half attained the

bachelor's degree. In 1966, 1.8 percent of the entering freshmen intended to become professors. By 1982, this figure had dropped to 0.2 percent (Study Group on the Conditions of Excellence in American Higher Education, 1984).

The recommendations of the study group stressed the need for increased personal contact between students and faculty on intellectual issues (recommendation 3:41) and the use of adjunct faculty positions to attract individuals who possessed special talents and abilities. Although the report stressed the use of full-time faculty as the prime teaching force, it stated that adjunct faculty were reported to be used extensively in some fields by custom and necessity (recommendation 7:42). These fields included accountants, lawyers, clinical psychologists, architects, and other practicing professionals. The report continued to stress the requirement for adjuncts to maintain and strengthen ties with the educational institution and to develop and maintain contact with the students outside the classroom. A further requirement was to participate as much as possible in the educational institutional environment (Study Group on the Conditions of Excellence in American Higher Education, 1984).

The report stated that faculty members at colleges and universities have lost approximately 20 percent of their purchasing power in the past decade. This has caused some

to leave the teaching ranks. With this decline in full-time faculty members, the proportion of adjuncts used has increased from 23 percent in 1966 to 41 percent in 1980 (Study Group on the Conditions of Excellence in American Higher Education, 1984).

Still unresolved was the question of what should be the prime effort of college faculty. Maslow and Zimmerman (1956) reported that faculty colleagues tended to equate good teaching with creativeness and research, while students looked to personality.

The College Adjunct

There exists in the collegiate ranks a shortage of high-quality faculty members in certain fields. Business administration is one of these fields. While the demand for business professors is increasing due to higher enrollments in the field, current professors are being lured into more lucrative and rewarding positions. Programs in business and public administration are faced with increasing student demands and an insufficient number of terminally qualified faculty members (McCullough and Wooten, 1981).

There also exists within the academic community an excess of faculty members in certain non-business fields. Some of these could be retrained or cross-trained into fields which experience a greater demand for teaching

(Polley, 1980). This solution has not proved successful in some areas. In the field of accounting it was found that there was little incentive for existing faculty in surplus positions to re-educate themselves in accounting, since they were secure in their present positions (Hodges and Burke, 1984). Although one institution attempted to expose current faculty to business administration, the results were dubious. The study concluded that such experiences are probably best left to the initiative of the individual (G. Peterson, 1980).

Part-time or adjunct faculty members have been called to fill the void when qualified, full-time faculty were not available for teaching assignments (Nicholson, 1981; F. Peterson, 1980). This use of part-time faculty has been increasing across the nation. In some institutions part-time faculty represent 30 to 50 percent of the full-time equivalent faculty. Part-time faculty are more prevalent in community colleges, urban colleges, and colleges which emphasize off-campus and evening instruction than in traditional universities focusing on on-campus instruction. There appears to be no conclusive study that demonstrated a significant difference in the quality of education provided by full-time or part-time faculty. While little could be found generally about the number of adjuncts used in higher education, the Washington Community College system used

adjunct faculty to teach 29.7 percent of all classes in the academic programs, which equaled 28.4 percent of the full-time faculty (Washington State Board for Community College Education, 1984). In some off-campus programs, adjunct faculty taught over 90 percent of all courses (Polley, 1982). The Study Group on the Conditions of Excellence in American Higher Education (1984) reported an increase in the proportion of adjunct faculty from 23 percent in 1966 to 41 percent in 1980.

Greive (1983:viii) reported that:

Each year it is becoming more evident that institutions of higher education are dependent upon adjunct and part time faculty to assume a greater percentage of the teaching load. As we move into the 80's and 90's, it is certain that this trend will continue and even accelerate.

In the field of law, many law professors have left the academic ranks because of greater financial return from private employment. Others have left because of perceived swings from the teaching of practical legal ideas to a theoretical approach to law. Some decried the move of experienced law professors from the academic ranks as legal professors to that of practicing attorneys and stated that soon the academic ranks would be filled with those who had no practical legal experience (Langley, 1981). Langley also reported that law students often preferred professors who could bring real-life experiences and examples to the

classroom as well as discussing legal issues and theories. To fill this void, some law schools turned to the use of adjunct faculty, practicing attorneys returning to or joining the academic community to teach a few classes. This use of adjunct faculty has also led to the use of a highly qualified group of practitioners who might only teach one class each term or year in their specialties.

The literature has shown that there is an increasing trend toward the use of adjunct faculty to meet the teaching requirements of the 1980s. With so much dependence on part-time or adjunct faculty, the successful recruitment, selection, and retention of effective teachers is crucial to the programs and to the quality of higher education received by the modern student. The literature revealed that there were improved methods of selection used in many organizations today, improvements over the use of resumés, letters of reference, and interviews. The extended use of biographical data is one of those methods.

Evaluation Procedures

Many methods of evaluation are available for use in the academic situation. Levenson (1976) stressed the need for appraisal of employees. Examination of the literature involving biographical data showed many factors which could be measured for success. Evaluation methods include such

systems as global distributions, narrative reports, adjectival comments and ratings, management by objectives, and behaviorally anchored rating scales (Beatty and Schneier, 1977). Global distributions place each person in a position someplace from top to bottom with all other rated individuals. Narrative reports are written descriptions of the performance of the worker by the supervisor. Adjectival reports simply list one or two adjectives to describe a trait. Management by objectives covers a long period of establishing goals and measuring the attainment of these goals. Behaviorally anchored rating scales (BARS) involve the establishing of tasks and then indicators of how well the individual performed each of these tasks. BARS contain the missing rating ingredients not found in other rating systems (Kearney, 1979).

Performance appraisal has three basic functions, according to Levenson (1976). These are to provide each person with adequate feedback about his performance, to provide guidance for changing one's behavioral pattern, and to provide management with information on which to base future personnel actions. Schuler (1984) reported inherent conflicts in performance appraisal due to differing goals of the institution and the individual. He also reported the increased use of interviews in evaluating performance. Lazer (1976) urged caution in the establishment of rating

systems due to new EEO guidelines, since any selection tool or test that has an adverse impact must be validated.

Landy and Farr (1980:72) stated that "ratings have been shown to be prone to various types of systematic and random error."

Evaluation of Educators

Evaluation of any group requires some group norms against which to evaluate. Miller (1972) reported that the educator is more than a teacher, being also an advisor, administrator, and a writer. This leads to complications in evaluation, even merit evaluation. Wilson, Dienst, and Watson (1973) asked about the characteristics of effectiveness of college teachers as perceived by their colleagues. Subkoviak and Levin (1974) found that the faculty characterized a professor on the basis of research, teaching, and service, while the students listed teaching and interpersonal relations as the criteria. Sherman and Blackburn (1975) and Marques, Lane, and Dorfman (1979) reinforced the perception that there is a lack of criteria for measuring effective teaching. Goldsmid, Gruber, and Wilson (1977) showed that those teachers with concern for student mastery of course material were more often given the superior teaching awards.

Students did not change their opinions of their teachers over time; as students gained job experience, they still rated the same faculty highly (Firth, 1979). Tullar (1982) noted that at least in community colleges, with repeated use of evaluations, the number of teachers receiving outstanding evaluations increased significantly, while the number of those receiving poor evaluations decreased dramatically.

Burton (1956) reported that students are in the best position to evaluate the quality of instruction which they are receiving. He stated that when properly administered, student evaluations could be accepted by the faculty as a source of personal evaluation and guidance.

In a comprehensive study of faculty evaluation, Miller (1974) compared the characteristics of good teaching as presented by eight other authors. He concluded that classroom teaching is the most important of all of the criteria in evaluation of faculty. Another conclusion he made was that students were in a better position than colleagues or administrators to judge the quality of the instruction which they are receiving.

Summary

Gardner (1961) urged all to pursue excellence. People not equal, but there are things that each person does best.

Gardner urged people to find those attributes in themselves and others, and then do the best possible. Mobley (1974) stressed that under all civil rights guidelines, progress must be made in obtaining the best individuals for any position. The same concept is true in the educational field. The challenge of those involved in the preparation of instruction is to find the best faculty available.

The literature revealed that the employee selection process is not an easy one. The days of simple approaches are over. Academic hiring has not kept pace with the hiring practices of other activities. Other activities have moved from the simple interview and letters of recommendation into a more complex hiring situation. Many new tools are available. The resumé permits the applicant to tell a prospective employer what that applicant would like to stress in showing how he or she is fitted for the new position. The interview is a getting-acquainted situation. Both of these techniques enable the applicant to conceal unfavorable information. Assessment centers are a fine tool, but they are expensive and not particularly adaptable to the academic environment.

One bright light in the selection process is the use of biographical data. The literature showed that what an individual does in the future is an outgrowth of what that person did in the past. An examination of a number of

studies has shown that the collection and identification of elements of biographical data has been used to predict success. Schuh (1967b) presented an extensive review of the literature dealing with employee tenure. Biographical data were found to be superior to most of the other data-gathering methods in predicting tenure. England (1961, 1971) developed a list of data elements for study and use. Goldsmith (1922) selected nine common data elements which predicted success. Novak (1970) showed how data elements could be collected in a weighted application blank (WAB) which could then be utilized in selective employment of individuals with predictable success on the job.

Legal concerns surrounding employment have caused a hard look at employee selection and selection techniques. Pre-employment inquiries must be confined to items which are related to the job (Ledvinka, 1977). The use of biographical data in the employment process can be tailored to meet this requirement (Pace and Schoenfeldt, 1977).

The Study Group on the Conditions of Excellence in American Higher Education (1984) pointed to the rise in the use of adjunct faculty in higher education. McCullough and Wooten (1981) revealed the shortage of terminally qualified professors of business. Langley (1981) suggested the use of adjuncts to teach in special fields.

Evaluation tools were examined by Beatty and Schneier (1977). However, Miller (1974) concluded that it was the teaching element which meant the most when evaluating educators.

The review of the literature revealed the increased use of adjunct faculty in higher education teaching, particularly in certain fields. Biographical data elements are available to college and university faculty to aid in the hiring process.

CHAPTER THREE

Methodology

This research was conducted to determine whether biographical data could be of assistance in selecting high-quality adjunct, or part-time, faculty members to teach business and public administration. The method was selected with the realization that many factors could be considered and that the selection of the criteria and possible responses needed to be objective and measurable. The method followed was suggested as Correlational Research (Isaac and Michael, 1978) in that the relationships between high-criterion or low-criterion groups were investigated. To some extent this is similar to Causal-Comparative Research (Isaac and Michael, 1978) because some data already available were examined. The variables were complex and did not lend themselves to controlled manipulation or experimentation.

The purpose of the study was to determine to what extent certain variable factors in an individual's background were indicators of success in teaching in the educational environment at the advanced undergraduate and graduate levels.

Due to the sensitive nature of this study, legal implications, and the possible perception of the subjects that

their positions could be in jeopardy due to some of their responses, no face-to-face or interview situations were deemed possible. The university, due to the legal implications of the material collected as well as its sensitivity, also placed a barrier between the researcher and the part-time faculty subjects.

Conduct of the Study

This study was conducted at a small, private, liberal arts university in the Pacific Northwest. This university had approximately 2,800 full-time students on the main campus, but also operated in several off-campus locations. The major off-campus programs were in business and public administration. Master's degrees were given in business administration, public administration, and education. The university's law school was to involved in the study. The study was conducted in three phases.

The first phase of the research involved the development and distribution of a questionnaire to all those on the current roster of adjunct faculty teaching in off-campus programs of the university. These questionnaires were treated as confidential information, were coded, and were used only by those evaluating the results.

The second phase covered the evaluation of quality of the part-time faculty. The data were secured from three

sources: (1) the standard student course/teacher evaluation form, (2) subjective evaluation of each faculty member based upon the views and observations of the administrators of the programs, and (3) a subjective self-evaluation from each of the subjects of the study through one of the questions in the questionnaire.

The third phase was an in-depth examination of the data contained in the questionnaires compared with each of the evaluations obtained in the second phase.

Operational Hypotheses

The hypothesis shown in Chapter One was placed in the null form for the purpose of statistical evaluation:

NH: There are no significant differences in biographical data between those adjunct faculty members who are rated highly successful and those who are rated average or below.

The sub-hypotheses were also placed in the null form for the purpose of statistical evaluation:

NH₁: There are no significant differences in past experiences between those adjunct faculty members who were rated highly successful by the academic administration when compared to those who were rated average.

NH₂: There are no significant differences in past experiences between those adjunct faculty members who were

rated highly successful by the students in class evaluations when compared to those who were rated average.

NH₃: There are no significant differences in past experiences between those adjunct faculty members who rated themselves highly successful when compared to those who rated themselves average.

Subjects

The university studied operated both an undergraduate and a graduate program in business and public administration. While the undergraduate program was conducted both on the main university campus and at off-campus locations, at the time of this study, the graduate program was exclusively at the off-campus locations. At the time of this study, these off-campus locations included two metropolitan centers and three military bases within a 50-mile radius of the main campus. Most of the off-campus instruction involved business and public administration courses.

Most of the on-campus instruction was by full-time faculty, supplemented by a few part-time members. The majority of these part-time members were teaching in special areas and taught the same courses each semester. The bulk of the off-campus faculty were part-time or adjunct faculty. They taught for a variety of reasons. Although many of them taught the same classes or series of classes

each term, there was a high degree of turnover within the adjunct faculty. Due to the degree of turnover in their ranks and the lead time to secure faculty and to prepare for the next term, it could be a few terms before the administration ascertained either that a new adjunct was indeed a quality educator or there was a problem with the adjunct or the course.

The subjects of this study were the adjunct, or part-time, faculty members teaching in the off-campus locations. No attempt was made to include any of the full-time, tenure track faculty, regardless of the teaching location.

The off-campus faculty was administered by the Director of Continuing Education and separate from any faculty on the main campus. The off-campus program used an evaluation procedure which differed from that used on the main campus. For these reasons, the study was limited to the off-campus, adjunct faculty involved in teaching business and public administration courses.

The list of adjunct faculty utilized during the 1983 school year in the off-campus programs was provided by the Office of Continuing Education and subsequently coded through the efforts of the Associate Dean of the University to maintain the confidentiality of the respondents. Eighty-two individuals were in the original list. Sixty adjuncts

(73.17 percent) responded to the questionnaire and were included in the major portion of the study.

During the course of the study, the university announced that it was closing its off-campus programs and terminating the conferring of the degree of Master of Business Administration. Few new adjunct faculty members were needed, and only the better of the existing faculty were retained. Therefore, no follow-up was possible, nor could additional data be collected.

Biographical Instrumentation

The questionnaire developed for this study was designed around the elements selected by England (1961, 1971) and Owens (1976) and presented in an order suggested by Bouchard (1976). The review of the literature failed to disclose any special or significant variables which might be consistent with high teaching achievement but suggested several that had been used with success in previous studies. Goldsmith (1922) reported success with nine variables. Of these, education, age, occupation, marital status, clubs to which one belonged, and professional experience were applicable to this study. Nevo (1976) suggested the variable of military service to measure success. Tanofsky, Shepps, and O'Neill (1969) reported prior salary and the number of dependents as variables which predicted

success. The final question in the survey was added to provide data to the faculty salary committee of the university for use in their salary structure proposals and was not otherwise utilized in this study. The question which preceded the final question was to be used both in this study and by the faculty salary committee.

Questions were developed to provide absolute data whenever possible and were discriminatory in design. Open-ended questions were not used. Ten questions required the entering of narrative responses. Multiple response questions were avoided when possible, but they were used occasionally. The questionnaire was designed to provide a demographic background for each of the responding faculty. The questions were based upon those questions, or areas of questioning, opened by previous researchers. Questions seeking opinions were not included. As the target population was heavily involved in many activities and would have to answer the questionnaire on their own time, the questions were limited in number.

Final design and distribution of the questionnaire followed the guidance given by Bouchard (1976). He said that the preparation of questionnaires was still dependent upon past experiences and a few general guidelines. The questionnaire contained 51 questions, 50 of which were

designed to collect biographical data from the adjunct's background. The questionnaire is included as Appendix A.

The Associate Dean and the Director and former Director of the School of Business and Public Administration examined the questionnaire prior to its use. Two full-time faculty members completed the questionnaire to determine the time and effort involved. Both reported that the questionnaire was easily understood and answered in a minimum of time. Other attempts to determine the validity or reliability of the questionnaire were frustrated due to the small number of adjuncts teaching in similar programs in the area.

The questionnaires were mailed to the 82 individuals as an enclosure to a letter (Appendix B) requesting assistance with the study. A second letter was sent to those who did not respond. As a result of both letters, 60 individuals (73.17 percent) responded and were included in the study.

Rating Instruments

Three instruments were utilized during the study: ratings of the adjuncts by the administration, by the students, and a self-evaluation.

Administration Evaluation

The administration did not normally conduct a written evaluation of the adjunct faculty. Some face-to-face consultations or counseling sessions were conducted from time to time, or when needed. There was no normal or scheduled time for these evaluations. Since there was no formal rating system, the Director of Continuing Education was asked to provide the Associate Dean with a special adjectival rating on all adjuncts on his current list of those being used in the program. He directed each of his two major subordinates, who had an in-depth knowledge of the adjuncts, to provide this rating. One of these subordinates was responsible for the program in the major metropolitan area and the other for the rest of the programs. Both had been with the off-campus programs for several years and knew well the adjuncts utilized in their programs.

