2009

Predicting job satisfaction among Iowa community college adjunct faculty members: Use and application of Herzberg's motivation-hygiene theory

Steven Dwight Schulz
Iowa State University

Predicting job satisfaction among Iowa community college adjunct faculty members: Use and application of Herzberg's motivation-hygiene theory

by

Steven D. Schulz

A dissertation submitted to the graduate faculty

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Major: Education (Educational Leadership)

Program of Study Committee:
Larry H. Ebbers, Major Professor
Frankie Santos Laanan
Robyn M. Cooper
Richard M. Cruse
Soko Starobin

Iowa State University

Ames, Iowa

2009

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

ABSTRACT

Over the past few decades, institutions of higher education have increased their dependence on part-time faculty members (Gappa & Leslie, 1993). Factors influencing this trend include: (a) increases in instruction-related costs relative to revenues; (b) efforts by academic administrators to achieve staffing flexibility; (c) the number of individuals who have been unable to obtain full-time teaching positions; and (d) the growth of community colleges which traditionally have employed large percentages of part-time faculty members (Valadez & Antony, 2001; NCES, 2000).

The purpose of this study was to examine the current level of adjunct faculty job satisfaction in Iowa's 15 community colleges and to determine if satisfaction variables can be used to predict overall job satisfaction. The unit of analysis was the adjunct faculty members who responded to the Iowa Community College Adjunct Faculty Survey 2009.

The population of adjunct faculty members targeted for this study included all adjunct faculty members employed at one of Iowa's 15 community colleges during the 2008-09 academic year. The final sample included all of Iowa's 15 community colleges, and 3,412 adjunct faculty members were eligible to complete the survey. For the purpose of this survey, respondents who did not complete questions regarding job satisfaction were eliminated from the sample. A final sample of 930 participants was included in the data set.

The survey respondents' ratings on how job satisfaction was perceived were regressed on six independent variables associated with job satisfaction. The six independent variables (gender, age, benefits, instruction, relationships, and physical environment) accounted for 56% of the variance explained in the regression model and were statistically

significant at the last step. Findings reveal a strong relationship between independent variables and the dependent variable, overall job satisfaction.

Finally, the findings of this study provide valuable information to human resource directors and other campus administrators. The information from this study provides empirical data that can be used to inform hiring practices and guide programming designed to improve the job satisfaction of adjunct faculty members.

CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION

Much has been written about the perception, effectiveness and use of adjunct faculty in recent years due to the increased number of sections being taught by adjunct faculty in most community colleges. Over the past few decades, institutions of higher education have increased their dependence on part-time faculty members (Gappa & Leslie, 1993). Factors influencing this trend include: (a) increases in instruction-related costs relative to revenues; (b) efforts by academic administrators to achieve staffing flexibility; (c) the number of individuals who have been unable to obtain full-time teaching positions; and (d) the growth of community colleges which traditionally have employed large percentages of part-time faculty members (NCES, 2000; Valadez & Antony, 2001).

With the increasing use of adjunct instructors and the anticipated labor shortage in postsecondary education, an examination of the current adjunct faculty in Iowa's community colleges is necessary to develop a better understanding of the perceptions of this faculty group. This information will be valuable to institutions that wish to satisfy the personal and professional needs of this important faculty group.

Statement of the Problem

Wallin (2004) stated, "The variety of designations—temporary faculty, part-time faculty, contingent workforce, expendable academics, nontenured track faculty, adjunct faculty—speaks volumes about their ambiguous place in the workforce" (p. 374). Studies completed in the early 1990s reported part-time faculty were frequently dissatisfied. Gappa and Leslie (1993) documented reports of general dissatisfaction with working conditions. Fulton (2000) described the treatment of part-time faculty in the following manner. "Part-

time faculty generally earn no benefits, qualify for no development programs and get no respect. Few of them get an office, fewer still have access to such perks as faculty discounts at the bookstore, an Internet-connected computer, or a faculty locker at the gym" (p. 1).

By examining the job satisfaction of adjunct faculty more closely, a deeper understanding of what motivates them and how they feel about the intrinsic and extrinsic factors associated with their jobs can be developed. Herzberg's (1959, 1968/2003) theory supports the need to understand more fully the perception of employees and the factors that motivate them in their work. In doing so, employers can evaluate jobs and include content that will produce the motivation required to involve, challenge and promote higher levels of job satisfaction. Addressing these motivational factors in the work place can produce job enrichment for employees that ultimately result in improved performance, increased longevity and increased job satisfaction.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to examine the current level of adjunct faculty job satisfaction in Iowa's 15 community colleges and to determine to what extent it is possible to predict overall job satisfaction. The unit of analysis was the adjunct faculty members who responded to the Iowa Community College Adjunct Faculty Survey 2009.

To examine job satisfaction, the Iowa Community College Adjunct Faculty Survey 2009 was distributed to 3,412 adjunct faculty members in the state of Iowa. The results of the survey created a statewide database representing adjunct faculty members from all 15 Iowa community colleges.

Theoretical Perspective

Fredrick Herzberg (1959) was among the first to focus on job attitudes and the impact of both extrinsic and intrinsic factors that motivate employees. Herzberg's work continues to be the seminal research that informs modern day studies related to job attitudes and job satisfaction.

This study expands on the growing body of job satisfaction research by focusing on contextualizing the experiences of adjunct faculty members in Iowa's 15 community colleges. Through the framework of Herzberg's (1959, 1968/2003) motivation-hygiene theory, this study proposes a causal model that focuses on both an individual's physiological and psychological environment.

Fredrick Herzberg (1959) performed a study to determine which factors in an employee's work environment caused satisfaction and dissatisfaction. He developed the motivation-hygiene theory to explain his findings. Herzberg (1968/2003) summarized that there were in fact physiological needs that can be fulfilled by money, and there is the psychological need to achieve and grow. The physiological needs can be thought of as humankind's animal nature-the built-in drive to avoid pain from any environment (work) and to meet basic biological needs (food). The psychological needs described by Herzberg are those needs unique to the human species, the ability to achieve, and through achievement, to experience psychological growth. He determined that people are intrinsically motivated by interesting work, challenge, and increasing responsibility.

Herzberg's findings suggest the factors involved in producing job satisfaction (and motivation) are separate and distinct from the factors that lead to job dissatisfaction. In short, Herzberg determined that management must provide hygiene factors to avoid employee

dissatisfaction, but also must provide factors intrinsic to the work itself in order for employees to be satisfied with their jobs and perform at a high level. Herzberg (1968/2003) found that motivators were the primary cause of satisfaction, and hygiene factors the primary cause of unhappiness on the job or dissatisfaction. Herzberg (1968/2003) stated, "The very nature of motivators, as opposed to hygiene factors, is that they have a much longer-term effect on employees' attitudes. It is possible that the job will have to be enriched again, but this will not occur as frequently as the need for hygiene" (p. 96).

Herzberg (1968/2003) suggested that work be enriched to bring about effective utilization of personnel:

> The term job enrichment describes this embryonic movement. An older term job enlargement, should be avoided because it is associated with past failures stemming from a misunderstanding of the problem. Job enrichment provides the opportunity for the employee's psychological growth, while job enlargement merely makes a job structurally bigger (p. 93).