The Director of Continuing Education provided copies of current student evaluations of the 82 adjunct faculty members and an adjectival rating of these individuals to the Associate Dean of the University. These documents were again coded to protect the privacy of the faculty. The questionnaires and the ratings were coded and entered in the computer for further study.

The adjectival ratings from the administration distributed the faculty into outstanding, excellent, good, poor,

and unsatisfactory. Few fell into the lowest rating group (Appendix D). For statistical purposes, values were assigned to each rating: outstanding = 5, excellent = 4, good = 3, poor = 2, unsatisfactory = 1 (there were no unsatisfactory ratings). The mean and standard deviation were then determined. These ratings were also entered into the computer data bank.

Student Evaluation

At each of the off-campus locations, at the end of each term, each student was asked to complete a Student Opinion of Instructor and Course report. These forms were used by the administration in evaluating the faculty members and were passed to the faculty members after the grades for the term had been submitted. The same report form was used in all off-campus programs (Appendix C).

A conference among the Director of Continuing Education, his two principal subordinates who were the administrators of the two off-campus elements of the program, and the researcher was held to study the Student Opinion of Instructor and Course report and to extract from it those elements which best depicted the instructor and not the course. For the purpose of this study, six elements were selected from this report as being most significant in

determining the student's rating of the instructor. These six were as follows:

1. Is the instructor actively helpful if you have difficulty with the course content?
3. Do you feel free to ask questions, disagree and express your ideas?
5. Does the instructor seem genuinely interested in teaching?
7. Is the material presented in a well-organized fashion?
8. Does the instructor introduce new and/or exciting ideas beyond the basic text materials?
9. Were the objectives of the course clearly presented and pursued?

The form scored these elements from 5, Superior, to 1, Poor, with no intermediate adjectival ratings. From the evaluations of each question a mean was established for each instructor. An adjunct's ratings on these six questions were totaled and a mean of the means established. This mean of the means became the student evaluation score for each adjunct.

Numerical ratings were assigned, with 5 being the highest and 1 the lowest. No subject averaged in the lowest score (Appendix E). These scores were entered into the computer data bank. To maintain the same adjectival ratings as the administration's 5, the superior rating was established as outstanding and the rating of 1 as

unsatisfactory. Since there were no defined criteria of success established in the rating form, an arbitrary score range of 5-4.67 was established as outstanding, 4.66-4.40 as excellent, 4.39-4.29 as high good, 4.28-3.72 as good, 3.71-3.51 as low good, 3.50-2.50 as poor, and below 2.50 as unsatisfactory. These score ranges were established by the researcher and were based upon experience with the academic system and the rating form.

Self-Evaluation

Self-evaluation scores for each adjunct were extracted from their responses to question 6 in the questionnaire. Adjuncts were asked to rate themselves with values of outstanding (1), excellent (2), good (3, 4, 5), poor (6), or unsatisfactory (7).

Normally, adjuncts were offered an opportunity to rate themselves at the end of each course through their own views of what they accomplished during the term and the receipt of the standard student evaluation, but no record had been maintained of these self-evaluations.

Procedures

A letter was sent to the 82 adjuncts on the list provided by the Director of Continuing Education (Appendix B) on February 2, 1983, forwarding the questionnaire and a stamped return envelope, requesting return of the

questionnaire and asking for support in the study. A second letter was sent on March 1, 1983 to those who did not respond to the first letter. As a result of both letters, 60 adjuncts returned completed questionnaires.

Through the Office of the Associate Dean, the questionnaires were assigned a code number and provided to the researcher. The data taken from the questionnaires were coded for entry into a computer. A computer run of the raw data was undertaken. The results of this first run showed too few responses in many boxes to be statistically significant. For example, the sources of the adjuncts' degrees showed that few graduated from the same university. Also, there were too few in the "poor" category to be of significance, so a second run was undertaken. This time the categories of success were reduced to two: high and lower, with 31 high and 29 lower. Student evaluations also showed the same groupings. An examination of the raw student evaluation scores showed that it would be impractical to provide 30 in each group, since the adjectival ratings could not be changed, and there were two individuals rated at 4.29.

After the vertical compression of the successful/less successful criteria and these criteria were renamed "highly successful" and "average," the horizontal groupings were examined. Again, many of the boxes contained fewer than

five responses. In an effort to gain statistical significance by enlarging the responses in a given box, horizontal compression was undertaken.

The data were then analyzed by using cross-tab tabulation, a nonparametric statistical test with chi-square techniques. When only four cells were present and cell sizes were small, a corrected chi-square was computed. The data were extracted from information provided through evaluation by the university administration and student body on all adjunct faculty and the 60 of the 82 questionnaires which were returned by the adjunct faculty.

The Responding Adjuncts

An examination of the data provided by the responding adjunct faculty was conducted through data extracted from information provided in the returned questionnaire. A comparison was also made using the ratings given by the administration and the students to determine the validity of the responding population.

Respondents Versus Non-Respondents

In this study, success was measured through the use of administration, student, and self-ratings between poor and outstanding. If outstanding is given a value of 5, excellent 4, good 3, poor 2, and unsatisfactory 1, for the

faculty ratings an average can be struck. A similar rating profile can be developed from the self-rating given in question 6.

The student rating form showed 5 as the highest or superior position and 1 as poor. Since administration and student ratings were available for all adjuncts, both respondents and non-respondents, a comparison can be shown and an inference drawn on the lack of degradation of the study due to lack of response. The closeness of the mean and median led to a belief that conclusions drawn in this study remain valid for the total population.

To test whether the 60 respondents were representative of the total population of 82, a t test of the student evaluations was conducted. The pooled variance estimate showed a probability of .9, while a separate variance estimate also showed a probability of .9. An analysis of variance showed no significance. The student evaluation of the sample of adjuncts was accepted as representative.

A t test of the administration ratings was not conducted, since the variables were ordinal rather than integral. Instead, a chi-square test with correction was run with a significance greater than .9. In view of the above testing, the administration's ratings were considered as being representative of the population.

A biserial correlation was run of the self-student means which showed $+0.62$. This was followed by a standard error of correlation test of $.146$. This showed a significant correlation. Similar tests were run on the administration-student means. This point biserial correlation showed $+0.525$ with a standard error of $.108$, a stable population. A phi coefficient of the self-administration means yielded $.13$, a low coefficient of correlation.

The samples were accepted as representative of the total population in both the administration's and the students' ratings.

Appendices D, E, and F show the distribution in descending order of the administration, student, and self-ratings, respectively, and the relationships between the ratings for each individual. No relationships are demonstrated among the three appendices. The mean and standard deviation for each group are shown in each appendix.

The respondents were divided into high and low groupings to describe their degrees of success in teaching. These ratings were given by the administration on the basis of an adjectival rating, by the students through a student evaluation report, and by the adjunct through the answer to one question (question 6). Table 1 shows the distribution of ratings from each source.

Table 1
Rating Distribution of Adjuncts

	<u>Administration</u>		<u>Student</u>		<u>Self</u>	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
High success	31	51.67	31	51.67	50	83.33
Average	29	48.33	29	48.33	10	16.67

Due to the small size of the low category in the self-evaluation and the small size of some of the average cells, less attention was given to the self-evaluation than to the administration's or the students' evaluation. It is mentioned when a response indicated significance or helped to show a trend.

Demographic Description

A total of 60 adjunct faculty members out of 82 adjunct faculty members utilized by the university during the winter of 1983 responded to the questionnaire (73 percent). The responding sample consisted of 11 female (18.33 percent) and 49 male (81.67 percent) adjuncts.

The age group spread of the respondents is shown in Table 2. Over 70 percent of the respondents were between 31 and 45 years of age.

Table 2
Age of Adjuncts

Age	N	%
Under 26	0	00.00
26-30	10	16.67
31-35	18	30.00
36-40	17	28.33
41-45	8	13.33
46-50	3	5.00
51-55	2	3.33
56-60	2	3.33
Over 60	0	00.00

All respondents had bachelor's degrees from recognized academic institutions. Table 3 shows that 51 had master's degrees and 16 terminal degrees. In addition to those with terminal degrees, six PhD candidates (10 percent) were included in the study.

Table 3
Education of Adjuncts

Degree	N	%
Master's	51	85.0
Doctorate	16	26.7
PhD candidate	6	10.0
DBA	1	1.7
JD	9	15.0

The teaching experiences of the group (shown in Table 4) varied, with many teaching at other levels than in graduate and undergraduate programs.

Table 4
Teaching Experiences of Adjuncts

	N	%
Years Taught		
First time	3	5.0
Less than 1 year	3	5.0
1 to 4 years	22	36.7
5-10 years	22	36.7
Over 10 years	10	16.7
Other Levels Taught		
K-12	8	13.3
In business	22	36.7
In military	17	28.3
Community college	12	20.0
Vocational tech	3	5.0
Other	5	8.3

None of the subjects lived in condominiums, 52 (86.7 percent) owned their own homes, while only 8 (13.3 percent) rented.

Analysis

In addition to the t tests, biserial correlations, analyses of variance, phi coefficients, and chi-square

computations conducted in determining the representativeness of the sample, an analysis was run on each of the questions in the questionnaire. This analysis consisted of a chi-square test and when cell size was 4, a Yates corrected chi-square. In many cases, the cell size did not approach the expected value of 5. When possible, cells were then collapsed to create the desired cell size and another chi-square computed. When it was possible to conduct a chi-square test, the results are presented in text and the data summarized in Table 5 (pages 69-77). Significance at the 0.10 level is reported in the text and indicated in Table 5. When significance at the .10 level was determined and the cell sizes did not meet the minimum expected contribution of 5, the results are noted and further study is recommended, but the statistical significance was not accepted.

Descriptive

Due to the nature of some questions, it was not possible to collapse the cells. Some questions called for multiple responses. In these cases, a descriptive interpretation was made. In the determination of the source of degrees, there were so few adjuncts with degrees from the same institutions that regrouping had to be undertaken. In cases such as these, a narrative or descriptive analysis was conducted and a chi-square computed only on these

summary data. Descriptive data are presented in the text or in summary tables. A typical reporting method was undertaken for certain demographic data as portrayed in Chapter Four and shown in Tables 2, 3, and 4 in this chapter. Similar data are portrayed for the political activities of the adjuncts and their normal non-teaching employment. In cases such as whether or not they had experienced any of the stressful situations, whether or not they lived in condominiums, and their reasons for teaching are dealt with only in narrative.

Summary

The research conducted was to determine whether biographical data could be of assistance in the selection of high-quality adjunct faculty to teach business and public administration. The population was the adjunct faculty of a small, private, liberal arts university.

A questionnaire was developed using data elements highlighted by England (1971), Owens (1976), and others. It was prepared using the ideas of Bouchard (1976) and examined by five full-time faculty members, both administrative and teaching, at the subject university.

The questionnaires were sent to the 82 members of the then current list of adjunct faculty of the university. Sixty adjuncts responded to the original or one additional

request. The responding population was compared and tested to determine whether it was representative of the total population and was accepted as being representative of the total population.

Three methods of evaluation were utilized, an administration evaluation, a student evaluation, and a self-evaluation. The administration's evaluation was a special, one-time, adjectival rating. The student evaluation was one normally used at the end of each course to rate all classes and faculty members. Six questions were extracted as being the best measure of adjunct and not course evaluation, a mean taken of all responses, and then a mean of the means established values for each adjunct. The self-evaluation was derived from one of the questions in the questionnaire.

In order to develop meaningful results, degrees of success were combined into highly successful or average or below criterion groups. These groups were then compared as they responded to the elements in the questionnaire.

CHAPTER FOUR

Results

This study was designed to examine the use of biographical data as a predictor of success when selecting adjunct faculty. The hypothesis suggests that there are significant differences in the backgrounds of adjunct faculty that could separate those who have been highly successful from those who have been average. A research question also arose as to whether there would be significant differences in the evaluations of adjunct faculty members given by the administration, the students in these faculty members' classes, and by the individual faculty member.

The administration's ratings were a one-time adjective rating, the students' ratings were extracted from the Student Rating of Instructor and Course report given at the end of each term, and the self-evaluation was taken from question 6 of the questionnaire.

The questionnaire was sent to 82 adjunct faculty members teaching for the subject university. Sixty (73 percent) responded. The responses were coded to protect the privacy of the responding adjuncts, and the data entered into the study.

The findings of this research were determined through analysis of data using cross-tab tabulation, a

nonparametric statistical test with chi-square techniques. When only four cells were present, and when cell sizes were small, a corrected chi-square was computed.

Evaluation consisted of comparing the high criterion group (highly successful) and the average group. The unsatisfactory group proved to be so small numerically that it could not survive statistically as a separate group (Appendices D, E, and F). The highly successful group (high criterion) included all of those rated outstanding or excellent by the administration and 4.290 or higher by the students. The remainder of the adjuncts were placed in the average (low criterion) group.

The representativeness of the sample was tested, and the sample was accepted as representing the total population of off-campus, adjunct faculty members at the subject university during the period of the study. No test was conducted to ensure that the population was representative of the adjunct faculty in the area.

Significance was examined at the 0.10 level. Less importance was placed on the self-evaluations, since the number that fell within the average or below criterion encompassed only 16.67 percent of the responding population, making for a disproportionate division for comparison.

A summary of responses to non-multiple response questions is shown in Table 5. This table shows the responses separated into those given by the average and highly successful adjuncts and compared through ratings given by the administration, the students, and the adjuncts themselves. The responses to questions which showed statistical significance at the 0.10 level using the chi-square techniques are indicated.

Cells of more than 2 x 2 were computed but with the realization that the cell size would not meet the requirements of expected frequency of 5 or more in 20 percent of the cells. Where a significant chi-square for self was noted but did not meet cell size requirements, it was included in Table 5 as an indication of areas where future research might be fruitful. For the same reason, responses to questions when more than 20 percent of the cells did not meet the expected frequency are indicated. Twenty-eight chi-squares were computed for the administration and student ratings where cell requirements were met.

Due to the small number in the average or below average groups in the self-rating, statistical significance was difficult to establish when reporting these observations. In all cases when six or more cells were examined, over 20 percent of the cells contained less than the five expected responses. Only in cases of four cells, where a Yates

Table 5

Distribution of Responses to Questions Showing Distribution
by Rating, Category, and Chi-Square Significance

Question	Administration		Student		Self	
	Rating	High	Average	Rating	Average	Rating
1. Years of teaching experience: Less than 5 years 5 years or more	16	12	14	14	8	20
	13	19	15	17	2	30
						*
2. Years at subject university: Less than 1 year 1 to 4 years 5 years or more	9	9	8	10	5	13
	17	15	14	15	4	25
	3	10	7	6	1	12
3. University teaching experience: First 2 or 3 4 or more	11	12	12	11	8	15
	10	13	11	12	2	21
	8	6	6	8	0	14
5.	<p>^aMore than 20% of the cells contained less than an expected cell frequency of</p> <p>^bWould be significant; however, more than 20% of the cells contained less than an expected cell frequency of 5.</p> <p>*Chi-square significance at 0.10.</p>					

Table 5 (continued)

Question	Administration		Student		Self	
	Average	High	Average	High	Average	High
7. Attending workshops:						
Never	15	14	14	15	4	25
Occasionally	10	8	10	8	2	16
Regularly	4	9	5	8	4	9
9. Holding a master's degree:						
No	1	8	5	4	1	8
Yes	28	23	24	27	9	24
10. Holding a special license or other professional qualifications:						
Not holding	19	14	14	19	4	24
Holding	10	17	15	12	6	21
14. Books published:						
No books published	26	27	25	28	9	44
Books published	3	4	4	3	1	6

^aMore than 20% of the cells contained less than an expected cell frequency of

5.

*Chi-square significance at 0.10.

Table 5 (continued)

Question	Administration Rating		Student Rating		Self Rating	
	Average	High	Average	High	Average	High
15. Articles published:						
No articles published	22	20	22	20	8	34
1 to 5 articles	3	9	2	10	1	11
6 or more articles	4	2	5	1	1	5
16. Papers presented at a conference:						
No papers presented	20	24	22	22	8	36
Papers presented	9	7	7	9	2	14
19. Years in normal profession:						
5 years and under	9	8	7	10	4	13
6 to 10 years	10	12	13	9	3	19
Over 10 years	10	11	9	12	3	18
20. Years employed in the last ten years:						
5 years and under	2	4	2	4	0	6
6 to 8 years	6	7	6	7	3	10
Over 8 years	21	20	21	20	7	34

^aMore than 20% of the cells contained less than an expected cell frequency of

5.

^bWould be significant; however, more than 20% of the cells contained less than an expected cell frequency of 5.

Table 5 (continued)

Question	Administration Rating		Student Rating		Self Rating	
	Average	High	Average	High	Average	High
21. Employers over the last ten years:						
None	2	0	1	1	0	2
One	6	6	4	8	1	11
Two	9	14	9	14	6	17
Three	8	5	8	5	2	11
Four or more	4	6	7	3	1	9
22. Lost time due to sickness or injury:						
No time lost	17	17	13	21	3	31
Time lost	12	13	16	9	7	18
23. Level in the organization:						
High	10	17	15	12	3	24
Mid-level	8	10	7	11	4	14
Other levels	11	4	7	8	3	12

^a More than 20% of the cells contained less than an expected cell frequency of

5.

*Chi-square significance at 0.10.

Table 5 (continued)

Question	Administration		Student		Self	
	Average	High	Average	High	Average	High
24. Remuneration from normal occupation: Less than \$15,000	7	1	3	5	0	8
\$15,000 to \$29,999	5	11	7	9	4	12
\$30,000 to \$39,999	11	7	8	10	3	15
\$40,000 and more	3	9	8	4	2	10
			a	b		b
Less than \$30,000	12	12	10	14	4	20
\$30,000 to \$39,999	11	7	8	10	3	15
\$40,000 and more	3	9	8	4	2	10
25. Military rank, officer?						
No	23	16	21	18	7	32
Yes	6	15	8	13	3	18

^aWould be significant; however, more than 20% of the cells contained less than an expected cell frequency of 5.

^bMore than 20% of the cells contained less than an expected cell frequency of 5.

*Chi-square significance at 0.10.

Table 5 (continued)

Question	Administration Rating		Student Rating		Self Rating	
	Average	High	Average	High	Average	High
26. Length of active military service:						
Less than 5 years	27	20	26	21	9	38
5 years or more	2	11	3	10	1	12
31. Number of professional journals read regularly:						
None	7	9	6	10	1	15
1 or 2	14	16	17	13	6	24
3 or more	8	6	6	8	3	11
32. Membership in professional organizations:						
None	12	6	9	9	1	17
One	6	7	6	7	4	9
Two	5	8	5	8	2	11
Three or more	6	10	9	7	3	13
33. Membership in social/service/fraternal organizations:						
None	15	19	15	19	3	31
One	8	5	8	5	4	9
Two or more	6	7	6	7	3	10

^aMore than 20% of the cells contained less than an expected cell frequency of 5.

*Chi-square significance at 0.10.

Table 5 (continued)

Question	Administration		Student		Self	
	Average	High	Average	High	Average	High
34. Offices held while in college:						
None	15	19	16	18	4	30
One	9	8	8	9	6	11
Two or more	5	4	5	4	0	9
35. Offices held since graduation:						
None	17	13	15	15	5	25
One or two	8	10	8	10	4	14
Three or more	4	8	6	6	1	11
36. Vacation planning:						
No plans	4	2	5	1	1	5
General plans	12	10	10	12	3	19
Detailed plans	13	18	14	17	6	25
38. Marital status:						
Married	20	24	6	10	2	14
Not married	9	7	23	21	8	36
39. Employment of spouse:						
No	2	9	5	6	1	10
Yes	18	15	19	14	7	26

^a More than 20% of the cells contained less than an expected cell frequency of

5.

*Chi-square significance at 0.10.

Table 5 (continued)

Question	Administration		Student		Self	
	Average	High	Average	High	Average	High
40. Sex:						
Female	5	6	4	7	2	9
Male	24	25	25	24	8	41
41. Number of dependents:						
None	9	7	7	9	2	14
One or two	10	13	10	13	5	18
Three or more	10	12	12	8	3	17
42. Number of other people sharing quarters:						
None	8	4	6	6	4	8
One	7	10	8	9	3	14
Two or more	14	16	15	15	3	27
46. Distance traveled to teach:						
Under 6 miles	12	3	9	6	2	13
6 to 15 miles	7	13	10	10	7	13
Over 16 miles	10	15	10	15	1	24

^aMore than 20% of the cells contained less than an expected cell frequency of

5.

^bWould be significant; however, more than 20% of the cells contained less than an expected cell frequency of 5.

*Chi-square significance at 0.10.

Table 5 (continued)

Question	Administration Rating		Student Rating		Self Rating	
	Average	High	Average	High	Average	High
47. Length of time living in the Puget Sound area:						
Under 5 years	7	9	5	11	3	13
5 to 10 years	13	9	16	6	4	18
Over 10 years	9	13	8	14	3	19
				*		a
49. Has the adjunct been involved in political activity:						
Never involved	7	7	5	9	3	11
Has been involved	22	23	24	21	7	38
50. Importance of financial remuneration for teaching:						
Of little importance	5	8	6	7	3	10
Of some importance	18	19	17	20	5	32
Primary reason for teaching	6	3	6	3	2	7
	a		a		a	

^aMore than 20% of the cells contained less than an expected cell frequency of

5.

*Chi-square significance at 0.10.

correction could be applied, could a chi-square test be conducted. In each of these instances, one of the four cells contained less than the expected five responses. Throughout the following presentation, only those instances in which there were only four cells in the self-evaluation, or where there would have been statistical significance had there been sufficient expected values, is the self-evaluation discussed.

Teaching Experience

The questionnaire contained a number of questions about the teaching experience of the adjunct including length of time taught (question 1), length of time teaching at this university (question 2), the number of other universities at which the adjunct taught (question 3), location of the local university campuses at which the adjunct taught (question 4), other levels taught (question 5), and self-improvement as an educator (questions 7 and 8).

Since only 3 (5 percent) of the adjuncts responding to the questionnaire were teaching for the first time, and only 3 more were in their first year of teaching, it was impractical to separate the new faculty from the rest. In this, and in other elements of this study, topic cells were combined to obtain cells of sufficient size to become statistically significant. The length of the adjunct's

teaching experience was divided at the five-year level to determine if the longer period of experience was significant in excellence. It was expected that a pattern would develop showing that those with more experience would be the better teachers. Twenty-eight (46.67 percent) had less than five years' experience, and 32 had more. The administration tended to rate those with experience slightly higher than did the students, but when examined by the chi-square techniques, the student and administration ratings were not significant. The self-evaluations showing the longer-term educator to be more successful, however, were significant at the 0.10 level (question 1).

To examine the relationships between the length of teaching experience at the subject university and success, adjuncts were divided into three groups: those teaching less than one year (18 adjuncts), between one and five years (29), and those whose employment had extended over five teaching years (13). No statistically significant differences were found for any ratings. The administration's ratings approached significance when the chi-square showed a significance of 0.1018 as the over five year group contained 10 in the high criterion to 6 for the students and 3 versus 7 in the low group (question 2).

To examine further the relationship between those who had taught five years or more for the subject university

and possible bias exhibited by the administration, a comparison between the administration and the student ratings was made. Thirteen adjuncts reported teaching five years or more. When a chi-square with a Yates correction was run on this, the result was not statistically significant at the 0.10 level. The relationship was rejected, and the idea of statistically significant bias was rejected.

The number of universities at which the adjuncts taught was examined. Twenty-three were adjuncts at only one university, 23 at two or three, and 14 at four or more. None of the patterns for the administration or student ratings were significant. The self-ratings, however, again showed a statistical significance of 0.01, supporting the idea experience was related to higher ratings; however, cell requirements were not met (question 3).

The number of campuses at which the adjunct taught proved to be of no significance. Since the largest program was at the large city campus, and the bulk of the adjuncts taught there, the statistics for the campus overwhelmed the others (question 4).

Continuing Education held annual workshops for the adjunct faculty at which attendance was encouraged. These were held at the main campus on one Saturday each year. The administration hoped that all adjunct faculty would avail themselves of this method of improving their teaching

skills. They believed that attendance would be reflected through excellence in teaching. Regular attendance at these workshops evidently had little to do with the ratings and the success of the adjunct. There was no statistical significance of the responses to this question (question 7).

Some adjuncts received training in education or teaching methods as part of their other academic instruction (22), 15 as part of their military training, and 28 as part of other experiences. Twenty-five (42 percent) reported no special training in education or teaching methods. Twenty adjuncts (33.33 percent) received training in more than one area. Due to the multiplicity of responses, no tests of statistical significance were conducted (question 8).

Educational Background

Does the source of an educator's academic degree have a bearing on his ability as a teacher? This subject often comes up in discussions of what makes a good educator. The question was difficult to examine due to the diversity of answers and the many sources and types of degrees (question 9).

Data were gathered on the source and major field of each degree. Due to the small size of the sample, subgroupings were established. Degree sources were established as

the state's major university, the university at which the study was being conducted, the top 50 universities and colleges (except for the state's major university) according to Gourman (1980), other public universities in the state, private universities and colleges, and other universities and colleges. The state's major university was later combined with the other top business universities, the subject university and the other public universities in the state were added to the northwest institutions, and the military activities joined the other universities and colleges. It was discovered that the adjuncts received their education from a wide variety of institutions, but no group was large enough for statistical sampling. Most subjects received degrees in business or economics (Table 6). Three (5 percent) had two or more bachelor's degrees, and 4 (6.67 percent) had more than one master's degree.

Another comparison was made among business, economics and related graduates and the source of their bachelor's and master's degrees combining all business and economic degree sources in the Pacific Northwest, and all other business and education sources (Table 7). No significance was found.

The third grouping combined business and economics undergraduate majors (35 adjuncts, 58.3 percent) in one group and all other majors in a second group (25 adjuncts,

Table 6
Sources of Degrees Held by Adjuncts

	Top Business and Economics	Top Non-Business and Economics	Other Business and Economics	Northwest Business and Economics	Northwest Non-Business and Economics	Subject University Business and Economics
Highly Successful						
Administration Student	7	4	8	1	4	4
Self	6	4	9	2	4	3
Average	10	7	12	2	6	5

Bachelor's

Highly Successful

Administration Student
Self

Average

Administration Student
Self

^aAll graduates of the subject university teaching in the off-campus programs had degrees in business or economics.

Table 6 (continued)

	Top Business and Economics	Top Non-Business and Economics	Other Business and Economics	Other Non-Business and Economics	North-west Business and Economics	North-west Non-Business and Economics	Subject University Business and Economics
Highly Successful							
Administration Student Self	5 6 12	2 1 3	8 11 12	0 0 1	1 3 3	1 2 4	5 4 7
Average							
Administration Student Self	10 9 3	1 2 0	7 4 3	1 1 0	3 1 1	3 2 0	4 5 2

Master's

^aAll graduates of the subject university teaching in the off-campus programs had degrees in business or economics.

Table 7
Comparison of Business and Economics Degrees
Held by Adjuncts

	Top Business and Economics	Northwest Business and Economics	Other Business and Economics
<u>Bachelor's</u>			
Highly Successful			
Administration	7	5	8
Student	6	5	9
Self	10	7	12
Average			
Administration	5	6	4
Student	6	6	3
Self	2	4	0
<u>Master's</u>			
Highly Successful			
Administration	5	6	8
Student	6	7	11
Self	12	10	12
Average			
Administration	10	7	7
Student	9	6	4
Self	3	3	3

41.7 percent). Again, no statistical significance was found, nor was there a major difference in the perceptions of the administration and the students. The same pattern existed for master's degrees where 43 had business, economics, or related degrees (84.3 percent). Those with master's degrees accounted for 85 percent of the sample (Table 8).

Table 8
Comparison of Business and Non-Business Degrees
of Adjuncts

	Bachelor's		Master's	
	Business	Non-Business	Business	Non-Business
Highly Successful				
Administration	20	11	19	4
Student	20	11	24	3
Self	29	21	34	8
Average				
Administration	15	14	24	4
Student	15	14	19	5
Self	6	4	9	0

When the question was asked whether the possession of a master's degree was important, it was discovered that the absence of one was related to the administration's ratings. A statistical correlation of significance at the 0.05 level

was shown with 8 non-master's degree adjuncts who were rated high and only 1 low, compared to 23 master's degree holders high and 28 low (question 9, Table 5).

Next, the sources of doctorates were examined. The sample size was so small that no significance could be determined in the source of the degree, but the type of terminal degree could be examined. The only degrees reported were Ph.D. (10 percent of the total sample), DBA (1.67 percent), and JD (15 percent). Doctorates accounted for 26.67 percent of the sample. The sample also included 6 candidates for the degree of Ph.D. (10 percent of the sample) (Table 9). No statistical significance could be found in the type of doctoral degree held or the lack thereof.

Table 9
Types of Doctoral Degrees
Held by Adjuncts

	Ph.D.	DBA	JD	Candidate
Highly Successful				
Administration	2	0	7	2
Student	1	0	5	4
Self	6	1	7	6
Average				
Administration	4	1	2	4
Student	5	1	4	2
Self	0	0	2	0

An indicator of professional competence is often shown by the display of a special license or passing of a professional examination. This study asked (question 10): "Does the holding of special professional qualifications indicate success in teaching?" Twenty-seven (45 percent) of the respondents indicated special qualifications including Certified Public Account, bar exam, Certified Managerial Accountant, engineering, financial/real estate license, and teaching certificates. Of the 27 (45 percent of the sample) who possessed a special license, the administration placed 17 in the high and 10 in the average categories, while the students placed 12 and 15 in the high and average categories, respectively (Table 5). To determine whether any disproportionality existed between the student and administration ratings, a chi-square test was conducted with a result that was not statistically significant. Likewise, when the 33 (55 percent) who possessed no special license were examined, the administration placed 14 high and 19 average, while the students reversed the ratings (19 and 14). However, the results were not statistically significant.

The above examination of the academic or special professional qualifications proved interesting, but few statistically supported conclusions could be drawn from the

data pertaining to the educational backgrounds of the adjunct faculty members.

Publishing

Faculty members have been encouraged to write and publish articles and books and to deliver papers at conferences. This study examined publishing of books (question 14), articles (question 15), and presenting papers at conferences (question 16) on the results of research in relation to success of an adjunct faculty member in the classroom teaching situation.

So few of the adjuncts had published books (7, or 11.67 percent, and only one acknowledged more than one book) that it was impractical to separate them by the number of books published, so the criterion became any published books. The results of this comparison were not statistically significant (question 14, Table 5).

More adjuncts had written articles (18, or 30 percent). The analysis of whether an adjunct had written articles was of no statistical significance from the standpoint of administration, student, or self-ratings. Eight (13.33 percent) of the sample had written one article, while 5 (8.33 percent) had written 6 or more articles. When the comparison was broken into the number of articles published (none, 1 to 5, or 6 or more), significance at the 0.02

level was derived in the student evaluations. A chi-square test of the data did not meet the cell requirements that 20 percent of the cells have an expected frequency of 5 or more. It would appear that there is a relationship between the number of articles written and success as an adjunct. If cell size were met, it would appear that it is well to publish articles, but not a great number (question 15, Table 5).

The pattern for papers delivered at conferences was similar to that of books published. Sixteen (26.67 percent) had presented papers to a conference; 6 (10 percent) had delivered one paper, 8 (13.33 percent) had presented 2 to 5 (2 each had presented 2, 3, 4, and 5 papers) 1 gave 7, and 1 presented 8. Since the number at each level was too small to make a valid analysis, the question was changed to presenting papers, yes or no. Still no statistical significance was indicated for any of the three rating groups (question 16, Table 5).

Motivation

Four questions were asked to try to determine why an individual would be desirous of undertaking part-time teaching either as a major occupation or as an addition to a normal workload in another line of endeavor. These questions involved main reasons for teaching (question 11),

other employment (question 12), obstacles to teaching (question 13), and the importance of monetary remuneration to the adjunct (question 50).

The first of these questions dealt with reasons for teaching. The adjuncts were asked to choose three reasons for teaching from a given list. Stimulation was given as the first reason by 23 respondents, the second reason by 16, and the third reason by 8. Money was mentioned by 11, 10, and 20 in the three priorities. The third largest selection was keeping current: 9, 17, and 9. Liking students received only 5, 5, and 7 responses. There is still something impressive about teaching, for 1, 1, and 4 stated their reason was status. As this was a multiple response question, statistical significance was not determined (question 11).

Adjuncts were questioned as to their other employment, since a pattern might develop showing full-time, part-time, academic, or no employment as significant. The cell sizes were too small to evaluate. Individuals engaged in other academic employment were not rated significantly higher or lower by either the administration or the students than those otherwise employed. No statistical significance was found (question 12).

In addition to rewards, there are obstacles to teaching, particularly at night and at diverse locations.

Again, three responses were solicited. There was no significance in the reported answers. Fewer adjuncts answered this question than most of the other questions (54 gave one reason, 49 two, and 35 all three). There was neither significance nor pattern to the answers. The most frequent response was "time constraints imposed by other employer" (10, 12, and 2 responses). Family responsibility was listed by 11, 9, and 5. There was no clear-cut distinction between the obstacles listed by the higher and lower rated adjuncts (question 13).

A final question was asked about the importance of monetary remuneration to the adjunct. The size of the cells precluded a statistical test of significance. Nine of the adjuncts (15 percent) reported that monetary remuneration was the primary reason for teaching; or these, both the administration and the students placed 3 in the highly successful and 6 in the average categories. Thirty-seven (61.67 percent) reported that monetary remuneration was of some importance, and 13 (21.67 percent) listed it as of little importance. The data, while interesting, demonstrated no statistical significance (question 50, Table 5).

Professional Experiences

The study investigated the professional fields of the adjuncts and their experience in those fields. Fifty-five

(91.67 percent) of the adjuncts reported business professional fields. Teaching by lawyers was rated higher overall than that of other groups and teaching by those in non-business professions was rated lower. Seven adjuncts listed more than one professional field, 4 in finance, and 1 each in law, computers, and management. The additional fields did not change the overall ratings of the adjuncts-- 4 high, 3 low by the administration and 2 high, 5 low by the students. Table 10 shows the professional fields of the adjunct faculty (question 17).