Job enrichment is a continuous managerial function. Herzberg summarized the argument for job enrichment as follows: "If you have employees on a job, use them. If you can't use them on the job, get rid of them, either via automation or by selecting someone with lesser ability. If you can't use them and you can't get rid of them, you will have a motivation problem" (p. 93).

Research Questions

Based on the objectives stated previously, this study attempted to answer the following research questions:

1. What are the demographic characteristics of adjunct faculty in Iowa's 15 community colleges?

2. How do adjunct faculty members working at Iowa community colleges rate their overall job satisfaction?
3. How do levels of job satisfaction of community college adjunct faculty members differ according to the background characteristics of gender, age, racial/ethnic background and marital status?
4. How do adjunct faculty members rate their satisfaction/dissatisfaction as it relates to Herzberg's Motivation Hygiene Theory?
5. To what extent do background characteristics, benefits, instruction relationships and physical environment predict overall job satisfaction?

Hypotheses

Questions 1 – 3 do not require hypotheses, as they are answered through descriptive data analysis. According to Creswell (2003), null hypotheses make predictions that no relationship or difference exists between groups for a variable or variables. Null hypotheses are presented for research questions 4 and 5 because the answers are inferred:

Hypothesis for Research Question 4: There are no significant differences between Herzberg's findings on satisfaction and dissatisfaction and those of the Iowa Community College Adjunct Faculty Survey 2009.

Hypothesis for Research Question 5: There are no variables found in this study that can be used to predict overall job satisfaction.

Significance of the Study

This survey was the first attempt to collect data on a statewide basis regarding Iowa adjunct faculty. The findings of this study will inform institutional policy and practice related

to the use and perceptions of adjunct faculty. Additional information was collected to provide college leaders and department chairs with data regarding the current job satisfaction ratings of adjunct faculty according to an institutional and statewide data set. The current study updates educational leaders throughout Iowa and the nation of job satisfaction ratings related to relationships, benefits, instruction, physical environment and overall job satisfaction.

Hardy and Laanan (2006) concluded that understanding the characteristics, opinions and degree of satisfaction of adjunct faculty is pivotal to both understanding the culture of the community colleges and determine the most effective way in which to manage them. In addition, Outcault (2002) and Rifkin (2000) predicted between 10 to 40% of full-time community college faculty will retire within the next 10 years. According to Hardy and Laanan (2006), "It is important for institutions to be able to benchmark levels of satisfaction and opinions using national norms to judge their effectiveness, and comparatively analyze their own relative institutional health" (p. 788).

These results should be used to identify the unmet needs of adjunct faculty within the institution and provide policymakers the data to improve working conditions and salary/benefit plans for adjunct faculty. The results may also be used to encourage institutions to conduct regular satisfaction surveys with their adjunct faculty. Hardy and Laanan (2006) emphasized the importance of developing a benchmark of satisfaction within this faculty group to enable administrators and faculty leaders to compare satisfaction data from year to year, and determine if initiatives are being successful in improving individual motivation, job satisfaction and overall institutional health. Finally, recent study provides a voice to a faculty group that is rarely represented in the policy and planning process within postsecondary institutions.

Delimitations and Limitations

For the purpose of this study, the sample was delimited to include only adjunct faculty who were identified by their respective institutions who taught during the 2008-09 Academic Year at one of Iowa's 15 community colleges. The sample was further delimited to include only the adjunct faculty who completed the Iowa Community College Adjunct Faculty Survey 2009. A final delimitation to this study was that the variables used to assess job satisfaction were limited to those included in the Iowa Community College Adjunct Faculty Survey 2009 instrument.

This study had several limitations. Because the data gathering procedure entailed utilizing an electronic survey instrument, the willingness, interest and ability of the individuals to respond to all questions, to respond within the timeline of the survey, and to respond accurately could not be controlled by the principal investigator. This limitation is critical to the study because any lack of interest from the respondents can affect the outcome of the study. The current research is limited in that it does not provide information about the adjunct faculty members who chose not to respond to the Iowa Community College Survey 2009. Perhaps the length of the study caused adjunct faculty members to not complete and submit the survey.

The sample for this research was limited to the adjunct faculty members who self-reported on Iowa Community College Adjunct Faculty Survey. The survey instrument used a purposive sampling procedure which decreases the generalizability of findings. This study will not be generalizable to all faculty categories and groups.

Finally, the research was cross-sectional in nature and not longitudinal, which did not allow the researcher to measure change over time. Instead, this type of study required adjunct

faculty to reflect on their past and current experiences as an adjunct instructor at one specific Iowa community college. The sample is not a stable body and will change each year.

Definition of Terms

The following research questions were defined for use in this study:

Adjunct Faculty: Considered synonymous with the term "part-time" faculty. The definition of adjunct for the purpose of this study coincides with Freeland's (1998) definition, "those employed by a short contract with no guarantee of being rehired for the next academic year or term" (p. 3).

Autonomy: The authority to decide course content, make job decisions and to decide course content.

Hygiene: In this research the term hygiene, as defined by Herzberg, has been redefined as physical environment when used outside of the discussion of Herzberg's theory.

Iowa Community College Adjunct Faculty Survey 2009: A statewide survey of all 15 Iowa public community colleges and a sample of 3,412 adjunct faculty members.

Job Satisfaction: Herzberg, Mausner, Peterson, and Capwell (1957) believed the very term "job satisfaction" lacks adequate definition. They agreed that job satisfaction is not unidimensional. A simple breakdown would show that there can be satisfaction with the specific activities of the job, often referred to as "intrinsic job satisfaction;" with the place and working conditions under which the job is performed; or with specific factors such as economic reward, security or social prestige.

Summary

This study seeks to inform educators and policymakers by providing insight into the current perceptions of adjunct faculty and to identify factors that contribute most to job satisfaction as reported by adjunct faculty statewide. Findings will assist in identifying factors that contribute both positively and negatively to job satisfaction of adjunct faculty at Iowa's community colleges.

Chapter 1 provides an overview of this study including the problem, purpose, theoretical perspective, research questions, hypotheses, significance, delimitations and limitations, and definition of terms. Chapter 2 provides an overview of the literature reviewed for this dissertation. The chapter begins with a review of the role of instruction and the important role of adjunct faculty in the community college setting followed by a review of the attitudes and perceptions of adjunct faculty. This section concludes with a brief review of recent studies using the National Study of Postsecondary Faculty (NSOPF) data and a summary of the chapter.

Chapter 3 begins with a brief overview of the study including the research questions to be addressed. The remaining sections of this chapter will define the methodology, research design, population and sample, instrumentation data collection results and data analysis procedures. Chapter 4 provides an overview of the results of the statistical analyses of the study including descriptive data, exploratory analyses and multiple regression analyses. The final chapter includes a summary and discussion of the findings of this study which include suggestions for future research.

CHAPTER 2. LITERATURE REVIEW

The review of literature is divided into six subsections related to job satisfaction of adjunct community college faculty: (1) the role of instruction; (2) the role of adjunct faculty; (3) attitudes and perceptions of adjunct faculty; (4) recommendations for improvements; (5) recent studies using NOSPF data sets; and (6) summary of the literature.