Table 10
Professional Fields of Adjunct Faculty

Profession	N	% of N
Accounting	10	16.67
Banking	2	3.33
Quantitative	1	1.67
Finance	6	10.00
Law	8	13.33
Computer	2	3.33
Management	14	23.33
Marketing	5	8.33
Other business	7	11.67
Non-business	5	8.33

The population was employed in a number of different areas. The area of employment of the adjunct seemed to have no statistical significance in relation to the

performance of that adjunct. The adjuncts' normal areas of employment are shown in Table 11 (question 18).

Table 11
Adjuncts' Normal Areas of Employment

Area	N	% of N
For profit	26	43.33
Self-employed	10	16.67
State	6	10.00
Military	8	13.33
Other federal	1	1.67
Higher education	5	8.33
Other not for profit	2	3.33
Other	1	1.67
Not reporting	1	1.67

Only 17 (28.33 percent) of the adjuncts had been employed less than 6 years, 22 (36.67) 6 to 10 years, and 21 (35 percent) 11 or more years (question 19, Table 5). To ascertain whether the time the adjunct had been employed would show a different picture than that of years in the profession, the adjuncts were asked for the years employed in the last 10. Only 6 (10 percent) reported 5 years or less. It was interesting to note, but of no significance, that 4 of these were rated high by both the administration and the students and 2 were low. Forty-one (68.33 percent) had been employed 9 or more years, 20 high and 21 low in both ratings. The administration and the students agreed

in this question. There were too few responses in two of the six cells for a statistical examination (question 20, Table 5).

Of interest was the fact that 35 (58.33 percent) reported only one or two employers in the last 10 years or since graduation; 12 (20 percent) had had only one employer. No provision was made in the questionnaire for the adjunct to respond that the current job was the first since graduation. Since the responses to this question did not meet the cell requirement for a chi-square analysis, no conclusions were drawn. However, it was noted that those adjuncts with one, two, or three employers showed a higher rating than did those with more employers (question 21, Table 5).

The adjunct faculty came from all levels of their organizations. Is the position in the organizational structure an indicator of probable success in teaching? One question addressed the adjunct's level in his or her organization. Eight (13.33 percent) listed top level, 19 (31.67 percent) listed upper, 18 (30 percent) mid-level, and 15 (25 percent) chose other levels in the organization. Since those the administration rated as highly successful appeared more frequently in the upper levels than did those the students rated highly, there may have been a halo effect involved. To investigate such a possibility, those

rated in the high level were compared. The administration listed 17 as high and 10 as low, while the students rated 11 high and 16 low. The chi-square derived was not statistically significant, and no significant differences between faculty and student ratings were assumed. When the top and upper cells were combined with the other cells remaining the same, a statistical significance of 0.07 was determined for the administration ratings. It would appear that this significance was caused by the contribution of the cells in the administrative rating pertaining to the other levels within the organization, as the contribution of those rated average seemed to control the significance of this question. The student ratings did not prove significant, and the self-evaluations contained too few responses in the cells to be examined (question 23, Table 5).

Remuneration from the current position, rather than just the adjunct's level in the organization, could have been a factor in performance. Salary did prove to be significant at the 0.05 level when the administration's ratings were considered, but not from the standpoint of student or self-perceptions. Such a situation could come from a halo effect similar to that questioned above in the analysis of the adjunct's level in the organization. Of those reporting earnings of over \$44,000, the administration rated 9 subjects in the high position and 3 in the average,

while the students reported 4 and 8, respectively. A chi-square test of the possibility of bias was rejected as not being significant at the 0.10 level. In spite of the 0.02 significance in the administration's ratings, the significance was not accepted because two of the eight cells contained less than the expected cell frequency of five. None of the other ratings met the required expected cell frequency. When the cells were compressed again to combine the 8 individuals (13.33 percent) who reported incomes of less than \$15,000 with those of \$15,000 to \$29,000, remuneration was not statistically significant (question 24, Table 5).

Stress

Is there some correlation between injuries and accidents and the stressful or distressful situations in which one finds oneself and performance in teaching? The respondents were questioned about those situations affecting their health and about stressful situations.

One question pertained to the time lost from the job due to illness or injury. Thirty (50.8 percent, N = 59) of the respondents reported no illness or injury during the past year, and 7 (11.86 percent) reported one week or more of lost time. The administration's and the adjuncts' self-ratings of these individuals, when compared with time lost,

did not show significance, but for student ratings the 0.10 level was met; however, the cell size was too small for chi-square significance. When the data were re-examined as to time lost versus no time lost, the administration's significance was nonexistent, the students remained significant, and the self-evaluation approached significance (0.112 when corrected) (question 22, Table 5).

Selye (1974) reported that stress is an important factor in our lives and that it could be harmful or helpful. To determine whether stress had an effect upon adjunct faculty, representative elements were taken from the Holmes-Rahe Social Readjustment Rating Scale (Ivancevich and Matteson, 1980) to determine whether any of those listed stressful events could have an effect upon the quality of teaching. Only 18 (30.5 percent, N = 59) reported any of the events occurring to them during the past year. The number reporting the same events was so small that no statistical test was conducted. These 18 were then combined and compared with the 41 respondents reporting no event. There was no statistical significance in the comparison for any of the three rating groups (question 28).

Military Service

There are many military and former military personnel in the local area. Most of these spent a major part of their military careers teaching. Several are now involved in part-time or full-time education. Since these individuals could be a prime source of adjunct faculty, the success of those currently teaching needed to be evaluated. Three questions were asked pertaining to military experience. These involved the adjunct's military service, if any, rank (question 25), length of service (question 26), and the arm of service (question 27).

When an examination of military rank and success was made, rank became significant at the 0.10 level for the administration's rating but not for the student or adjunct ratings. Of the sample who had military experience, none were generals or admirals, 8 were field grade (Army/Air Force Colonel/Navy Captain, Lieutenant Colonel/Commander, Major/Lieutenant Commander), 12 were other officer grades, 1 was a warrant officer, 7 were non-commissioned/petty officers, and 1 was other enlisted. The administration rated 7 field grade officers in the high group and 1 as average, while the students scored 6 and 2, respectively. The cell size was too small to permit a comparison of field grade versus other military ranks. But when field grade officers were examined against the total population, a corrected

significance was found at the 0.10 level showing higher ratings for the field grade officers. A second examination of the impact of serving as an officer was to compare serving as an officer versus the total population. In this case, with cells of normal size, significance in favor of serving as an officer was found at the 0.05 level for the administration ratings. No significance was demonstrated for the student or self-ratings (question 25, Table 5).

The length of service became significant at 0.01 for the administration but not for any other rating. Those with longer service showed higher ratings, but the cell size was small, so another grouping was made. Adjuncts were grouped into no military service, less than 2 years (the normal term for selective service), 2-4 years, and 5 or more years. When the length of service was re-examined against a lack of military service or less than 5 years in one group and service of 5 years or more in the other, the results became significant at 0.05 for the administration ratings and 0.10 for the student ratings, but not for the self-evaluation. Longer military service, over 5 years, was significant in the highly qualified adjuncts (question 26, Table 5).

The sample size showing duty in a specific military service was too small to be representative. Fifteen reported service in the Army, 10 in the Navy, 4 in the Air

Force, and 1 in the Coast Guard. The question was re-analyzed to select military service or none. Twenty-nine (48.33 percent) of the adjuncts had had military service of some type, but this fact was not statistically significant (question 27).

Military rank and extended service seemed to be statistically significant data elements in predictors of success in adjunct faculty.

Reading

All professionals need to keep current in their fields. Much of what is new in the fields of business and economics is reported in the daily or weekly media and in other trade publications. Three questions were asked to delve into the reading habits of the adjuncts. The first had to do with newspapers read on a continuing basis (question 29), the second asked the same about magazines (question 30), and the third asked about professional journals read (question 31, Table 5).

Fifty-eight of the adjuncts reported subscribing to or reading one or more newspapers on a regular basis. Since this was a multiple response question and the reading of local newspapers depended to a certain extent on the domicile of the adjunct, no statistical test was applied to this question. There was only one newspaper that was read

by a seemingly sizeable portion of the adjuncts, The Wall Street Journal. Thirty-eight adjuncts (63.33 percent) reported subscribing to or reading it regularly. Of the regular readers, the administration placed 20 in the high grouping and 18 in the lower, the student ratings were 18 and 20, and the self-evaluation was 33 and 5. Of the non-readers, the administration grouped 13 high and 9 low, the student ratings were 11 and 11, and the self-evaluation was 17 and 5. The newspaper and magazine reading patterns of the adjuncts are reported in Table 12 (questions 29 and 30).

Forty-four adjuncts (73.33 percent) reported reading professional journals regularly. Thirty said that they read 1 or 2, while 14 indicated 3 or more. Only 16 (26.67 percent) did not indicate regular reading of these. None of the comparisons attempted revealed any statistical significance. No chi-square was computed for the self-evaluation due to small cell size (question 31, Table 5).

The reading patterns of the adjunct faculty gave little insight into the characteristics which separate a highly successful adjunct from an average one. No statistical significance was developed, nor were there any patterns for further exploration.

Table 12
Adjunct Reading Patterns

	N	% of N
<u>Newspapers</u>		
Wall Street Journal	38	63.33
Seattle Times	35	58.33
Seattle Post-Intelligencer	22	36.67
Tacoma News Tribune	8	13.33
New York Times	7	11.67
Daily Olympian	4	6.67
Christian Science Monitor	1	1.67
<u>Magazines</u>		
Business Week	17	28.33
National Geographic	17	28.33
Newsweek	13	21.67
Harvard Business Review	12	20.00
Time	11	18.33
Fortune	10	16.67
U.S. News and World Report	6	10.00
Atlantic Monthly	5	8.33

Membership and Participation

During the design of this questionnaire, it was envisioned that a pattern of participation in organizations, begun while an undergraduate, would be an indicator of future involvement which would predict probable success as an adjunct. The membership and leadership patterns of the adjuncts were examined by asking to what professional organizations they belonged (question 32, Table 5), to what social/fraternal/service organizations they belonged (question 33, Table 5), what elective or appointive offices they held while in college (question 34, Table 5), and what elective or appointive offices they have held since graduation (question 35, Table 5).

The adjunct faculty did belong to professional organizations (70 percent). Forty-two reported belonging to one or more professional organizations; only 18 (13 percent) reported no membership. Thirteen said that they belonged to one (21.67 percent), another 13 reported 2, while 16 (26.67 percent) indicated membership in 3 or more. Although there was a trend showing that membership in professional organizations was important, no statistical significance could be attached to this variable. Limitations on the cell size did not permit a computation of self-rating (question 32, Table 5).

Membership in social and fraternal organizations was examined. This was one of the few tests conducted in which the students agreed exactly with the administration. Thirteen students agreed exactly with the administration. Thirteen adjuncts (21.67 percent) indicated membership in one, while another 13 mentioned membership in 2 or more. Thirty-four (56.67 percent) did not report membership in any social or fraternal organizations. There was no statistical significance of membership in social or fraternal organizations. Cell size limitations did not permit a computation for self-rating (question 33, Table 5).

The adjuncts were asked to indicate the elective or appointive offices they have held. The first question was about college activities. Only 26 (43.33 percent) reported holding office while in college; 17 of these (28.33 percent) held office in one organization, and 9 (15 percent) indicated offices in 2 or more organizations. A rather large number, 18, reported presidencies (30 percent), and 8 (13.33 percent) reported other offices. The administration and student evaluations showed no statistical significance; however, the self-evaluations showed significance at the 0.04 level. The cell size requirements for the chi-square statistic were not met for any of the groups of raters for this variable (question 34, Table 5).

Finally, adjuncts were asked about their appointive and elective offices since college. The results were interesting, as the adjuncts had held elective or appointive offices from the high levels of state government to precinct committeeman. A wide variety of other offices were also reported by half (30) of the reporting adjuncts. As interesting as these individual reports were, there was no statistical significance of holding elective or appointive office in the community. The self-evaluations did not meet the chi-square cell requirements (question 35, Table 5).

From the examination of the offices held by the adjunct faculty, except for the self-evaluation report of offices held while in college, no statistical conclusion can be drawn from office holding, either in college or in later life, as a predictor of success for an adjunct faculty member.

Political Activity

At the time of the development and distribution of the questionnaire, the Pacific Northwest had just concluded some contested political races. How the adjunct did or did not participate in political activities, as well as other community activities, might have been a predictor of success; therefore, two questions were asked pertaining to political involvement. The first question was about voting

(question 48) and the second (question 49, Table 5) about the depth of political involvement.

The adjuncts performed their civic duty by voting in general elections. Only 4 (6.8 percent) of the responding 59 adjuncts indicated that they had not voted in the last general election; 20 of these were placed in the upper group by the administration, 3 by the students, and all 4 were placed in the upper group by the self-evaluations. The number not voting in the local elections was 10 (16.9 percent). For primary elections the pattern was similar, with only 14 (23.7 percent) not voting. There were so few in the not voting category that no statistical tests were performed. The adjuncts reported a decrease in voting when it came to special elections, as 23 (39 percent) indicated that they did not vote in special elections. The numbers voting and not voting reversed when the adjuncts reported attending their precinct caucus, as 50 (85 percent) did not attend; only 9 (15.3 percent) reported attending (question 48, Table 13).

The adjuncts did not confine their political activity to voting; 45 (76.3 percent) reported other political activities. Of these, 24 (46.7 percent) reported more than one type of involvement. The political activities of the respondents are reported in Table 14 (question 49).

Table 13

Adjuncts' Patterns of Voting in Elections

(N = 59)

	<u>Administration</u>		<u>Student</u>		<u>Self</u>	
	Average	High	Average	High	Average	High
General (National/State)						
No	2	2	1	3	0	4
Yes	27	28	28	27	10	10
Local (City/County)						
No	6	4	3	7	1	9
Yes	23	26	26	23	9	40
Primary						
No	8	6	6	8	2	12
Yes	21	24	23	22	8	37
Special (Bond/School, etc.)						
No	12	11	8	15	6	17
Yes	17	19	21	15	4	32
Attend Precinct Caucus						
No	27	23	24	26	9	41
Yes	2	7	5	4	1	8

No statistical conclusions were drawn from the voting records of the adjuncts studied.

Table 14
 Political Activity of Adjuncts
 (N = 59)

Type of Activity	N	% of N	Administration		Student		Self	
			Average	High	Average	High	Average	High
Been a candidate	2	3.4	0	2	0	2	0	2
Doorbelled or spoke	2	3.4	0	2	1	1	0	2
Held a get-acquainted	6	10.2	2	4	5	1	0	6
Attended a rally	20	33.9	9	11	12	8	1	19
Attended a convention	11	18.6	4	7	6	5	1	10
Financial contribution, local	21	35.6	9	12	11	10	1	20
Financial contribution, national	20	33.9	7	13	9	11	2	18
Put up yard sign	16	27.1	6	10	9	7	3	13
Other	13	20.0	4	9	7	6	1	12

No statistical conclusions were drawn from the political activity of the adjuncts.

The political activities of the adjunct faculty showed definite trends. They were more involved than the normal population. The segment that did not vote was too small for statistical analysis.

Vacation Planning

One question was placed in the questionnaire to see if the adjuncts had a pattern to their planning. The question was suggested by Perin (1981). The question asked about the adjuncts' planning processes when getting ready to take a vacation (question 36): What type of planning did they do--detailed, skimpy, or none?

Fifty-nine individuals responded to the question. Only one (1.7 percent) made plans in great detail, 30 (50.1 percent) made general plans centered around taking trips, 2 (3.4 percent) liked to be spontaneous in recreation, 2 (3.4 percent) planned their vacations around their homes, 1 liked to just loaf around home on vacation, and 1 never took a vacation. The spread was too great and the individual responses too few to permit statistically examining the situation (Table 5).

No statistically significant conclusions can be drawn from this examination of the planning processes utilized by the adjuncts studied in this report.

Personal Data

England (1961, 1971) and others investigated many items of personal data in their studies of predictors of success. The personal data gathered in this study included age (question 37), marital status (question 38), employment of spouse (question 39), sex (question 40), number of dependents (question 41), number of individuals sharing living arrangements (question 42), type of residence (question 43), condominium living (question 44), home ownership (question 45), distance traveled to teaching location (question 46), and time in residence in the Puget Sound area (question 47).

Age is one of the basic considerations in any study of biographical data. In this study a scenario of ages developed. The age brackets are shown in Table 2 (Chapter Three, page 61). The original separation in the age brackets provided too few individuals in certain age groups, so some combining became necessary. Those 46 and older (11.67 percent), although a small group, were combined, as were the 36 to 45 year-old groups. Again, no significant patterns developed. A final grouping with a cut-off of 35 was made. Twenty-eight (46.67 percent) were 35 and under and 32 (53.33 percent) were over 35. No statistical significance was shown by this grouping (question 37, Table 2).

The bulk of the sample, 44 (73.33 percent), were married. The unmarried group included 7 (11.67 percent) divorced, 1 (1.67 percent) widowed, 1 (1.67 percent) separated, and 7 (11.67 percent) never married. Since these groups were small and difficult to use as predictors, a second grouping was made. This time all of the unmarried were grouped together. No statistically significant findings were revealed (question 38, Table 5).