In the first two sections of this chapter, a review of the important role instruction plays in the minds of the community college professor and the important role adjunct instructors play in delivering instruction at the community college. In sections three and four of this chapter, a review of the attitudes and perceptions of adjunct faculty and recommendations for improvement. Sections five and six will review recent studies using NSOPF data sets and summarize the literature reviewed for this study

The Role of Instruction

Instruction is the foundation that the community college professoriate is built upon. A defining element of the community college is its vision of itself as a “teaching college” (Grubb, 1999). This statement supports the study by Cohen and Brawer (1977) who revealed that the educational literature has consistently found that community college instructors evince a stronger commitment to teaching than their counterparts at the four-year colleges and universities. Valadez and Anthony (2001) concluded part-time faculty are pursing the profession that gives them the opportunity to do what they enjoy, that is teach. Hardy and Laanan (2006) espoused the following as it relates to community college faculty, “understanding the characteristics, opinions and degree of satisfaction of this employee group

is pivotal to both understanding the culture of the community colleges and determining the most effective way to manage them" (p. 788).

This research study focused on adjunct faculty in Iowa community colleges. The emphasis on instruction at the community college opens the door for further research on the quality of the instruction delivered by community college faculty. This research is based on the theory that satisfied employees will perform at a higher level than dissatisfied employees, thus provide better instruction.

Part-time faculty members are not nearly as involved in the day-to-day activities of the college as the full-time faculty. Even though, both full- and part-time faculty are equally committed to their occupations. This study suggests that the professional commitment of part-time faculty does not go beyond their interest in teaching, their students and individual assignments (Cohen, Brawer, & Florence 1977; Garii & Peterson 2005; Valadez & Anthony 2001).

Findings by Garii and Peterson (2005) support the findings presented by Cohen et al. (1977):

> The explicit role of full-time faculty is three-tiered: teaching, service, and scholarship. On the other hand, adjunct faculty describe a role that lies solely with the realm of teaching: while they are influenced by the realities of their professional positions, they are less concerned with the needs of the overall system and more influenced by practical realities manifest in their professional lives and in the classrooms in which they teach. (pp. 2-3).

Leslie and Gappa (2002) summarized their findings by stating that part-time faculty in community colleges look more like full-time faculty than is sometimes assumed. Their interests, attitudes and motives are relatively similar. They are experienced, stable

professionals who find satisfaction in teaching, and feel that their institutions have been appropriately supportive.

In a study conducted to explore the differences in faculty attitudes and practices, Kozeracki (2002) posited that "part-time faculty, who make up 35 percent of the respondents, are more likely to describe their students' enthusiasm for learning as excellent and to agree that faculty promotions should be based on formal student evaluations of their teachers" (p. 52). In addition, part-time was more likely to describe their relationships with students as excellent. According to Kozeracki, it appears that part-time faculty finds their academic interactions with students to be more positive than do the full-time faculty.

On several measures in the Council for the Study of Community Colleges (CSCC) survey, Leslie and Gappa (2002) found that part-time faculty members appear less committed, accomplished, and creative in their teaching than full-time faculty. Over three fourths of both full-time and part-time faculty at community colleges indicated that they are motivated to pursue professional development, but the relative strength of the feelings of part-time faculty leaves room for improvement. Given that part-time faculty are also somewhat less experienced teachers and, perhaps, more conventional in their instructional methods, it would appear that their professional development needs cover a both substantive disciplinary preparation and preparation to teach.

Current literature explores the similarities and differences in the attitudes of part- and full-time faculty. There is a paucity of research to support the claim that part- or full-time instructors are either less or more effective classroom instructors. Contradictory findings exist within the current body of available research. Roueche, Roueche, and Milliron (1995)

perceived there is a generalized concern that part-time faculty, no matter how competent, lack the permanent commitment required for sustained teaching effectiveness.

Banachowski (1996) found this to be far from reality:

> Several studies concluded that there are virtually no differences in the type or quality of instruction delivered by part- and full-time faculty. A study conducted by the Chancellor's Office of the California Community Colleges to examine current policies and practices regarding the use of part-time faculty in the California system, faculty characteristics, implications for instructional quality and policy options revealed that evidence regarding differences in the quality of instruction provided by full- and part-time faculty was inconclusive. (p. 5) [reporters report; researchers reveal….]

Many assumptions exist that full-time instructors use significantly different teaching techniques than the part-time faculty. The research does not indicate that significant differences exist between the instructional methods used by full-time and part-time faculty (Leslie& Gappa, 2002; Schuetz, 2002). It is often perceived that full-time faculty possess pedagogical knowledge that translates into dynamic and creative classroom instruction. Leslie and Gappa (2002) determined that there are almost no differences between part- and full-time faculty members in the predominant instructional methods used. Lectures, student discussions and exams account for close to two thirds of all class time regardless of whether the instructor is part- or full-time. Full-time faculty did use lab activities as an instructional method at a slightly higher rate than did part-time faculty. Leslie and Gappa found that "data does show that part-time community college faculty members appear to be more comfortable with conventional teaching practices and less likely to have won outstanding teaching awards" (p. 65).

Schuetz (2002) completed a study that mirrors Leslie and Gappa's (2002) findings. The study indicated very similar use of class time regardless of faculty status. Both part- and

full-time faculty used an average of 43% of class time for lectures, 15% for discussion and 11% for quizzes and examinations, accounting for over two-thirds of class time.

This review suggests part-time faculty members are not as accessible to students, lack a connection with colleagues and the institution as a whole and are often excluded from institutional activities (Garii & Peterson, 2005; Schuetz, 2002). Schuetz found "…statistically significant differences in results describing the distribution of instructional practices, faculty availability to students and connection with colleagues and the institution were identified by employment status" (p. 44).

Garii and Peterson (2005) expressed concern that part-time faculty are often disengaged from the institution and rarely included in faculty orientation, mentoring or professional development activities. They determined the following:

> Ultimately, the instructional delivery of the adjunct instructor rests on the beliefs and definitions of the adjunct him/herself; this delivery may inadvertently undermine official efforts of the institution. Adjuncts' lack of connection with the institution may belie a full understanding of the values, needs and institutional expectations that underlie the interdependent nature of individual courses with programs. (p. 3)

The Role of Adjunct Faculty

Wallin (2004) revealed the following as it relates to adjunct faculty: "The variety of designations—temporary faculty, part-time faculty, contingent workforce, expendable academics, nontenure track faculty, adjunct faculty—speaks volumes about their ambiguous place in the workforce (p. 374). Twombly and Towndsend (2007) suggested that knowing about the faculty who instruct community college course is important because a lack of knowledge about them often results in the reluctance of 4-year college faculty to accept

community college courses. They question the quality of the courses and hold a general sense of arrogance about the status of 2-year college faculty (p. 3).

The use of part-time faculty in the community college is not a new phenomenon. Although the motivating factors for employing adjunct instructors may have changed over the last 50 years, there is little debate that this practice has increased in the American community colleges. Cohen and Brawer (1996) noted:

> In the early years sizable percentages of the instructors were part-timers, often from local high schools. As the colleges matured, they were more able to support a corps of full-time instructors; in the late 1960s almost two-thirds were so employed. Then the ratio of part-timers increased, so that by 1986 they had reached 60 percent of the total; by 1992 the proportion slipped back to 53 percent. (p. 85)

Banachowski (1996) provided additional support to Cohen and Brawer's (1996) finding when they reported that the number of part-time faculty instructors at two-year colleges has grown steadily since the early 1960s. Banachowski (1997) noted that part-time faculty constituted 38.5% of the instructors in 698 junior colleges in 1962, 40% in 1971, nearly 60% by 1980 and, by 1993, 65% of the faculty in 2-year colleges were employed on a part-time basis.

Wallin (2005) stated, "Part-time faculty are indeed here to stay and their ranks will likely grow in the years ahead. They are absolutely necessary if community colleges are to fulfill their teaching mission (p. 217). Community colleges have used part-time faculty to meet escalating demands in an environment of declining resources. Part-time faculty enable community colleges greater flexibility in meeting enrollment demands and the needs of the community. Part-time faculty give colleges the flexibility to meet the training and

educational demands of local businesses that arise during the course of the academic year. Valadez and Anthony (2001) revealed the following:

> This trend in hiring part-time faculty members is likely to continue, for several reason: (a) increases in instruction-related costs relative to revenues; (b) efforts by academic administrators to achieve staffing flexibility; (c) the number of individuals with advanced degrees who have been unable to obtain full-time teaching positions: and (d) the growth of community colleges. (pp. 97-98)

A strong case has been made in the literature to support that the use of part-time faculty will continue to be an important part of the community college instructional delivery system. Banachowski (1996) summarized that the debate over the advantages and disadvantages of employing part-time faculty is complex with no easy answers. Among the advantages are cost savings, institutional flexibility, and the infusion of real world vocational experience into the classroom. The common disadvantages are loss of positions to full-time faculty and, of more serious concern, the loss of academic integrity.

The advantages expressed previously are not all inclusive, but little research exists to contradict the advantages of using part-time instructors. These advantages range from practitioner expertise in the vocational field to filling teaching assignments that arise near the beginning of a term. No author was found who attempted to make a case for eliminating the practice of using part-time instructors in specific situations, but substantial research has been conducted to explore the treatment and attitudes of part-time faculty members. Finally, research has been conducted that explores the instructional techniques used by part-time instructors, student performance in courses taught by part-time instructors and the impact of this practice on the integrity of the organization.

A more recent development is the impending labor shortage in post-secondary education. Cohen and Brawer (1996) suggested that a more recent, and crucial development would seem to be the aging of the full-time faculty in community colleges. Forty percent of the full-time faculty are expected to retire by the year 2000. The Bureau of Labor Statistics (2006-07) predicted the "employment of postsecondary teachers is expected to grow much faster than the average for all occupations through 2014. A significant proportion of these new jobs will be part-time positions" (p. 8). Judging by the rate of employment of part-time instructors and the existing literature, part-time instructors will continue to play an important role in the nation's community colleges.

Attitudes and Perceptions of Adjunct Faculty

Studies completed in the early 1990s reported part-time faculty were frequently dissatisfied with the lack of institutional commitment, poor treatment and lack of resources. Overall, part-time faculty are frustrated by the uncertainty of their futures, current treatment and lack of institutional support (Fulton, 2000; Gappa & Leslie, 1993; Kelly, 1991).

Gappa and Leslie (1993) documented reports of general dissatisfaction with working conditions.

> If you fall in love, you want a commitment. The institution won't make a commitment [to me]. Thus, as a part-timer I am vulnerable.
>
> We are basically in the same position as migrant workers. There is a lot of wasted energy and unnecessary expense in trying to stay alive with part-time teaching.
>
> There is confusion-power, guilt relationships, and powerful feelings. The part-time faculty [have power] over the tenured faculty. We have the numbers and control the enrollment. The tenured faculty have their schedules and [other perks] at our expense, and they feel guilty. They know there are inequities. (pp. 42-43)

Kelly (1991) found:

> The frustrations of part-time faculty expressed in this study consistent with the literature. Generally, part-time faculty feel that they are being treated as second class citizens: Part-time faculty with the same qualifications as full-time faculty are paid less for teaching the same classes, they have no benefits, and they have no guarantee of employment from one semester to the next. (pp. 8-9)

Fulton's (2000) findings support Kelly (1991), and describe the treatment of part-time faculty in the following manner: "Part-time faculty generally earn no benefits, qualify for no development programs and get no respect. Few of them get an office. Fewer still have access to such perks as faculty discount at the bookstore, an Internet-connected computer, or a faculty locker at the gym" (p. 1).

Additional studies concerning the individual attitudes of part-time instructors unveiled another side of the story. Rifkin (1998) created a survey to examine the differences in professional attitudes between part-time and full-time faculty in community colleges. A national sample of community college faculty was surveyed using a questionnaire designed to assess the individual attitudes of the respondents. Rifkin found that "…there are no differences between full- and part-time faculty on Caring for Students, Autonomy from Students and Commitment to a Calling" (p. 13).

Rifkin (1998) also revealed that full-time faculty are more involved in classroom activities and assessing student learning than part-time faculty and that full-time faculty put greater effort into authoring books, attending conferences and creating instructional materials than part-time faculty. Students reported part-time faculty had greater expectations for student learning and achievement than full-time faculty. No significant difference was discovered between full- and part-time faculty in the area of service; however, part-time

faculty may express a greater degree of professionalism than full-time faculty, particularly with respect to student expectations for success.

Rifkin (1998) explored the area of faculty autonomy. Full-time faculty members express a significantly greater feeling of autonomy from the institution than part-time faculty. Part-timers have acknowledged and express concerns about their apparent inferior status and feel they have no decision-making power within the institution, and, therefore lack autonomy. Rifkin (1998) concluded:

> The professional profile of part-time faculty is distinguishable from full-time faculty along several dimensions. In comparison to full-time faculty they are significantly less involved in curriculum and instruction and scholarship, and they have less autonomy from the institution, and appear less responsible in their institutional behavior (Integrity). On the other hand, they have greater expectations of students and thus a higher degree of professionalism in their overall service orientation than full-time faculty. Where their professional profile is similar to that of the full-time faculty is in caring for students, their autonomy from students and their commitment to the profession. (p.17)

Conversely, Leslie and Gappa (2002) revealed that part-time faculty members rate their own autonomy, relations with administrators, and students' enthusiasm for learning more favorably than do full-time faculty. They found "little data to suggest that the popular image of part-time faculty as under-qualified, nomadic, or inadequately attentive to their responsibilities has any validity. In fact, findings were to the contrary, the portrait shows part-time faculty in community college to be stable professionals with substantial experience and commitment to their work" (p. 62). The NSOPF (2000) data revealed that half (51%) of all part-timers in community college prefer to teach part-time.

Leslie and Gappa (2002) determined that part-time faculty members are not as universally dissatisfied with their jobs as is popularly assumed. Over half of all part-timers in community colleges prefer to teach on a part-time basis and reported being less stressed than

full-time faculty. Contrary to popular images, Leslie and Gappa (2002) found that only a small fraction of part-timers are eagerly seeking full-time positions.

Outcault (2002) concluded in his findings that it appears that both part-time and full-time faculty are satisfied with their work. However, investigation into individual survey items did reveal some statistically significant differences. Part-timers were, for the most part, less satisfied than full-timers, full-timers were much more likely to report that they feel considerable stress from their jobs.