In our current society, a significant number of families have two or more incomes. Of the 59 respondents, this sample showed 23 (33.9 percent) with spouses employed full time, 10 (16.9 percent) employed part time, and 11 (18.6 percent) not employed. The remaining 15 (25.4 percent) listed no spouse. When the category of no spouse was removed from the population, the sample reached statistical significance at the 0.10 level for the administration's ratings in the direction of spousal non-employment (question 39, Table 5). A spouse's employment was not of statistical importance in the performance of the adjuncts in this study, according to the students and the self-evaluations.

It was not envisioned that the sex of the adjunct would have any significance in predicting his/her success. The results of the survey supported this contention. The sample consisted of 11 (18.33 percent) females and 49 (81.67 percent) males. Using the corrected chi-square

statistic, the significance of the administration and self-ratings was 1.00, while the student ratings were 0.59. From the above, it is obvious that sex is not a predictor of success for adjunct faculty (question 40, Table 5).

The relationship of the number of dependents and success was explored. It was found that 16 (27.1 percent) of the 59 respondents had no dependents, 12 (20.3 percent) had 1, 11 (18.6 percent) had 2, 13 (22 percent) had 3, 7 (11.8 percent) had 4, 2 (3.4 percent) had 5, and 1 (1.7 percent) had 7. For statistical sampling, groupings were made of none, 1 or 2, and 3 or more. Even with the regroupings, no statistical significance was found for this data element. Cell size limitations precluded a test of the self-evaluations (question 41, Table 5).

A variation on question 41 was made to determine the number of persons with whom the adjunct shared living quarters. Twelve individuals (20.3 percent) of the 59 responding indicated living alone, 17 (28.8 percent) said that they lived with one other person, 8 (13.6 percent) said 2, 13 (20 percent) indicated a living arrangement of 3, 6 (10.2 percent) shared their quarters with 4, 2 (3.4 percent) 5, and 1 (1.7 percent) had 7. This distribution was difficult to deal with statistically, so a compression was undertaken to none, 1, or 2 or more. There was no statistical significance in the responses to this question. Again,

cell size limitations precluded a test of the self-evaluations (question 42, Table 5).

Two questions were asked about the adjunct's residence. The first asked for a description. The bulk of the adjuncts, 56 (93.33 percent), reported living in single family residences. Of these, the administration rated 29 as highly successful and 27 average, the students 30 and 26, and self-evaluations were 46 and 10. Of the remaining 4 (6.67 percent), 1 each reported a duplex, a 3 or 4 family residence, an apartment, and other. When grouped, these 4 were rated 2 high and 2 low by the administration, 1 and 3 by the students, and 4 and 0 by the adjuncts themselves (question 43).

The area supporting the university contains many condominiums. Condominium living and its effect upon adjunct professors could not be examined in this study. None of the adjuncts lived in a condominium (question 44).

Does home ownership relate to an adjunct's performance? Only 8 adjuncts reported renting. The others were either owners or buying their residences. Due to the small number of non-owners, no significant statistical analysis could be conducted (question 45).

Some adjuncts travel great distances to conduct their classes. Does this travel have an effect upon their performance? This was not an element included by England (1971)

but seemed to be a follow-on type of element related to biographical data that might function as discriminating factors. This study disclosed that only 2 (3.33 percent) adjuncts traveled less than 2 miles to their teaching locations, 13 (21.67 percent) traveled 2 to 5 miles, 8 (13.33 percent) 6 to 10 miles, 12 (20 percent) 11 to 15 miles, 16 (26.67 percent) 16 to 20 miles, 3 (5 percent) 21 to 25 miles, 3 (5 percent) 26 to 30 miles, 1 (1.67 percent) 31 to 40 miles, and 2 (3.33 percent) over 40 miles. The number of adjuncts in each category was small; therefore, another compression was made by grouping under 6 miles, 6 to 15 miles, 16 to 20 miles, and over 20 miles. Distance did seem to be statistically significant, reported as 0.02 for the administration and 0.05 for self-evaluation. Distance was not significant for the students. The highest rating seemed to be for those who traveled 6 to 15 miles and more than 20 miles. The distances became even more significant when the 16 to 20 mile and the more than 20 mile groups were combined; then, significances of 0.02 were obtained for both the administration and self-evaluations. The major contribution to the cells seemed to be the large number of average adjuncts commuting less than six miles when coupled with the small number of highly successful traveling that distance. Commuting distance still was not statistically significant for the students. Cell size

limitations precluded the acceptance of the conclusions from the self-evaluations (question 46, Table 5).

Most of the adjunct faculty had lived in the Puget Sound area for a considerable period of time. Only 2 (3.33 percent) had lived in the area for under one year, 4 (6.67 percent) from 1 to 2 years, 3 (5 percent) 2 to 3 years, 7 (11.67 percent) 3 to 5 years, 11 (18.33 percent) 5 to 7 years, 11 (18.33 percent) 7 to 10 years, 2 (3.33 percent) 10 to 15 years, 4 (6.67 percent) 15 to 20 years, and 16 (26.67 percent) over 20 years. Since the numbers were so small in many categories, a compression was undertaken to under 5 years, 5 to 10 years, and over 10 years. A trend was established in which 5 to 10 years seemed to be a negative aspect. Length of residence became statistically significant in the student evaluations at 0.02. An analysis of the cell contribution revealed that the most significant contribution was by the 5 to 10 year group. Here it was the large average group that had the greatest influence on the results. The administration findings revealed no statistical significance. The cell sizes in the self-evaluations were too small to permit statistical examination (question 47, Table 5).

This study did not reveal any of the classic biographical data elements to be predictors of success for adjunct faculty in the teaching of business and public

administration. The students' ratings showed positive statistical significance between the amount of time the adjunct had lived in the Puget Sound area and success. This was not supported by the administration or the self-evaluations. A significant relationship was noted for administration ratings when the distance traveled to teach was examined. The bulk of those traveling less than 6 miles were in the average group, while those traveling more than 6 miles were in the highly successful group.

Test of the Hypotheses

The data collected in this study were examined using a cross-tab tabulation and a nonparametric statistical test with the chi-square technique. When only four cells were present, a corrected chi-square was computed. Statistical significance at the 0.10 level was examined.

This study focused on an examination of each of the discrete variables as they related to the success of an adjunct in teaching business and public administration, rather than on the three evaluation tools, administration, students, and self. The focus in this chapter was on these discrete variables. The hypotheses were a tool to lead in this examination.

Twenty-eight chi-squares were computed for administration and student ratings where cell requirements were met.

Of the combined 56, approximately 16 percent were significant. This exceeded the expected number by 6 percent for these groups. It is of interest that 21.4 percent of the administration's ratings were significant, whereas only 10.7 percent of the student ratings were significant. This percentage places the students' evaluations at about what might be expected by chance. The chi-square for the self-ratings yielded only one significant result out of a possible 14. This fell below that which would be expected from chance.

Table 15 portrays the discriminations between the highly successful and the average or below adjunct. Statistical significances are shown. In certain cases there would have been statistical significance had the cell sizes met the chi-square requirement. These cases are indicated, as are other areas with insufficient cell size.

With Table 15 and the percentages of significance in mind, the following sub-hypotheses were examined.

H_1 : There will be significant differences in past experiences between those adjunct faculty members who were rated by the academic administration as highly successful when compared with those who were rated average.

When the variables were factored into discrete segments or categories, the backgrounds of the adjuncts did reveal certain past experiences which separated the highly

Table 15
Discriminations Between Highly Successful
and Average Adjuncts

Question	Administration	Student	Self
1 Years of teaching	No	No	Yes
3 University teaching experience	No	No	Yes ^a
9 Not holding a master's degree	Yes	No	No
15 Articles published	b	Yes ^a	b
22 Sick or injured	No	Yes	No
23 Position in organization	Yes ^a	No	b
24 Current salary	Yes ^a	b	b
25 Military rank	Yes	No	No
26 Length of military service	Yes	Yes	No
34 Office in college	b	b	Yes ^a
39 Employment of spouse	Yes	No	No
46 Commuting distance	Yes	No	Yes ^c
47 Time living in area	No	Yes	b

^aQuestions 3 (university teaching experiences), 15 (articles published), 24 (current salary), and 34 (offices held in college) showed a statistical significance at the 0.10 level. However, 20% of the cells or more contained less than an expected cell frequency of 5. This element, therefore, cannot be included in the firm conclusions of this study.

^bTwenty percent or more of the cells contained less than an expected cell frequency of 5. These are indicated here only to aid future researchers.

^cQuestion 46, commuting distance, showed a statistical significance at the 0.10 level for both the administration and self-evaluations. However, two of the six cells examined in the self-evaluation contained less than an expected cell frequency of 5. This element, therefore, is included in the conclusions of this study for the administration's ratings, but only noted for the self-ratings.

successful teaching group from the average and below group. Six of the 28 variables were statistically significant at the 0.10 level. Since this number of significant elements is more than double what would have been expected due to chance, the above hypothesis was accepted.

H₂: There will be significant differences in past experiences between those adjunct faculty members who were rated by the students in their classes as highly successful when compared with those who were rated average.

When the variables were factored into discrete segments or categories, the backgrounds of the adjuncts did reveal three variables which related to the highly successful teaching group. However, the number of elements selected was about what would have been expected by chance. The above hypothesis was not accepted.

H₃: There will be significant differences in past experiences between those adjunct faculty members who rated themselves as highly successful when compared with those who rated themselves as average.

Again, when the variables were factored into discrete segments or categories, the backgrounds of the adjuncts revealed only one significance out of the 14 relationships examined which separated the highly successful group from the average group. This was less than could be expected by chance. Therefore, the above hypothesis was not accepted.

With one of the three sub-hypotheses accepted and two not accepted, the hypothesis was examined.

H: There are significant differences in biographical data between those adjunct faculty members who were rated highly successful and those who were rated average or below.

This study has shown that certain biographical factors have had a relationship with and appear to have support for the administration's ratings of the teaching success of adjunct faculty.

An additional research task for this study needed to be examined: In addition, relationships among the three evaluation variables will be analyzed, and areas where agreement or disagreement exists in significant relationships between certain biographical variables and the three evaluations will be explored.

Table 15 shows that in 11 questions out of the 50 considered (18 percent), the administration, the students, and the adjuncts themselves rated each of those elements with statistically significant differences. In only two cases did two of the ratings agree, and in one of these the cell size did not support a finding. In 21 instances (42 percent), the administration and the students agreed on ratings. When the number of tests was reduced to the 28 that

met the chi-square requirement, the percentage of agreement increased to 75 percent.

However, a biserial correlation of the self-student ratings showed $+0.62$ with a standard error of correlation of $.146$. For the administration-student evaluations, a point biserial correlation showed $+0.525$ with a standard error of $.108$. A chi-square test showed a significance greater than $.9$. A phi coefficient of the self-administration ratings showed an estimate of correlation of $+0.13$.

The statistical evaluation shows that there was a significant relationship within the ratings.

CHAPTER FIVE
Summary, Interpretations, Conclusions,
and Recommendations

This chapter contains a summary of the research, interpretations based upon the statistical interpretation of the data collected, conclusions, and recommendations.

Summary

Colleges and universities are depending on adjunct or part-time faculty members to carry an increasing portion of the teaching responsibilities. This situation exists from community colleges through law schools. Poor or unqualified faculty members lead to a disgruntled student body, a loss of students, and eventually to a decline in the academic standing of the institution.

Over the last few decades, little has been done to change the process by which adjunct faculty members are selected. Historically, for adjunct faculty members and other employees, selection was based upon letters of recommendation and an interview. Letters of recommendation are provided by friends of the applicant and present the applicant in a favorable light. The true meaning or content of letters of recommendation is somewhat difficult and costly to verify. These letters are, therefore, of dubious

validity. In the academic community, academic degrees and the sources of those degrees have long been the major selection tool. Most applicants are interviewed at some point during the selection process and hired based upon their academic credentials and the interview. In the academic community, the degrees held and their sources often substitute for letters of recommendation. Recently the resumé has been added to the selection process. This, with a cover letter, often establishes the initial contact between the applicant and the organization. The resumé is limited in that it provides only the information which the applicant would like to present to the hiring party. Resumés have been used to supplement academic credentials in the hiring of adjunct faculty.

Many new tools are available to aid in the employee selection process. These tools may also be used to obtain a high grade of adjunct faculty. Biographical data could be one of these tools. These data have been a valid and inexpensive predictor of success in other fields.

This study was designed to determine whether any significant differences in background experiences existed between the highly successful and the average and below average adjunct faculty members, and further, to determine what some of these differences were.

The theoretical basis for the study was that a person's past performance is a predictor of future performance. It also examined some of the societal elements that exist in the normal life and routines of the adjunct to see if the presence or absence of these elements had an effect on the teaching performance of the adjunct.

It was necessary to consider several sources of ratings whereby an adjunct is judged to be highly successful or average. Three of these ratings were utilized in the study: the ratings given by the university administration, the ratings or evaluations given by the students taught by each adjunct, and the adjunct's own evaluation of his/her success or lack of success with these students. The administration's ratings were a one-time rating for this study on a scale of outstanding, excellent, good, fair, or poor. The student evaluations were derived through the use of the normal student and course evaluation form used in the off-campus programs of the subject university, with a point scale ranging from 5 denoting outstanding to 1 designating poor. Adjuncts rated themselves on their performance in the last class they taught on a scale of outstanding, excellent, good, fair, or poor through one of the questions in the questionnaire.

The subjects of this study were male and female adjunct faculty members teaching in an off-campus program

in business and public administration for a small liberal arts university in several locations in the Pacific Northwest. The study took place during the winter of 1983. A sample of 60 from a population of 82 adjuncts responded either to a letter transmitting the questionnaire or to one follow-up letter.

The study took place during a period in which the subject university had announced the closing of its off-campus programs and termination of the offering of graduate degrees in business and public administration. Of the adjunct faculty utilized in this study, only three were teaching for the first time, while another three had taught less than one year.

The significance of the sample of 60 respondents of the population of 82 was determined through the use of several tests examining the responding and non-responding groups using both the students' and administration's reports. Since the self-evaluation was drawn from responses within the questionnaires, no comparison could be undertaken between responders and non-responders. Tests of the student responses included a t test with a pooled variance estimate of probability of .9 and a one-way analysis of variance which showed no relationship; a chi-square test on the administration's ratings also showed no relationship. These tests showed no significant differences

between the groups; thus, the sample was accepted as representative of the population.

To test the research question, other tests were conducted. A biserial correlation of the self-student ratings showed $+0.62$ with a standard error of correlation of $.146$. For the administration-student evaluations a point biserial correlation showed $+0.525$ with a standard error of $.108$. A chi-square test showed a significance greater than $.9$. A phi coefficient of the self-administration ratings showed an estimate of correlation of $+0.13$.

As determined by both the administration and student ratings, 31 adjuncts were in the highly successful category and 29 in the average or below average category. In the self-evaluation, 50 of the adjuncts rated themselves highly successful and 10 average. Biographical data were secured through the means of a questionnaire of 51 questions designed for this study based upon those biographical elements selected by England (1971). Some additions were made to the items to fit the local situation.

The hypotheses were placed in the null form and examined based upon the responses to the questionnaire. These responses were analyzed using the chi-square technique for significance at the 0.10 level, and the hypotheses were tested.

Interpretations

A hypothesis with three sub-hypotheses was developed concerned with the likelihood of distinguishing performance of an adjunct faculty member based upon past performance. The sub-hypotheses were concerned with evaluation of success by the administration, by the students taught, and a self-evaluation by the adjunct.

The analysis did support the hypotheses for the administration's ratings. Analysis indicated that there were certain elements in the background of non-teaching experiences of the adjuncts that distinguished between those who were rated highly successful and those who were rated average or below. The hypothesis could not be accepted for the student or self-ratings. The average and below group for the self-evaluation was too small to permit many statistical significance tests.

Several areas were identified from the ratings which distinguished between those adjuncts who were rated as highly successful and those rated average or below, 21.4 percent from the administration's evaluations, 10.7 percent from the student evaluations, and 7.1 percent through the self-evaluations. Of these, only two were common to two ratings, but none to all. There was little commonality across ratings as to significant variables predicting success.

Teaching Experience

Years teaching: The adjuncts' self-ratings related positively to success in teaching for the group that taught for over five years when compared with the under five years group. Significance was at the 0.05 level. No such significance existed in the other two rating groups.

Teaching at several universities: In the self-evaluations, those adjuncts with teaching experience at more than one university received higher teaching ratings. Significance was at the 0.01 level. However, the chi-square cell distribution was not met, and the significance could not be accepted. No significance was found for the other groups.

Educational Background

Neither the degrees held by the adjuncts nor their sources proved to be significant in the performance of the adjuncts. The possession of a doctorate did not indicate any significant relationship with success. The possession of special licenses added nothing to the statistical significance of the adjunct's rating.

Possession of a master's degree: An unexpected significance was determined when examining the administration's ratings of those who possessed or did not possess master's degrees. Their higher evaluations showed a

statistically significant relationship for the 8 adjuncts who did not have master's degrees. This was not found in the students' or the adjuncts' ratings.

Publishing

The academic standard of success based upon writing was not supported in this study. No statistical significance could be found discerning the relationships between publishing books or presenting papers at conventions or other assemblies and success or the lack thereof. There was, however, a relationship between the publishing of articles and the ratings. When the distinction was made among those who published no articles, those who published from one to five, and those publishing over five, the adjuncts in the one to five bracket received the higher ratings. This relationship was significant at the 0.02 level for the student evaluations. This significance could not be supported due to the small size of two of the six cells, which did not meet the chi-square requirements. The relationship was not statistically significant for the administration. The self-evaluation was not significant, but as was the case with the student ratings, expected cell size was not met.

Professional Experiences

The adjuncts came from several professional fields. Two elements in their professional lives proved to be of statistical significance: their current positions and their current incomes.

Level within the organization: Those in the higher levels within their organizations were rated significantly higher as adjunct teachers by the administration than those who were not in the higher levels.

Remuneration from normal occupation: For administration ratings, those in the income brackets of \$15,000 to \$29,999 and those over \$40,000 were identified more frequently as successful than those below \$15,000 and those between \$30,000 and \$40,000. However, the expected cell size was too small for acceptance. Income was not significant in the other two analyses.

Stress

Time lost from sickness or injury in the previous year showed a significant relationship with the evaluations by the students. In comparisons between those who had lost time and those who had not lost time, the students rated those with no time lost over those who had lost time at a significance level of 0.10.

Military Service

About half of the sample reported having had military service. Military service or the lack of it proved to be of statistical significance.

Military rank: Adjuncts who attained commissioned or warrant officer ranks were rated higher than those who either had no service or held other ranks or grades by the administration. Significance was at the 0.05 level. There was no statistical significance in the self- or the student ratings.

Military service: Military service of more than five years was positively significant at the 0.02 level for the administration ratings and the 0.08 level for the student ratings when compared with no service or service of less than five years. No statistical significance was revealed for the self-evaluations.

Membership and Participation

There was no statistical significance associated with membership in professional, social, service, or fraternal organizations, or of the offices held in them. However, the adjuncts' self-evaluations revealed positive significance at the 0.04 level with offices held while in college. Those who held these offices rated themselves higher than those who did not. Neither the administration nor the

student evaluations showed statistical significance concerning those who possessed these data elements.

Commuting Distances

The one area in which the administration and the self-ratings showed statistical significance was that of commuting. The pattern for all showed low ratings for those commuting less than 6 miles and gave higher ratings to those commuting 6 to 15 miles or over 20 miles. Significance for this element was 0.02 for the administration and 0.05 for the adjuncts. However, the cell sizes in the self-evaluation did not meet the chi-square requirement. Commuting was not statistically significant in the students' ratings.

Time Living in the Puget Sound Area

Positive significance was shown in the student ratings of the adjuncts who had lived in the Puget Sound area for between 5 and 10 years when compared with those who had resided in the area for a shorter or longer period at the 0.02 level. Neither the administration's nor the adjuncts' ratings showed significance in this area.

Other Factors

None of the other areas examined showed statistical significance at the 0.10 level. These areas included

motivation, reading patterns, political activity, vacation planning, and personal data.

Of the 15 relationships reported above, five had chi-square expected cell sizes too small for statistical acceptance. They were included as possible areas for future research.

Conclusions

In drawing conclusions for this study, it must be remembered that the subjects of this study were adjuncts or part-time faculty members, not full-time educators. The students in this study were engaged in an off-campus evening program of education. These students may or may not have had the same motivations, study time, and expectations of full-time, on-campus students. The conclusions drawn, then, pertain to an evening program, a program probably less traditional than those found in an on-campus graduate or undergraduate program.

It must also be remembered that the study was conducted during a reduction in the off-campus academic program of the university. Few new and untried adjuncts were utilized. Although the sample was shown to be statistically representative of the total population, the characteristics of that total population could be questioned. In very few instances was a poor or unsatisfactory rating

reported. Only four adjuncts (4.8 percent of the population of 82) were rated poor by the administration. The students reported only two (2.4 percent) with a score below 3. The responding adjuncts (N = 60) reported no poor or unsatisfactory ratings, 1 low good, 2 good, and 7 high good on the self-rating scale. Eleven of the adjuncts considered themselves as outstanding and the rest excellent. The administration rated 37 (45 percent) as excellent or better, and the student median was 4.270. The absence of individuals at the lower end of the rating scales may have had a skewing effect upon the study.

Institutions of higher education, as well as the rest of the population, need to protect themselves from the ever-increasing volume of legal actions brought about by disgruntled individuals. The literature supports the idea that the use of improved selection methods is one defense available to academic institutions. The literature bears out the idea that selection techniques which point to or predict specific elements of success can meet the current court verdicts under EEO legislation.

This study is important not only in those areas which were found to be significant, but also in those areas where no significance was found. The normal press for the academic community to publish books and articles and to present papers at conventions was found not to be significant

in predicting the success of an adjunct faculty member. Whether it is of prime consideration for a full-time faculty member should be the subject of another study. The pattern which developed from the students' evaluations, suggesting that the adjunct who published a few articles, probably on those topics in which he/she had a vital interest, was more successful, should be explored further.

It was expected that experience would play a positive role in the pattern of a highly successful adjunct. There were, however, few adjuncts in this study who were new to teaching.

Significance was also expected to be found in the willingness of adjuncts to attend training workshops and to try to improve their abilities as adjuncts. Possibly the location of the workshops and the travel distance or the lack of remuneration for attending had a bearing on the outcome of this element.

The idea that military officers and those with more than five years of military service can become highly successful in the teaching environment opens vistas for some of the retired community to become useful in part-time service.

Attention to the student seems to be an underlying element in the student evaluations. The area of time lost due to sickness or injury is indicative of this expectation.

The students in this program seemed to be interested in their education, not in just getting by. Although this study does not support the idea, it can be inferred that the students are interested in having faculty members who are in the classroom and not absent for various reasons. Evidently they placed emphasis on faculty attendance and dedication to teaching.

The study focused attention on the disparity between the values of the individual adjunct held by the administration, the students, and the adjuncts themselves. At no point in this study did all three agree on the presence of one characteristic which would indicate success. There were only two areas in which two agreed. There were, however, many indications that the absence of a characteristic or element had an effect upon the rating. This study did not show significance for presence or absence of items when the three evaluations were compared. It should be noted, however, that biserial correlations between student and administrative ratings, as well as between student and self-ratings, indicated positive significant relationships at around the 0.60 level. No such relationships were revealed between administration and self-ratings. More study is needed in the field of evaluation in the academic environment to obtain ratings which show validity between raters.

There is significance in the findings as to the employment of adjunct faculty members to teach business and public administration. Combining the ideas presented through the review of the literature, the evaluations, and the responses to the questionnaire, that relevance lies in more careful selection procedures. When these ideas are combined, there is an inference that the institution must look beyond the academic credentials, the source, and the level of degree, to subjects or professional competence and teaching ability. It is probably not what one has written but what one can teach that becomes important in the part-time teaching world.

The hypothesis can be accepted for the administration's ratings, which indicated a significant (21.4 percent) rate of agreement. The number of significant relationships between the biographical data and student ratings as well as self-ratings were at or below what might be due to chance.

The findings of this study lead to the conclusion that biographical data have limited usefulness as a predictor of success in the hiring of adjunct faculty. The results do show sufficient statistical significance to support research on some of the elements which were included in the study. Colleges and universities, however, must continue to improve their selection techniques for adjunct faculty.

Further studies in biographical data, human factors in education, and demonstration teaching by a new adjunct need to be performed.

Some of the educational institutions consulted while conducting this study are revising their selection procedures for adjunct faculty to reduce the emphasis on source of degree and publishing of materials and increasing emphasis on the human relations factors involved in teaching.

A final conclusion is that in today's academic world, the adjunct or part-time faculty member is a major element. The adjunct provides the educational institution with flexibility to meet changing needs in education with professionally and educationally qualified individuals to teach the student body. To establish and maintain a quality program, more attention will have to be placed upon selection of adjunct faculty who have the ability to relate their experiences in the business and professional worlds to eager students.

Recommendations

The following recommendations are drawn from this study to provide additional data for the selection, use,

and evaluation of adjunct faculty members. These recommendations come from the data developed during the study, the review of the literature, and general observations.

1. This study showed that ideas of what constitutes an outstanding, excellent, good, or poor adjunct faculty member are not the same for the program administrators, the students, and the adjuncts themselves. In spite of the biserial correlations which would account for about two-thirds of the variance in predicting faculty ratings from student ratings, or self-ratings from student ratings, an inspection of Table 15 (Chapter Four, page 119) indicates considerable commonality in those areas of significance reported for the three rating groups. Appendices D, E, and F show that individual ratings by the administration, the students, and the adjuncts themselves were not the same, and that few of the adjuncts rated themselves in the average and below categories. Further study needs to be undertaken to explore the differences in these ratings.

2. Evaluation procedures for faculty members need to be examined to develop new and more responsive systems. The review of the literature and this study showed that the single adjective rating system is arbitrary and does not always provide for the most efficient rating system. The five-position selection allows the rater more freedom, but still provides wide latitude for individual interpretation.

A BARS system (Beatty and Schneier, 1977) might be developed for educational use by both the administration and the students.

3. There was no significance in the adjunct's presence or absence at the workshops presented by the administration. There was no evidence that the adjuncts received any information from the administration, except for the student evaluation, about their progress or standing with the university. As this study progressed and the news of the closing spread, some of the adjuncts expressed verbally their concern for their future with the university. Feedback through the use of an administration evaluation might have led to an improved core of adjunct faculty. Tullar (1982) reported that when adjunct faculty received feedback on their progress through the use of evaluation systems, the number of faculty members receiving outstanding ratings increased significantly.

4. Institutions of higher education should review their objectives in the areas of research, publishing, and teaching. The use of publishing as a criterion of success was not supported in this study when teaching advanced undergraduates and graduate students. A study should be conducted with students engaged in a doctoral program to investigate the importance of research and publishing when

teaching students at this level. Does the emphasis or goal within education change with the level of education?

5. This study examined the importance of having a license or special qualifications to success. Success was not related to possession of a specific qualification or license relative to a specific course, such as obtaining a CPA and teaching accounting, or a JD and teaching business law. Follow-on study should be done in this area.

6. This study addressed the importance of the absence of the faculty member due to sickness or injury, but did not address the question of the absence of the faculty from the classroom for other reasons. Some faculty members are frequently absent from the classroom for reasons other than sickness or injury. A study needs to be done to investigate the impact of the absence of the faculty from the classroom.

7. More work needs to be done to add to Miller's (1974) study of what constitutes good teaching. Evaluation systems cannot be improved until these characteristics are more fully defined. The discrepancies in the student and administration evaluations show that there is a disagreement between these two as to what characteristics of an adjunct are important to the administration and to the student.

8. Additional studies of the use of biographical data and other selection techniques need to be undertaken at an institution utilizing a larger number of adjunct faculty, one in which the level of success is not skewed. Studies of the human relations aspects of employment might prove significant and might be combined with biographical data in the selection process.

The following recommendations are based upon the review of the literature and the investigator's experiences in the preparation and conduct of this study.

1. The work of England (1961, 1971) and Owens (1976) should provide the basis for several future studies of the application and use of biographical data in all types of endeavor. These studies are still of value today. More of their data elements could be used for an additional study of background data and the adjunct faculty. Further studies of the use of biographical data in the academic community should be performed.

2. The literature suggested that the adjunct will play an ever-increasing role in higher education. This study did not address the relative ratings or positions of adjunct faculty versus full-time or tenured faculty. A further study should be undertaken to determine the comparative ratings of adjunct and full-time faculty.

The adjunct faculty member will remain a major teaching element in higher education. Continued study should be undertaken to ensure that the best adjuncts are placed in the classroom with today's and tomorrow's students.

REFERENCES

REFERENCES

- Acuff, H. 1982. "Improving the Employment Function." Quoted in Personnel and Human Resource Management, by Randall S. Schuler. St. Paul, Minnesota: West Publishing Company, 1984, p. 121.
- Albright, Lewis E., and Glennon, J. R. 1961. "Personal History Correlates of Physical Scientists' Career Aspirations." Journal of Applied Psychology 45, no. 5: 281-84.
- Asher, James J. 1972. "The Biographical Item: Can It Be Improved?" Personnel Psychology 25: 251-69.
- Beason, George M., and Belt, John A. 1974. "Verifying Job Applicants' Background." The Personnel Administrator 19, no. 8 (November-December): 29-32.
- Beatty, Richard W., and Schneier, Craig E. 1977. Personnel Administration: An Experimental Skill Building Approach. Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley.
- Bouchard, Thomas, Jr. 1976. "Field Research Methods: Interviewing, Questionnaires, Participant Observation, Systematic Observation, Unobtrusive Measures." In Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology. Ed. M. D. Dunnette. Chicago: Rand McNally, pp. 363-413.
- Buel, William D. 1965. "Biographical Data and the Identification of Creative Research Personnel." Journal of Applied Psychology 49, no. 5: 318-21.
- 1972. "An Alternative to Testing." Personnel Journal 51 (May): 336-41.
- Burton, C. E. 1956. College Teachers. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich. Quoted in Developing Programs for Faculty Evaluation, by Richard I. Miller. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1974, pp. 120-21.
- Calhoon, Richard P., and Reddy, A. 1968. "The Frantic Search for Predictors of Success." Journal of College Placement, February-March, pp. 54-66.

- Cascio, Wayne F. 1976. "Turnover, Biographical Data, and Fair Employment Practice." Journal of Applied Psychology 48, no. 2: 101-05.
- Clarke, Walter V. 1972. "A New Look at the Hiring Procedure." Personnel Journal 51 (June): 428-30, 454.
- Coleman, Raymond J., and Riley, M. J. 1970. "The Chief Executive: His Personality Characteristics and the Firm's Growth Rate." Personnel Journal 49 (December): 994-1001.
- England, George W. 1961. Development and Use of Weighted Application Blanks. Dubuque, Iowa: William C. Brown.
- 1971. "Development and Use of Weighted Application Blanks." Bulletin 55. Minneapolis: Industrial Relations Center, University of Minnesota.
- Firth, Michael. 1979. "Impact of Work Experiences on the Validity of Student Evaluations of Teaching Effectiveness." Journal of Educational Psychology 71, no. 5: 726-30.
- Gardner, John W. 1961. Excellence. New York: Harper and Row.
- Goldsmid, Charles A.; Gruber, James E.; and Wilson, Everett K. 1977. "Perceived Attributes of Superior Teachers (PAST): An Inquiry in the Giving of Teacher Awards." American Educational Research Journal 14, no. 4 (Fall): 423-40.
- Goldsmith, Dorothy B. 1922. "The Use of the Personal History Blank as a Salesmanship Test." Journal of Applied Psychology 6, no. 2 (June): 149-55.
- Goldstein, Irwin L. 1971. "The Application Blank: How Honest are the Responses?" Journal of Applied Psychology 55, no. 5: 491-92.
- Gourman, Jack. 1980. The Gourman Report. Los Angeles: National Education Standards.
- Greive, Donald. 1983. Teaching in College--A Resource for Adjuncts and Part Time Faculty. Cleveland, Ohio: Info-Tec.

- Guion, Robert M. 1976. "Recruiting, Selection and Job Placement." In Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology. Ed. M. D. Dunnette. Chicago: Rand McNally, pp. 777-828.
- Harrel, Thomas W. 1960. "The Validity of Biographical Data Items for Food Company Salesmen." Journal of Applied Psychology 44, no. 1: 31-33.
- Hershey, Robert. 1971. "The Application Form." Personnel 48, no. 1: 36-39.
- Higgins, James W. 1976. "A Manager's Guide to the Equal Employment Opportunity Laws." Personnel Journal 55 (August): 406-18.
- Hodges, Richard L., and Burke, John T. 1984. "Can Faculty Retraining Programs Be Used to Meet the Shortage of Accounting Faculty?" Collegiate News and Views 38, no. 1: 43-45.
- Isaac, Stephen, and Michael, William B. 1978. Handbook in Research and Evaluation. San Diego, California: Educational and Industrial Testing Service.
- Ivancevich, John M., and Matteson, Michael T. 1980. Stress and Work--A Managerial Approach. Glenview, Illinois: Scott, Foresman and Company.
- Kavanagh, Michael J., and York, David R. 1972. "Biographical Correlates of Middle Managers' Performance." Personnel Psychology 25, no. 2: 319-32.
- Kearney, William J. 1979. "Behaviorally Anchored Rating Scales--MBO's Missing Ingredient." Personnel Journal 58, no. 1: 20-25.
- Klimoski, Richard J. 1973. "A Biographical Data Analysis of Career Patterns in Engineering." Journal of Vocational Behavior 3: 103-13.
- Korman, A. K. 1971. "Personnel Selection: The Traditional Models." Industrial and Organizational Psychology. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, pp. 178-204.
- Kulberg, Gordon E., and Owens, William A. 1960. "Some Life History Antecedents of Engineering Interests." Journal of Educational Psychology 51, no. 1: 26-31.