A variety of surveys and studies yielded mixed results related to the attitudes of part-time and full-time faculty members. Different surveys and different samples generate different results. Early work by Cohen, Brawer and Florence (1977) focused on the professional differenced between part- and full-time faculty in their individual attitudes toward knowledge acquisition and integrity. Differences in professional attitudes toward knowledge means part-time faculty is less involved than full-time faculty in the curricular and scholarly aspects of their teaching: fewer use a syllabus, run item analyses, distribute written measurable objectives, attend conferences, and receive funds to work on field related projects. Part-time faculty tend to feel less of an ethical responsibility to the profession and the institutions; fewer maintain office hours consistently, maintain good professional relationships with other faculty, and participate in departmental curricula planning.

Hagedorn (2000) recognized that few theoretical methods exist to explain or predict job satisfaction and developed a conceptual model to sort and categorize factors that compose and contribute to job satisfaction. Hagedorn (2000) explained the conceptual framework of Faculty Job Satisfaction as follows:

> The conceptual mode contains six unique triggers: (1) change in life stage, (2) change in family-related or personal circumstance (for example, birth, death, divorce, illness of self or significant other), (3) change in rank or tenure, (4) transfer to a new institution, (4) change in perceived justice, and (6) change in mood or emotional state.
>
> The model includes three types of mediators: (1) motivators and hygienes, (2) demographics, and (3) environmental conditions. The mediators and triggers from an elementary structure and framework in which faculty job satisfaction may be examined. (p. 7)

Hagedorn (2000) created a survey based on her framework and determined, on average, job satisfaction increases with advanced life stages and can be affected by family-related circumstances with married faculty reporting higher levels of job satisfaction than either their single or divorced counterparts while lower levels of job satisfaction were reported for individuals experiencing change. Finally, faculty who perceived a high level of justice within their institution reported much higher levels of job satisfaction than those whose perceptions of justice were low.

Recommendations for improvement

With all of the uncertainty surrounding the use of part-time instructors, researchers offer suggestions on how to improve the conditions for this employee group. Jacobs (1998) suggested that institutional culture can be a vehicle for improving satisfaction and performance. Part-timers need to be included in institutional activities so that they can begin to understand what is expected and learn the values of the institution. Jacobs perceived that involving part-timers in the organizational activities is inexpensive, but will take significant effort. These efforts may include mentoring, office space, telephone and e-mail access and other perks that are taken for granted by full-time faculty. Benefits can change the culture

and make part-time work more satisfying and rewarding for both the part-time faculty and the students.

Job Satisfaction Studies using NSOPF

The National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) conducted the fourth National Study of Postsecondary Faculty (NSOPF) in 2004. The NSOPF has been conducted previously in 1988, 1993, and 1999. These surveys collected and compiled data concerning faculty at postsecondary institutions throughout the United States and the District of Columbia and are cited most frequently in the existing literature. Since the inception of NSOPF, these data have been used to inform policy and practice by many audiences, including practitioners, policymakers, and researchers.

Researchers have conducted multiple studies utilizing the NSOPF data sets, both public and restricted that are available through NCES. Studies that explore issues at 2-year public colleges include Valadez and Anthony (2001), who investigated the job satisfaction of both full-time and part-time faculty. Valadez and Anthony determined that overall, both full- and part-time faculty were satisfied with their work, but part-time faculty members were concerned with issues regarding salary, benefits, and long-term job security. Valadez and Anthony concluded, “Instead of being largely disenchanted with their roles, part-time faculty members are engaged in the kind of work they enjoy-work that brings them a degree of satisfaction” (p. 107).

In a statistical analysis of the NSOPF: 93, Palmer and Zimbler (2000) sought to differentiate instructional faculty and staff in public 2-year colleges by age (35 vs. 55-64) and by years of experience (under 10 years vs. 20 or more years). Their conclusions were that the

individuals in different age groups were at different stages of the professional careers and that their employment experiences were different. The authors determined that there were subcultures within disciplines.

Palmer (2002) expanded his research of the subcultures identified previously when he used the NSOPF: 99 data set to profile full-time community college faculty members. He categorized faculty into 11 distinct disciplinary categories (business; education; engineering and computer sciences; fine arts; health sciences; human services; humanities; life sciences; natural, physical sciences, and math; social sciences; and vocational education). Palmer determined that there were variations in discipline in: (a) academic and employment histories; (b) approaches to instruction; (c) methods used to assess student work; and (d) scholarship outside of teaching. Palmer's findings informed researchers that they need to be aware of the unique cultures inherent in each discipline. It is important to understand not only that these different cultures exist, but how they may influence instruction and other professional behaviors.

Summary

In reviewing the literature pertaining to the use of adjunct faculty in community colleges, employment statistics and employment trends indicate adjunct faculty will continue to play a significant role in delivering instruction in the community college setting. Retirements, budgetary constraints, enrollment increases, and the need to provide for the community will continue to support the use of adjunct faculty in the community college setting. It is apparent that conflicting findings continue to emerge from the research regarding the perceptions and attitudes of adjunct faculty as they relate to job satisfaction. It is

necessary to examine the current status of faculty attitude, perception and job satisfaction. Wallin (2004) posited, “Knowing what motivates adjunct faculty will enable administrators to be more attentive to ways they can assist adjuncts to feel a part of the college and know that the college recognizes and appreciates their work” (p. 389).

CHAPTER 3. METHODOLOGY

Overview

The purpose of this study was to develop a more accurate understanding of the perception of part-time faculty in Iowa's community colleges regarding their level of job satisfaction. This chapter explains the research design of this study. A description of the research questions, population and sample, instrumentation, data collection, results, data analysis, and anticipated ethical issues related to the study are presented.

This survey was conducted in conjunction with the Office of Community College Research and Policy (OCCRP) at Iowa State University, Ames. The Office of Community College Research and Policy provided support for development of the survey, training on the survey software and the Qualtrics Survey Software used to create and execute the survey. At the completion of this study, all data will be kept on a secure server in the Office of Community College Research and Policy. This survey is believed to be the first statewide attempt to collect detailed information regarding Iowa's adjunct faculty members. The principal investigator did not intend to use all of the information collected in this survey for this study, rather only those variables pertinent to exploring the research questions below. The remaining data will be stored by the Office of Community College Research and Policy for future research.

The following research questions guided the study:

1. What are the demographic characteristics of adjunct faculty in Iowa's 15 community colleges?

2. How do adjunct faculty members working at Iowa community colleges rate their overall job satisfaction?
3. How do levels of job satisfaction of community college adjunct faculty members differ according to the background characteristics of gender, age, racial/ethnic background and marital status?
4. How do adjunct faculty members rate their satisfaction/dissatisfaction as it relates to Herzberg's Motivation Hygiene Theory?
5. To what extent do background characteristics, benefits, instruction relationships and physical environment factors predict overall job satisfaction?

Research Design

The purpose of conducting the survey was to examine a sample of current Iowa community college adjunct faculty members so inferences could be made regarding the background characteristics, academic/professional background, instructional responsibilities and workload, current employment, scholarly activities, other activities, educational goals for students, professional development, job satisfaction, and opinions. In order to address the research questions, the researcher created an online survey that served as the instrument used to survey the target population. Following a review of job satisfaction surveys referenced in the literature, the principal investigator developed an original survey. The original survey was created in an effort to collect new data from adjunct faculty in Iowa's 15 community colleges. Because this study intends to contribute to the existing body of research regarding adjunct faculty experiences in community colleges, an original survey was created so that new data could be collected from adjunct faculty members in Iowa's 15 community colleges.

Experts in research design were consulted in the final stages of survey design. Internal experts consulted included: Dr. Larry Ebbers, University Professor, Department of Educational Leadership and Policy Studies, Iowa State University; Dr. Frankie Santos Lanaan, Associate Professor, Department of Educational Leadership and Policy Studies, Iowa State University; and Dr. Soko Starobin, Assistant Professor, Department of Educational Leadership and Policy Studies, Iowa State University. Following the internal review, drafts of the survey instrument were externally reviewed and constructive comments received from two leading community college researchers: Dr. Desna L. Wallin, Associate Professor, Department of Lifelong Education, Administration and Policy, University of Georgia; and Dr. Linda Serra Hagedorn, Professor and Director of Research Institute for Studies in Higher Education, Iowa State University.

A pilot study was conducted by Ms. Margi Boord, Iowa State University Ph.D student, and Associate Executive Director of Human Resources at Des Moines Area Community College. A draft of The Iowa Community College Adjunct Faculty Survey 2009 was e-mailed to a group of 20 adjunct faculty members at Des Moines Area Community College in Ankeny, Iowa who participated in the Adjunct Advantage Professional Development Program. The online survey was sent via e-mail on April 13, 2009, with a letter attached inviting participation in the survey along with specific instructions on how to complete the survey and contact information for participants who had questions or concerns. Twelve participants completed the survey and submitted it for review, which resulted in a response rate of 60%.

The purpose of the pilot was to collect constructive feedback regarding the format and content of the survey, to establish an estimated time of completion, and to ensure each

survey item was understood by the participants. This information was used to guide the revisions included in the final draft of the survey. Recommendations from the pilot participants, internal and external experts were incorporated into the final draft prior to e-mail distribution of the survey.

The principal investigator applied for and received project approval from the Iowa State Institutional Review Board on May 21, 2009. A copy of the approval is provided in Appendix A.

Population and Sample

The population of adjunct faculty members targeted for this study included all adjunct faculty members employed at one of Iowa's 15 community colleges during the 2008-09 Academic Year. The President of each of Iowa's 15 community colleges granted written institutional permission to participate in the Iowa Community College Adjunct Faculty Survey 2009. Each President was asked to appoint a local facilitator to serve as the designated institutional contact person. Facilitators were asked to provide the principal investigator the institutional data required to distribute the survey. The principal investigator requested first names, last names, and e-mail addresses of all adjunct faculty members employed at one of Iowa's 15 community colleges during the 2008-09 Academic Year. This information was provided to the principal investigator by the facilitator designated by the President at 14 of the 15 community colleges. One of the colleges required the survey be distributed to the designated facilitator and then he in turn forwarded the survey to the adjunct faculty members at the institution. The final population included all of Iowa's 15 community colleges and 3,412 adjunct faculty members were eligible to complete the survey.

Instrumentation

Data were collected using an original survey instrument, The Iowa Community College Adjunct Faculty Survey 2009. The 73-item Iowa Community College Adjunct Faculty Survey 2009 was formulated as a result of a review of past survey instruments (NOSPF: 04; CCSSFE, 2008) and previous studies in the area (Hagedorn, 2000; Hardy & Laanan, 2006; Outcalt, 2002; Palmer & Zimbler, 2000; Rifkin 1998; Valadez & Anthony, 2001). The surveys reviewed were used to study adjunct and full-time faculty, including background characteristics, academic/professional background, instructional responsibilities and workload, current employment, institutional resources, scholarly activities, other activities, educational goals for students, professional development, job satisfaction, and opinions. These survey instruments utilized dichotomous responses (i.e., ”yes” and “no”) numerical scales and Likert-type rating scales (e.g., “very satisfied, somewhat satisfied, somewhat dissatisfied, very dissatisfied”). A complete copy of the survey instrument is provided in Appendix B.

The 73 item survey is organized in eleven sections: (1) background characteristics; (2) academic/professional background; (3) instructional responsibilities and workload; (4) current employment; (5) institutional resources; (6) scholarly activities; (7) other activities; (8) educational goals for students; (9) professional development; (10) job satisfaction; (11) opinions; and (12) open ended questions. The following is a description of each section.

1. Background Characteristics

This component of the survey asked to provide background information including; gender, age, racial/ethnic background, primary language, marital status and citizenship. The purpose of this section is to gain a better understanding of the demographic make-up of this faculty group and to use the information collected for comparative statistical analyses.

2. Academic/Professional Background

Adjunct faculty were asked to provide information regarding their academic/ professional background. The rationale for these questions was to collect data that would be helpful in determining the postsecondary education experiences and preparation of the sample. Questions regarding community college student experience, most advanced degree earned and discipline of most advance degree were included in this section.

3. Instructional Responsibilities and Workload

In this section, adjunct faculty members were asked to provide information about their principal field or discipline of teaching at their respective institutions during the 2008-09 Academic Year. Additional questions were asked pertaining to instructional workload and instructional deliver method (ie. Face to face vs. Online). Finally, a question was asked to determine if the adjunct instructor taught any remedial/developmental courses. The purpose of this section was to gain insight into the instructional responsibilities of the sample population.

4. Current Employment

Questions were asked related to the current employment of adjunct faculty members both inside and outside of the community college setting. The rationale for these questions was to collect data that would be useful in understanding the employment status of adjuncts

employed outside of their part-time positions at the community college. In addition, this component was intended to produce data useful in determining why individuals chose to teach on an adjunct basis and if they would have preferred to have had a full-time position during the 2008-09 Academic Year.

5. Instructional Resources

Previous research indicates adjuncts were frequently dissatisfied with the lack of institutional resources provided to adjunct faculty members in varying degrees from institution to institution (Fulton 2000, Gappa & Leslie, 1993; Kelly, 1991). Information from this section was included in the survey to gain a better understanding of adjunct faculty satisfaction with the physical resources and support services provided to adjunct faculty members in Iowa's community colleges.

6. Scholarly Activities

This section asked respondents to identify the amount of time spent per week on research, scholarly writing and other creative products/performances related to their discipline during the 2008-09 Academic Year. Information from this section provided insight into the scholarly commitment of the adjunct faculty in Iowa, not generally required of their instructional assignments or duties.

7. Other Activities

The other activities section asked respondents to indicate, on average, how many hours per week they spent participating in a variety of personal and professional activities. This section was designed to provide insight into the daily schedule and activities of adjunct faculty members in addition to their instructional assignments.

8. Educational Goals for Students

The educational goals for students component was designed to provide insight into the thought processes of adjunct faculty members related to the educational goals of their students. This component included questions about developing the ability to think critically, preparing students for employment after college, providing for students' emotional development, preparing students for family living, helping students develop personal values, enhancing students' self understanding, instilling a commitment to community service, preparing students to transfer to a four-year institution, enhancing students' knowledge of and appreciation for other racial/ethnic groups, promoting the ability to write effectively, helping students evaluate the quality and reliability of information, engaging students in civil discourse and controversial issues, teaching students tolerance and respect for different beliefs, encouraging students to become agents for social change and promoting lifelong learning.

9. Professional Development

This component of the survey was intended to produce data that will guide administrators in planning future professional development activities for adjunct faculty members. Iowa Administrative Code (Chapter 24) requires all adjunct Iowa community colleges to include adjunct instructors in their Quality Faculty Plans by 2011 (Quality Faculty Plan, 2009). Questions in this section asked respondents to identify the workshops/professional activities they have participated in and the usefulness thereof, as well as to identify areas of interest/need for future professional development training.