- Landy, Frank J., and Farr, James L. 1980. "Performance Rating." Psychological Bulletin 87, no. 1: 72-107.
- Langley, Monica. 1981. "Brain Drain: More Professors are Leaving Their Law Schools to Accept Rewarding Jobs in Private Practice." The Wall Street Journal, 1 September, p. 42.
- Lazer, Robert I. 1976. "The 'Discrimination' Danger in Performance Appraisal." The Conference Board Record, March, pp. 60-64.
- Ledvinka, James. 1977. "EEO Issues with Pre-Employment Inquiries." The Personnel Administrator 22, no. 2: 22-26.
- Levenson, Harry. 1976. "Appraisal of What Performance." Harvard Business Review, July-August, pp. 30-46, 160.
- Loughmiller, Grover C., et al. 1973. "Predicting Career Performance of Physicians Using the Biographical Inventory Approach." Journal of Vocational Behavior 3: 269-78.
- Marques, Todd E.; Lane, David M.; and Dorfman, Peter W. 1979. "Toward the Development of a System for Instructional Evaluation: Is There Consensus Regarding What Constitutes Effective Teaching." Journal of Educational Psychology 71, no. 6: 840-49.
- Maslow, A. H., and Zimmerman, W. 1956. "College Teaching Ability, Scholarly Activity and Personality." Journal of Educational Psychology 47: 185-89.
- McCullough, Charles D., and Wooten, Bob E. 1981. "The Shortage of Terminally Qualified Professors of Business: Fact or Fiction." Collegiate News and Views 35, no. 1: 1-3.
- Miller, Richard I. 1972. Evaluating Faculty Performance. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- 1974. Developing Programs for Faculty Evaluation. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Minter, Robert L. 1972. "Human Rights Laws and Pre-Employment Inquiries." Personnel Journal 51 (June): 431-33.

- Mobley, William H. 1974. "Meeting Government Guidelines on Testing and Selection." The Personnel Administrator 19, no. 8: 42-48.
- Mosel, James N., and Wade, Richard R. 1951. "A Weighted Application Blank for Reduction of Turnover in Department Store Sales Clerks." Personnel Psychology 4, no. 2: 177-84.
- Nash, Allan N., and Carroll, Stephen J., Jr. 1970. "A Hard Look at the Reference Check: Its Modest Worth Can Be Improved." Business Horizons, October, pp. 43-49.
- National Institute for Staff and Organizational Development. 1982. "Survey Profiles Master Teachers." Linkages 5, no. 2: 1, 4.
- Nevo, Barukh. 1976. "Using Biographical Information to Predict Success of Men and Women in the Army." Journal of Applied Psychology 61, no. 1: 106-08.
- Nicholson, Athyleen F. 1981. President, Puget Sound Institute, former coordinator, United States International University programs at McChord AFB, Washington. Personal interview. 4 February.
- . 1982. President, Puget Sound Institute, former coordinator, United States International University programs at McChord AFB, Washington. Personal interview. 17 September.
- Novak, Stanley R. 1970. "Developing an Effective Application Blank." Personnel Journal 49 (May): 419-23.
- Owens, William A. 1976. "Background Data." In Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology. Ed. M. D. Dunnette. Chicago: Rand McNally, pp. 609-44.
- Pace, Larry A., and Schoenfeldt, Lyle F. 1977. "Legal Concerns in the Use of Weighted Applications." Personnel Psychology 30, no. 2: 159-66.
- Perin, Stanley Richard. 1981. "Biographical Indicators that Distinguish Corporate Personnel Who Terminate Early from Those Who Complete International Assignment." Doctoral dissertation, United States International University.

- Peterson, Frank N. 1980. Director of the Graduate School, University of Puget Sound. Personal interview. 3 December.
- . 1983. Director of the Graduate School, University of Puget Sound. Personal interview. 10 February.
- . 1986. Director of the Graduate School, University of Puget Sound. Personal interview. 12 February.
- Peterson, Gary L. 1980. "Careers in Transition: Final Report." Unpublished report, University of Puget Sound.
- Polley, Roy J. 1980. Director of Graduate Studies, School of Business and Public Administration, University of Puget Sound. Personal interview. 3 December.
- . 1982. Director of Graduate Studies, School of Business and Public Administration, University of Puget Sound. Personal interview. 3 March.
- Rawls, James R., and Rawls, Donna J. 1974. "Recent Trends in Management Selection." Personnel Journal 53, no. 2: 104-09.
- Reilly, Richard R., and Chao, Georgia T. 1980. "Validity and Fairness of Alternative Employee Selection Procedures." Unpublished report.
- Ritchie, Richard J., and Boehm, Virginia R. 1977. "Biographical Data as a Predictor of Women's and Men's Management Potential." Journal of Vocational Behavior 11: 363-68.
- Roach, Darrel E. 1971. "Double Cross-Validation of a Weighted Application Blank Over Time." Journal of Applied Psychology 55, no. 2: 157-60.
- Schuh, Allen J. 1967a. "Application Blank Items and Intelligence as Predictors of Turnover." Personnel Psychology 20: 59-63.
- . 1967b. "The Predictability of Employee Tenure: A Review of the Literature." Personnel Psychology 20: 113-52.

- Schuler, Randall S. 1984. Personnel and Human Resource Management. St. Paul, Minnesota: West Publishing.
- Schwab, Donald P., and Oliver, Richard L. 1974. "Predicting Tenure with Biographical Data: Exhuming Buried Evidence." Personnel Psychology 27, no. 1: 125-28.
- Scully, Malcolm G. 1984. "U.S. Colleges Not Realizing Their Full Potential, Panel Says; Urges a National Debate on Quality." The Chronicle of Higher Education 29, no. 9: 1, 34.
- Selye, Hans. 1974. Stress Without Distress. New York: Signet Books, The New American Library.
- Sherman, Barbara R., and Blackburn, Robert T. 1975. "Personnel Characteristics and Teaching Effectiveness of College Faculty." Journal of Educational Psychology 67, no. 1: 124-31.
- Study Group on the Conditions of Excellence in American Higher Education. 1984. "Involvement in Learning: Realizing the Potential of American Higher Education." The Chronicle of Higher Education 29, no. 9: 35-38, 40-49.
- Subkoviak, Michael J., and Levin, Joel R. 1974. "Determining the Characteristics of the Ideal Professor: An Alternative Approach." Journal of Educational Measurement 11, no. 4: 269-76.
- Tanofsky, Robert; Shepps, R. Ronald; and O'Neill, Paul J. 1969. "Pattern Analysis of Biographical Predictors of Success as an Insurance Salesman." Journal of Applied Psychology 53, no. 2: 136-39.
- Taylor, Calvin W., and Ellison, Robert L. 1967. "Biographical Predictors of Scientific Performance." Science 155, no. 3768: 1075-79.
- Taylor, Kenneth E., and Weiss, David J. 1972. "Prediction of Individual Job Termination from Measured Job Satisfaction and Biographical Data." Journal of Vocational Behavior 2: 123-32.
- Thompson, David W. 1970. "Selective Trait Matching Sequence: An Alternative Approach to Management Selection and Promotion." Personnel Journal 51 (January): 45-49.

- Tucker, David. 1985. President of Seattle International University, former professor at Seattle University. Personal interview. 17 June.
- Tucker, Michael F.; Cline, Victor B.; and Schmitt, James R. 1967. "Predictions of Creativity and Other Performance Measures from Biographical Information Among Pharmaceutical Scientists." Journal of Applied Psychology 51, no. 2: 131-38.
- Tullar, V. Philip. 1982. "Recognizing Teaching Excellence Among Part-Time Faculty." Linkages 5, no. 4: 2, 4.
- Washington State Board for Community College Education. 1984. "A Study of Part-Time Faculty in Washington Community Colleges." Draft.
- Wiegman, Eugene W. 1982. Former President, Pacific Lutheran University. Personal interview. 4 February.
- Wilson, Robert C.; Dienst, Evelyn R.; and Watson, Nancy. 1973. "Characteristics of Effective College Teachers as Perceived by Their Colleagues." Journal of Educational Measurement 10, no. 1: 31-37.

APPENDICES

Appendix A
QUESTIONNAIRE

Code:

QUESTIONNAIRE

Please answer all questions in the space provided. Unless otherwise directed, select only one response by circling the appropriate number, or inserting that number in the space provided (i.e., [2]). If you have any other comments, please feel free to add them at the end.

1. How long have you been teaching?
 1. First time
 2. 3-6 months
 3. 7-12 months
 4. 1 year
 5. 2 years
 6. 3 years
 7. 4 years
 8. 5-10 years
 9. 11-20 years
 0. 20 years (+)

2. How long have you taught for the _____?
 1. First time
 2. 3-6 months
 3. 7-12 months
 4. 1 year
 5. 2 years
 6. 3 years
 7. 4 years
 8. 5-10 years
 9. 11-20 years
 0. 20 years (+)

3. For how many colleges or universities have you taught?
 1. This is the first
 2. Two
 3. Three
 4. Four
 5. Five
 6. Six
 7. Seven
 8. Eight
 9. Nine
 0. Ten or more

Code:

4. At what ___ campuses have you taught? (Indicate all.)

1. Main (Tacoma)
2. Tacoma Municipal
3. McNeil Island
4. Bangor
5. Bremerton
6. Fort Lewis
7. McChord
8. Olympia
9. Seattle
0. Other

5. Indicate other levels at which you have taught. (Indicate all.)

1. Kindergarten-9
2. Grades 10-12
3. 4 year undergrad
4. Graduate schools
5. Vocational/Technical
6. Community/Junior College
7. In business
8. In military
9. Other, government
0. Other (specify)

6. How would you rate yourself as an educator if you had been a student in your last class, or the one you are teaching now?

OUTSTANDING	EXCELLENT	GOOD	POOR	UNSATISFACTORY
1.	2.	3. 4. 5.	6.	7.

7. Continuing Education has conducted annual workshops for its faculty. Have you attended any of these workshops?

1. Never
2. Occasionally
3. Regularly

8. Indicate, in addition to the workshops, all formal courses or training you have had in education or teaching methods.

1. Part of my undergraduate studies.
2. Part of my graduate studies.

Code:

3. At other educational institutions at which I taught.
4. Part of my military courses.
5. Given by my company at work.
6. Other short courses.
7. No other courses in teaching methods.

9. List all of your degrees and their sources:

DEGREE	FIELD	SOURCE	DATE	Est. GPA (4 = A or HR) (3 = B or CR)
Bachelor				
Master's				
Doctorate				

10. List your licenses or other professional qualifications.

11. What are your main reasons for teaching? Indicate three in order of priority.

() First () Second () Third

1. Money
2. Stimulation
3. Keep busy
4. Keep current
5. Keep young
6. Like students
7. Meet new people
8. Employer encourages
9. Status
0. Other (specify)

12. In addition to your adjunct teaching, are you:

1. Employed full time outside of the academic community?
2. Employed part time outside of the academic community?
3. Employed full time as an academic administrator or staff?
4. Employed part time as an academic administrator or staff?

Code:

5. Employed full time in a faculty position (___ or other)?
 6. Employed part time in a faculty position (___ or other)?
 7. Not employed but looking for academic employment?
 8. Not employed but looking for nonacademic employment?
 9. Not employed, not looking for employment?
 0. Retired?
13. There are a number of obstacles to teaching at any institution or at any location. Of the following, which three do you consider to be the prime obstacles for you working at this institution and at the location at which you do most of your teaching?
- () First () Second () Third
1. Distance to the campus location.
 2. Time constraints imposed by the university.
 3. Time constraints imposed by other employer.
 4. Time of classes (evenings).
 5. Family responsibilities.
 6. Salary of an adjunct.
 7. Student abilities and their time constraints.
 8. Curriculum problems.
 9. Problems with other faculty (main campus or off campus).
 0. Administrative problems.
14. Please list any books of which you were the author or co-author:
15. Please list any articles which you have had published:
16. Please list any papers which you delivered to a conference.

PAPER

CONFERENCE

YEAR

Code:

17. What do you consider to be your major professional field?
1. Accounting
 2. Banking
 3. Quantitative
 4. Finance
 5. Law
 6. Computers
 7. Management
 8. Marketing
 9. Other Business
 0. Non-business
18. Who is your normal employer; if retired, your former employer?
1. City
 2. County
 3. State
 4. Military
 5. Other federal
 6. Self
 7. Higher education
 8. Other profit
 9. Other nonprofit
 0. Other
19. How long have you been in your profession? (Do not include time as a full-time student.)
1. Under 1 year
 2. 1 year
 3. 2 years
 4. 3-5 years
 5. 6-7 years
 6. 8-10 years
 7. 11-15 years
 8. 16-20 years
 9. 21-25 years
 0. 25 years (+)
20. For how many of the last ten years have you been employed?
1. One
 2. Two
 3. Three

Code:

4. Four
 5. Five
 6. Six
 7. Seven
 8. Eight
 9. Nine or more
 0. None
21. For how many employers have you worked full time during the past ten years, or since your graduation, if your graduation was within the last ten years?
1. One
 2. Two
 3. Three
 4. Four
 5. Five
 6. Five (+)
 7. Still a student
 8. Did not seek full-time employment
 9. Retired more than 10 years
 0. None
22. During the past year have you been sick or injured, or have you lost any work time due to that sickness or injury?
1. Not sick or injured
 2. Sick or injured, but no lost time
 3. One day lost
 4. 2-4 days lost
 5. One week lost
 6. 2 weeks lost
 7. 3 weeks lost
 8. 4 weeks lost
 9. Two months lost
 0. Three months (+) lost
23. At what level do you consider yourself in your current position within your organization, or if retired, your last position?
1. Top (CEO/Pres)
 2. Upper (V/P)
 3. Upper Staff
 4. Mid Management
 5. Mid Staff
 6. Lower Management

Code:

7. Lower Staff
 8. First Line Supervisor
 9. Entry Level
 0. Other
24. What is your current salary from your normal occupation? Include all income except compensation from this university for your current part-time teaching.
1. Less than \$10,000
 2. \$10,000-\$14,000
 3. \$15,000-\$19,999
 4. \$20,000-\$24,999
 5. \$25,000-\$29,999
 6. \$30,000-\$34,999
 7. \$35,000-\$39,999
 8. \$40,000-\$49,999
 9. \$50,000-\$60,000
 0. Over \$60,000
25. Please indicate the highest rank you held in military service (Regular, Reserve, NG, Auxiliary)
1. No military service
 2. General/Admiral (0-7+)
 3. Colonel/Captain (0-6)
 4. Lt. Col./Cdr. (0-5)
 5. Maj./Lt. Cdr. (0-4)
 6. Other Officer (0-1,2,3)
 7. Warrant Officer
 8. Senior NCO (E-7,8,9)
 9. NCO (E-4,5,6)
 0. Other Enlisted (E-1,2,3)
26. What was the level of your active military service?
1. No military service
 2. Six months or less
 3. Six months-two years
 4. 2-3 years
 5. 4 years
 6. 5-10 years
 7. 11-19 years
 8. 20-24 years
 9. 25-30 years
 0. Over 30 years

Code:

27. In what arm or service or how did you serve?
1. No military service
 2. Merchant Marine
 3. Conscientious Objector
 4. Army
 5. Navy
 6. NOAA
 7. Air Force
 8. Coast Guard
 9. Public Health
 0. CAP
28. During the past year did any of the following events occur in your life? (Indicate all.)
1. Death of a spouse.
 2. Divorce.
 3. Death of a parent or child.
 4. Loss of job.
 5. Major sickness, injury, or surgery.
 6. New marriage.
 7. Major sickness or injury of spouse or child.
 8. Death of a friend.
 9. New job (other than this part-time teaching).
 0. None of the above.
29. To which of the following newspapers do you subscribe or read on a regular basis? (Indicate all.)
1. Seattle Times
 2. Seattle Post-Intelligencer
 3. Tacoma News Tribune
 4. Daily Olympian
 5. Wall Street Journal
 6. Christian Science Monitor
 7. New York Times
 8. Barron's
 9. Other (specify)
 0. Other (specify)
30. Which of the following magazines do you subscribe to or read almost every issue? (Indicate all.)
1. Time
 2. Life
 3. Fortune
 4. Business Week

Code:

- 5. Newsweek
- 6. National Geographic
- 7. U.S. News and World Report
- 8. Harvard Business Review
- 9. Atlantic
- 0. Other

31. What professional journals do you read regularly?

32. To what professional organizations do you belong?

33. To what social/fraternal/service organizations do you belong?

34. If you held appointive or elective office or offices in college while a student, what were they?

POSITION

ORGANIZATION

35. What appointive or elective offices have you held in organizations since graduation?

POSITION

ORGANIZATION

36. When you take a vacation or take time off, do you:

- 1. Like to plan it to the last detail?
- 2. Like to make general plans with some important details planned?
- 3. Like to make general plans, but let the details take care of themselves?
- 4. Like to take spontaneous trips or recreation?
- 5. Like to make general plans centered around your home?
- 6. Like to just work around your home without a plan or set routine?
- 7. Like to just loaf around home on vacation?
- 8. Never take a vacation?

Code:

37. What is your age?

1. Under 26
2. 26-30
3. 31-35
4. 36-40
5. 41-45
6. 46-50
7. 51-55
8. 56-60
9. 61-65
0. Over 65

38. What is your marital status?

1. Married
2. Divorced
3. Widowed
4. Separated
5. Never married

39. Is your spouse gainfully employed outside the home?

1. Spouse is employed full time outside the home.
2. Spouse is employed part time outside the home.
3. Spouse has income-producing activities in the home.
4. Spouse has no income-producing activities.
5. No spouse.