10. Job Satisfaction

This component of the survey contains the variables at the center of this study. The section was intended to produce data that would provide insight into the perception of adjunct faculty members related to job satisfaction. Twenty-four items were included in this section that seeked to expand upon the growing body of job satisfaction research by focusing on contextualizing the experiences of adjunct faculty members at Iowa's 15 community colleges.

11. Opinions

This section asked participants to respond to a variety of questions related to training, orientation, content, professional development, employment opportunities, advising, working relationships, faculty access, student behaviors, social activities, adjunct faculty rewards, adjunct faculty involvement etc. The purpose of this section is to collect data that will better define the thoughts and perceptions of adjunct faculty members on a wide range of topics researchers have found to affect attitudes and job satisfaction.

Open Ended Questions

The survey concludes with two open-ended questions: (1) If you were given the opportunity to provide advice to the administration at this college, what advice for improving the experiences of adjunct faculty would you provide? (2) Describe the professional development experience that would assist you most in becoming a more effective adjunct instructor at this institution. These questions were designed to allow survey respondents the opportunity to share thoughts on issues that were not specifically addressed in the survey. The professional development question was included to gather information that can be used to guide the development of adjunct faculty training and recertification programs.

Data Collection

Qualtrics Survey Software was used to create, distribute, collect and aggregate the data collected for this research. The electronic survey instruments were e-mailed to adjunct faculty members on June 25, 2009. Adjunct faculty members were given a deadline of August 1, 2009 to complete and submit the survey. The instrument was accompanied by a cover letter (see Appendix C) from the principal investigator inviting adjunct faculty members to participate in the study. The e-mail also included the instructions on how to access the survey and contact information for the principal investigator and Iowa State University supervising university faculty member, Larry Ebbers, Ph.D.

In an effort to facilitate a high response rate, four reminder e-mails were sent to non-respondents at intervals over the next four weeks. The contact dates were:

June 25, 2009	Original Survey Mailing
July 6, 2009	E-mail reminder 1
July 13, 2009	E-mail reminder 2
July 20, 2009	E-mail reminder 3
July 27, 2009	E-mail reminder 4 (Final)

Surveys were completed from June 25, 2009 through August 1, 2009. There were 1,046 surveys started and 943 completed. Survey data were then exported from the Qualtrics Survey Software to Statistical Package for Social Sciences® (SPSS) software and stored on a secure server.

Population

Fifteen community colleges in Iowa identified 3,412 adjunct faculty members to be included in the population. Upon arrival of the survey completion deadline, 1,045 participants logged in to the survey and started to complete it. Of the 1,045 participants who started to complete the survey, only 943 completed and clicked the submission button at the end of the survey. Several participants were identified as instructors by multiple institutions. Duplicate participants were assigned to the institution where they conducted a majority of their teaching during the 2008-09 academic year.

For the purpose of this survey, respondents who did not complete any of the questions regarding job satisfaction were eliminated from the sample. A final population of 930 participants was included in the data set. Table 3.1 illustrates the response rate.

Table 3.1. Sample and response rate for The Iowa Community College Adjunct Faculty Survey

	Cases
Eligible Sample	3,412.00
Started the Survey	1,045.00
Final Sample Size	930.00
Response Rate	27.27

Data Analysis Procedures

The data analysis procedures used in this study included descriptive statistics that produced frequency and cross tabulation data describing the population, an exploratory factor analysis, a data reduction technique designed to reduce the 23 job satisfaction variables into reliable constructs and, finally, a multiple regression analysis designed to assess the relationship between the dependent variable and independent variables included in the data analysis.

Descriptive statistics

The Statistical Package for Social Sciences® (SPSS) for Windows® software was used to execute the statistical analysis for the study. SPSS is a comprehensive system for analyzing data and provides information on trends, descriptive statistics and complex statistical analyses. In an effort to address research questions 1-4, descriptive statistics were conducted to examine: demographic, educational background, professional preparation, reason for being an adjunct and overall job satisfaction.

Exploratory factor analysis

To examine the levels of job satisfaction of Iowa community college adjunct faculty, 23 items were selected from the Iowa Community College Adjunct Faculty Survey. These items address various aspects of job satisfaction**.** An exploratory factor analysis was conducted and the results grouped the independent variables into four dimensions (constructs): (a) Relationships, (b) Benefits, (c) Instruction, and (4) Physical environment. The remaining job satisfaction item, overall job satisfaction, was a stand-alone variable

representing an overall measure of satisfaction and was the dependent variable used in the data analysis for this study.

According to Tabachnick and Fidell, (2007), principal component analysis can be used if scores on numerous variables are available from a group of subjects to develop a small set of components that empirically summarized the correlations among the variables. An exploratory principal-component factor analysis was performed to determine if the 23 variables related to job satisfaction could be grouped reliably into constructs. According to Comrey and Lee (1992): loading over 0.71 are considered excellent; over 0.63 very good; 0.55 good; 0.45 fair; and 0.32 poor. For the purpose of this study, a cutoff of 0.608 was used to identify factors and develop constructs. This cutoff was established due to a natural break occurring in the loadings and 0.608 represents a "good" loading value.

Multiple regression analysis

In an effort to address Research Question 5: *To what extent do background characteristics, benefits, instruction, relationships and physical environment factors predict overall job satisfaction?* a linear regression analysis was conducted to assess the predictive capabilities of demographics, benefits and instruction, and relationships and physical environment on overall job satisfaction. According to Tabachnick and Fidell (2007), multiple regression analyses enable the researcher to assess the relationship between one dependent variable and several independent variables. The intent of this type of analysis is prediction and assessment of the relationship between the dependent and independent variables.

Predictor variables were entered into the hierarchal regression equation in three variable blocks. The first block comprised the demographic variables of gender and age. The

second block comprised nine variables related to benefits and instruction including: prospects for career advancement, benefits, teaching load, salary, autonomy and independence, freedom to determine course content, course assignment, and job security. The third block consisted of seven variables related to relationships and physical environment including: social relationships with other adjunct faculty; social relationships with other faculty; professional relationships with other adjunct faculty; professional relationship with other faculty; equipment and facilities available for classroom instruction; support for implementing technology-based instruction; office/lab space and institutional support for teaching improvement; and professional development. The variables entered into blocks two and three were selected due to the relationships discovered in the exploratory factor analysis and by aligning the constructs that included the most variables described by Herzberg (1957) as motivator factors in block two and physical environment factors in block three. The significance level established for this regression was $p < .05$. The variables included in block two and three were selected due to the relationships discovered in the exploratory factor analysis and by aligning the constructs that included the most variables described by Herzberg (1968/2003) as motivator factors in block two and hygiene factors in block three.

Ethical Issues

Participation in this study was voluntary, and willingness to participate had no effect on the current status of any adjunct faculty member at their respective community college. Summary data were provided to the college at the conclusion of this study. Results containing less than 10 cases/respondents were suppressed to protect any indirect

identification of participants. E-mail addresses were retained for follow-up communication only.

To ensure the integrity of the survey and its results, both the survey and the data were stored on a secure server. The data set continues to be stored on a secure server in the Office of Community College Research and Policy for future research.