40. What is your sex?

1. Female
2. Male

41. How many dependents do you have, other than yourself?

- | | | | | |
|------|------|------|------|---------|
| 1. 1 | 3. 3 | 5. 5 | 7. 7 | 9. 8+ |
| 2. 2 | 4. 4 | 6. 6 | 8. 8 | 0. None |

42. With how many other people do you share your immediate living quarters?

- | | | | | |
|------|------|------|------|---------|
| 1. 1 | 3. 3 | 5. 5 | 7. 7 | 9. 8+ |
| 2. 2 | 4. 4 | 6. 6 | 8. 8 | 0. None |

Code:

43. Which of the following best describes your residence?

1. Single family house
2. Mobile home
3. Duplex
4. 3 or 4 family
5. Apartment
6. Other

44. Is your residence a condominium?

1. Yes
2. No

45. Which of the following indicates your residence?

1. Own
2. Rent
3. Buying
4. Living with other members of the family (parents)
5. Other

46. How far is it, in miles, from your residence to the place at which you do most of your teaching?

1. Under 1
2. 1-2
3. 3-5
4. 6-10
5. 11-15
6. 16-20
7. 21-25
8. 26-30
9. 31-40
0. Over 40

47. How long have you lived in the Puget Sound area (cumulative)?

1. Under 1 year
2. 1-2 years
3. 2-3 years
4. 3-5 years
5. 5-7 years
6. 7-10 years
7. 10-15 years
8. 15-20 years
9. 20-25 years
0. Over 25 years

Code:

48. Did you vote in the last election? Mark each line.

General (National/State)	1. Yes	2. No
Local (City/County)	3. Yes	4. No
Primary	5. Yes	6. No
Special (Bond/School, etc.)	7. Yes	8. No
Attend Precinct Caucus	9. Yes	0. No

49. Have you ever (indicate all applicable):

1. Been a candidate for any political office.
2. "Doorbelled" or spoken for a political candidate?
3. Held a get-acquainted coffee for a candidate?
4. Attended a political rally?
5. Attended a political convention?
6. Made a financial contribution to a state or local candidate?
7. Made a financial contribution to a national candidate/party?
8. Put up a yard sign for a political candidate?
9. Performed other work in a political campaign?
Specify:
0. Never been involved in a political campaign.

50. How important to you is the monetary remuneration which you receive for teaching your course?

1. Monetary remuneration is my prime reason for teaching.
2. It is of some importance to me.
3. It is of little importance to me.
4. As long as I make my expenses I am happy teaching.

51. How do you feel about the financial remuneration which you receive from the University in relationship to that given by other institutions in the area, considering required experience and teaching load?

1. It is well above other institutions.
2. It is above other institutions.
3. It is comparable to other institutions.
4. It is below other institutions.
5. It is well below other institutions.

Thank you for your time and effort in answering this questionnaire.

Appendix B

COVER AND FOLLOW-UP LETTERS

February 2, 1983

Dear Professor

I need your help in finishing my dissertation. My topic is "Biographic Data as a Predictor of Success in Adjunct Faculty." Since I have taught as an adjunct faculty member at _____ and other universities, and since I have worked with some of you, I believe that I can assist a university in the selection of adjunct faculty. The University of Puget Sound, while not involved in the study, has agreed to assist me in securing the subjects for my research. I sincerely hope you are willing to help me as well.

The hypothesis of my study is that there are discriminating elements in an individual's history which contribute to the success of that adjunct faculty member and could be used in assessing new faculty members. This questionnaire is designed to aid in this search. Please answer each question completely. The questions cover a wide spectrum of your background and are not intended to pry, but to see if there are common biographical elements among the faculty. Since I have been serving on the University Salary Committee, there are a few questions relating to that topic.

To maintain your confidentiality, a random code number has been assigned to your response. No other identification will be available to anyone. This code number will enable me to remove names of respondents from my follow-up mailing list.

Please return the questionnaire in the envelope provided by February 18, 1983.

Thank you for your support in my project.

Sincerely,

M. Clinton Cannon

March 1, 1983

Dear Professor

While reviewing the responses to my February letter, I discovered that a few questionnaires have not been returned, and was told that yours was among that group. I hope that it was just an oversight and that your response will be forthcoming.

It is unfortunate that the announced closing of the off campus programs came at the same time my questionnaire was being distributed, for I know that the announcement upset us all. However, as we all prepare for our future activities, I need to re-evaluate my assets. To obtain a new teaching position, I need to finish my PhD. To complete my study, I need your help. I am therefore asking that you spend twenty to thirty minutes to complete the questionnaire and return it using the campus mail or, if you prefer, through the normal mails.

In case you no longer have the questionnaire, I have included a second copy. Remember that my study is "Biographic Data as a Predictor of Success in Adjunct Faculty," and the hypothesis is that there are discriminating elements in our backgrounds that can contribute to the success of adjunct faculty members. Please help me.

Thanks for your consideration and good luck to you in your future endeavors.

Sincerely,

M. Clinton Cannon

Appendix C

STUDENT EVALUATION FORM

Instructor: _____
 Course: _____ Term/Year: _____

STUDENT OPINION OF INSTRUCTOR AND COURSE

To assist us in planning future courses, we feel that it is important to know how satisfied you are with the present course--how well this course has met your expectations. These questionnaires will be handled confidentially. A summary of the results will be given to the instructor after the final class. Please rate the following questions by marking the number which most clearly expresses your view. We would appreciate any additional comments and suggestions you may have.

	SUPERIOR				POOR
	5	4	3	2	1
1. Is the instructor actively helpful if you have difficulty with the course content?	-	-	-	-	-
2. How well did the instructor accommodate differing levels of skill and expertise?	-	-	-	-	-
3. Do you feel free to ask questions, disagree and express your ideas?	-	-	-	-	-
4. Is the instructor fair and impartial in his or her dealings with you as a student?	-	-	-	-	-
5. Is the instructor's speech easily understood?	-	-	-	-	-
6. Are sufficient examples and illustrations used to clarify the material?	-	-	-	-	-
7. Is the material presented in a well-organized fashion?	-	-	-	-	-
8. Does the instructor introduce new and/or exciting ideas beyond the basic text materials?	-	-	-	-	-

	SUPERIOR				POOR
	5	4	3	2	1
9. Were the objectives of the course clearly presented and pursued?	-	-	-	-	-
10. Is the course work required reasonable?	-	-	-	-	-
11. Are the tests relevant?	-	-	-	-	-
12. How do you rate the contribution of the textbook to the course?	-	-	-	-	-
13. How do you rate this instructor?	-	-	-	-	-
14. How do you rate this course?	-	-	-	-	-

Now please go back over the list and place a check (X) before the items which were most important to you in making your judgments in questions 13 and 14. Again, if you have any additional comments to make about the course, instructor, evaluation form, or UPS in general, please make them on the back of this page. Thank you.

Appendix D

**ADMINISTRATION RATINGS OF ADJUNCT FACULTY
COMPARED TO STUDENT AND SELF**

**ADMINISTRATION RATINGS OF ADJUNCT FACULTY
COMPARED TO STUDENT AND SELF**

Number	Administration Rating	Student Rating	Self- Rating
1	Outstanding	4.810	NR
2	Outstanding	4.810	2
3	Outstanding	4.650	2
4	Outstanding	4.630	1
5	Outstanding	4.580	2
6	Outstanding	4.565	1
7	Outstanding	4.520	1
8	Outstanding	4.500	1
9	Outstanding	4.320	1
10	Outstanding	4.200	1
11	Outstanding	4.170	2
12	Excellent	4.840	2
13	Excellent	4.670	2
14	Excellent	4.670	2
15	Excellent	4.630	2
16	Excellent	4.625	2
17	Excellent	4.620	2
18	Excellent	4.610	1
19	Excellent	4.610	2
20	Excellent	4.570	2
21	Excellent	4.480	2
22	Excellent	4.370	NR
23	Excellent	4.330	1
24	Excellent	4.330	NR
25	Excellent	4.310	1
26	Excellent	4.290	2
27	Excellent	4.290	3
28	Excellent	4.270	3
29	Excellent	4.260	1
30	Excellent	4.250	2
31	Excellent	4.250	NR
32	Excellent	4.250	NR
33	Excellent	4.190	2
34	Excellent	4.090	2
35	Excellent	4.090	NR
36	Excellent	4.030	2
37	Excellent	3.780	2
38	Good	4.757	NR
39	Good	4.750	2
40	Good	4.680	NR

ADMINISTRATION RATINGS OF ADJUNCT FACULTY
 COMPARED TO STUDENT AND SELF
 (continued)

Number	Administration Rating	Student Rating	Self- Rating
41	Good	4.670	2
42	Good	4.670	4
43	Good	4.670	NR
44	Good	4.580	2
45	Good	4.580	2
46	Good	4.460	NR
47	Good	4.440	2
48	Good	4.420	2
49	Good	4.420	NR
50	Good	4.380	NR
51	Good	4.350	2
52	Good	4.330	2
53	Good	4.250	NR
54	Good	4.240	2
55	Good	4.220	NR
56	Good	4.190	2
57	Good	4.180	NR
58	Good	4.170	2
59	Good	4.140	NR
60	Good	4.130	2
61	Good	4.110	2
62	Good	4.080	NR
63	Good	4.070	2
64	Good	4.060	NR
65	Good	4.030	NR
66	Good	4.010	2
67	Good	4.010	4
68	Good	3.990	2
69	Good	3.940	2
70	Good	3.920	NR
71	Good	3.833	3
72	Good	3.710	2
73	Good	3.710	2
74	Good	3.710	3
75	Good	3.380	NR
76	Good	3.183	3

ADMINISTRATION RATINGS OF ADJUNCT FACULTY
 COMPARED TO STUDENT AND SELF
 (continued)

Number	Administration Rating	Student Rating	Self- Rating
77	Good	2.965	3
78	Good	2.750	2
79	Poor	4.250	1
80	Poor	3.850	NR
81	Poor	3.720	5
82	Poor	3.600	2
	Responding	Non-responding	Total
Mean	3.633	3.273	3.537
Standard Deviation	.823	.631	.789

Administrative evaluation: Outstanding (5), Excellent (4), Good (3), Poor (2), Unsatisfactory (1).

Self-evaluation: Outstanding (1), Excellent (2), Good (3, 4, 5), Poor (6), Unsatisfactory (7), No Response (NR).

Numerical listings are for identification only and do not reflect the same position in each appendix chart.

Appendix E

**STUDENT RATINGS OF ADJUNCT FACULTY COMPARED
TO ADMINISTRATION AND SELF**

STUDENT RATINGS OF ADJUNCT FACULTY COMPARED
TO ADMINISTRATION AND SELF

Number	Student Rating	Administration Rating	Self- Rating
1	4.840	Excellent	2
2	4.810	Outstanding	2
3	4.810	Outstanding	NR
4	4.757	Good	NR
5	4.750	Good	2
6	4.680	Good	NR
7	4.670	Excellent	2
8	4.670	Excellent	2
9	4.670	Good	2
10	4.670	Good	4
11	4.670	Good	NR
12	4.650	Outstanding	2
13	4.630	Outstanding	1
14	4.630	Excellent	2
15	4.625	Excellent	2
16	4.620	Excellent	2
17	4.610	Excellent	1
18	4.610	Excellent	2
19	4.580	Good	2
20	4.580	Outstanding	2
21	4.570	Excellent	2
22	4.565	Outstanding	1
23	4.520	Outstanding	1
24	4.500	Outstanding	1
25	4.500	Good	2
26	4.480	Excellent	2
27	4.460	Good	NR
28	4.440	Good	2
29	4.420	Good	2
30	4.420	Good	NR
31	4.380	Good	NR
32	4.370	Excellent	NR
33	4.350	Good	2
34	4.330	Excellent	NR
35	4.330	Good	2
36	4.330	Excellent	1
37	4.320	Outstanding	1
38	4.310	Excellent	1
39	4.290	Excellent	2
40	4.290	Excellent	3

STUDENT RATINGS OF ADJUNCT FACULTY COMPARED
TO ADMINISTRATION AND SELF
(continued)

Number	Student Rating	Administration Rating	Self- Rating
41	4.270	Excellent	3
42	4.260	Excellent	1
43	4.250	Excellent	NR
44	4.250	Excellent	NR
45	4.250	Good	NR
46	4.250	Excellent	2
47	4.250	Poor	1
48	4.240	Good	2
49	4.220	Good	NR
50	4.200	Outstanding	1
51	4.190	Good	2
52	4.190	Excellent	2
53	4.180	Good	NR
54	4.170	Outstanding	2
55	4.170	Good	2
56	4.140	Good	NR
57	4.130	Good	2
58	4.110	Good	2
59	4.090	Excellent	2
60	4.090	Excellent	NR
61	4.080	Good	NR
62	4.070	Good	2
63	4.060	Good	NR
64	4.033	Excellent	2
65	4.030	Good	NR
66	4.010	Good	4
67	4.010	Good	2
68	3.990	Good	3
69	3.940	Good	2
70	3.920	Good	NR
71	3.850	Poor	NR
72	3.833	Good	3
73	3.780	Excellent	2
74	3.720	Poor	5
75	3.710	Good	2
76	3.710	Good	2

STUDENT RATINGS OF ADJUNCT FACULTY COMPARED
TO ADMINISTRATION AND SELF
(continued)

Number	Student Rating	Administration Rating	Self- Rating
77	3.710	Good	3
78	3.600	Poor	2
79	3.380	Good	NR
80	3.183	Good	3
81	2.965	Good	3
82	2.750	Good	2
		Responding	Non-responding
Mean		4.239	4.253
Median		4.290	4.250
Standard Deviation		.428	.326
			Total
			4.243
			4.270
			.401

Administrative evaluation: Outstanding (5), Excellent (4), Good (3), Poor (2), Unsatisfactory (1).

Self-evaluation: Outstanding (1), Excellent (2), Good (3, 4, 5), Poor (6), Unsatisfactory (7), No Response (NR).

Numerical listings are for identification only and do not reflect the same position in each appendix chart.

Appendix F

SELF-EVALUATIONS OF ADJUNCT FACULTY COMPARED
TO ADMINISTRATION AND STUDENTS

SELF-EVALUATIONS OF ADJUNCT FACULTY COMPARED
TO ADMINISTRATION AND STUDENT

Number	Self- Rating	Administration Rating	Student Rating
1	1	Outstanding	4.630
2	1	Good	4.610
3	1	Outstanding	4.565
4	1	Outstanding	4.520
5	1	Outstanding	4.500
6	1	Excellent	4.330
7	1	Outstanding	4.320
8	1	Excellent	4.310
9	1	Excellent	4.260
10	1	Poor	4.250
11	1	Outstanding	4.200
12	2	Excellent	4.840
13	2	Outstanding	4.810
14	2	Good	4.750
15	2	Excellent	4.670
16	2	Excellent	4.670
17	2	Good	4.670
18	2	Outstanding	4.650
19	2	Excellent	4.630
20	2	Excellent	4.625
21	2	Excellent	4.620
22	2	Excellent	4.610
23	2	Outstanding	4.580
24	2	Good	4.580
25	2	Excellent	4.570
26	2	Good	4.500
27	2	Excellent	4.480
28	2	Good	4.440
29	2	Good	4.420
30	2	Good	4.350
31	2	Good	4.330
32	2	Excellent	4.290
33	2	Excellent	4.250
34	2	Good	4.240
35	2	Excellent	4.190
36	2	Good	4.190
37	2	Outstanding	4.170
38	2	Good	4.170
39	2	Good	4.130
40	2	Good	4.110

SELF-EVALUATIONS OF ADJUNCT FACULTY COMPARED
TO ADMINISTRATION AND STUDENT
(continued)

Number	Self- Rating	Administration Rating	Student Rating
41	2	Excellent	4.090
42	2	Good	4.070
43	2	Excellent	4.033
44	2	Good	4.010
45	2	Good	3.940
46	2	Excellent	3.780
47	2	Good	3.710
48	2	Good	3.710
49	2	Poor	3.600
50	2	Good	2.750
51	3	Excellent	4.290
52	3	Excellent	4.270
53	3	Good	3.990
54	3	Good	3.833
55	3	Good	3.710
56	3	Good	3.183
57	3	Good	2.965
58	4	Good	4.670
59	4	Good	4.010
60	5	Poor	3.720
61	NR	Outstanding	4.810
62	NR	Good	4.757
63	NR	Good	4.680
64	NR	Good	4.670
65	NR	Good	4.460
66	NR	Good	4.420
67	NR	Good	4.380
68	NR	Excellent	4.370
69	NR	Excellent	4.330
70	NR	Excellent	4.250
71	NR	Excellent	4.250
72	NR	Good	4.250
73	NR	Good	4.220
74	NR	Good	4.180
75	NR	Good	4.140
76	NR	Excellent	4.090

SELF-EVALUATIONS OF ADJUNCT FACULTY COMPARED
TO ADMINISTRATION AND STUDENT
(continued)

Number	Self- Rating	Administration Rating	Student Rating
77	NR	Good	4.080
78	NR	Good	4.060
79	NR	Good	4.030
80	NR	Good	3.920
81	NR	Poor	3.850
82	NR	Good	3.380
		Responding	Non-responding
Mean		2.050	n/a
Standard Deviation		.769	n/a

Administrative evaluation: Outstanding (5), Excellent (4), Good (3), Poor (2), Unsatisfactory (1).

Self-evaluation: Outstanding (1), Excellent (2), Good (3, 4, 5), Poor (6), Unsatisfactory (7), No Response (NR).

Numerical listings are for identification only and do not reflect the same position in each appendix chart.