CHAPTER 4. RESULTS

This chapter provides a comprehensive overview of the results of this study. The chapter is organized into four sections. The first section reports the demographic characteristics of adjunct faculty members in Iowa's 15 community colleges. The second section reports overall job satisfaction and how job satisfaction differs according to background characteristics of gender, age, racial/ethnic background and marital status. The third section reports the psychometrics of the Iowa Community College Adjunct Faculty Survey 2009. This section includes an exploratory factor analysis designed to determine how variables load and cluster. The final section reports the results of the multiple regressions analysis designed to explain the relationship between variables and the predictive capabilities of the model constructed.

Demographic Characteristics of Iowa Community College Adjunct Faculty

In an effort to answer *Research Question 1: What are the demographic characteristics of adjunct faculty in Iowa's 15 community colleges?* frequency analyses were conducted to gain a better understanding of the general demographics of the 930 adjunct faculty members who completed the survey. It should be noted that, on May 21, 2009, the Iowa State University Institutional Review Board required respondents to have the option of not answering questions, thus sample sizes differ on the variables reported in this study. Results containing less than 10 cases/respondents were suppressed to protect any indirect identification of participants.

Participants were asked to provide demographic information about their gender, age, ethnicity, primary language, marital status, and whether they are citizens. A detailed

description of the demographic information provided by the participants is presented in Table 4.1. By gender, a majority of the community college adjunct faculty members in the study were female, 58.6% (n = 545). Males represented 41.4% (n = 382). The mean age of those participants who responded (n = 923) to the survey question regarding age was 47.4 years old.

Of the 925 adjunct community faculty members responding to the question regarding race/ethnic background, 95.0% (n = 879) were White/Not Hispanic. Among other race/ethnicity groups, Latino/Hispanic adjunct community faculty members 1.6% (n = 15) and other racial groups comprised the final 2.4 % (n = 31).

Among the 924 adjunct community college faculty members responding to the question regarding primary language, 98.7% (n = 912) selected English. Of the 920 participants responding to the question regarding citizenship, 99.3% (n = 914) reported being a United States Citizen.

Of the 922 participants responding to the question regarding marital status, 77.2% (n = 712) reported being married/living with partner or significant other while 12.6% (n = 116) reported being single. The remaining participants reported being separated, divorced or widowed 10.2% (n = 94).

Respondents were asked to indicate if they had ever enrolled in a community college as a student. A little less than one half (47.6%) reported attending a community college as a student. Of those respondents who completed a degree at a community college, 50.9% (n = 139) reported completing an Associate of Arts (AA) degree, 25.3% (n = 69) reported completing an Associate of Sciences (AS) degree, and 22.3% (n = 61) reported completing an Associate of Applied Sciences (AAS) degree.

Table 4.1. Demographics of Iowa community college adjunct faculty members

Variable	*N*	Percent
Gender		
N = 927		
Male	382	41.2
Female	545	58.8
Age		
N = 927		
22 -29	82	8.9
30 -39	187	20.2
40 -49	234	25.4
50-59	244	26.4
60 and Older	176	19.1
Mean Age		47.7
Race/Ethnic Background		
N = 925		
Alaska Native	*	*
Asian	*	*
Black or African American	*	*
Latino, Hispanic	15	1.6
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific islander	*	*
White, Not Hispanic	879	95.0
Other	14	1.5
Primary Language		
N = 924		
English	972	98.7
Spanish	*	*
Other	*	*
Marital Status		
N = 922		
Single	116	12.6
Married/Living With Partner or Significant Other	712	77.2
Separated, Divorced or Widowed	94	10.2
U.S. Citizenship		
N = 920		
Yes	914	99.3
No	*	*

*Indicates less than 10 respondents were represented.

Results shown in Table 4.2 reveal that, of the 929 participants who responded to the question of highest degree completed, 60.7% (*n* = 564) had completed a Master's Degree (M.A., M.S., M.Ed., etc.) as their highest degree completed, while only 11.6% (n = 108) reported earning a Doctorate (Ph.D., M.D., Ed.D., J.D., etc.). Respondents reporting completing a Bachelor's Degree as their highest degree completed were 17.3% (n =161) of the sample, while 6.2% (n = 58) reported an Associates degree as their highest degree completed, while only 2.0% (n = 18) reported completing a diploma or certificate at a community college. Only .9% (n = 8) reported completing a high school diploma or a graduate equivalency degree (GED).

A question was asked to determine the category/area of study that best describes the most advanced degree earned by each respondent. A total of 925 participants responded to this survey question with 53.1% (n = 491) reported completing their highest degree in the Arts and Sciences (including postsecondary education degrees), Health Occupations represented 10.6% (n = 98), Business and Office, 9.2% (n = 85), Trade and Industry 1.9% (n = 18), Family and Consumer Science 1.1% (n = 10) and other 22.7% (n= 210).

To gain a better understanding of the professional backgrounds of current community college adjunct faculty members, respondents were asked to identify the number of years of teaching experience in a variety of educational settings. When asked to report the number of years respondents had been teaching at this institution (the institution through which they received the survey), 51.5% (n = 458) reported working 4 years or less, 23.9% (n = 213) reported working between 5 and 8 years. The remaining 24.6% (n = 219) reported teaching 9 years or more at their respective institutions.

Table 4.2. Educational background

Variable	*N*	Percent
Ever Enrolled in Community College as a Student		
N = 927		
Yes	441	47.6
No	486	52.4
Degree Completion		
N = 930		
Associate of Arts (AA)	139	14.9
Associate of Sciences (AS)	69	7.4
Associate of Applied Sciences (AAS)	61	6.6
Associate of General Studies (AGS)	*	*
No Response	791	70.7
Highest Degree Completed		
N = 929		
Doctorate (Ph.D., M.D., Ed.D., J.D., etc.)	108	11.6
Education Specialist (Ed.S.)	*	*
Master's Degree (M.A., M.S., M.Ed., etc.)	564	60.7
Bachelor's Degree	161	17.3
Associate's Degree	58	6.2
Diploma	11	1.2
Certificate	*	*
High School Diploma/GED	*	*
Not Applicable	*	*
Field/Discipline of Most advanced Degree		
N = 784		
Arts and Science (Includes education degrees)	491	53.1
Agriculture	*	*
Business and Office	85	9.2
Family and Consumer Science	10	1.1
Marketing Education	*	*
Health Occupations	98	10.6
Trade and Industry	18	1.9
Other	210	22.7

*Indicates less than 10 respondents were represented.

To gain a better understanding of the assignments of adjunct faculty, respondents were asked to identify their primary field or discipline of teaching at their respective institutions during the 2008-09 Academic Year. A majority of the adjunct faculty (n = 662) who responded revealed that they teach general education courses. Table 4.3 illustrates the findings.

In an effort to understanding of the teaching load of the adjunct faculty member in the sample, participants were asked how many courses they taught in each of the areas/disciplines included in the survey. Table 4.4 illustrates the number of adjunct faculty members who reported the number of sections taught in each area/discipline during the 2008-09 Academic Year. For example, 116 adjunct faculty members reported teaching two sections of General Education Courses (see Table 4.4).

Table 4.3. Area of primary teaching assignments (2008-09)

Area of Teaching	*N*
General Education Courses	662
Developmental /Remedial Courses	399
Vocational Courses	411
Non-credit Courses	338
Other Undergraduate Courses	473
Other	242

Note: Participants could respond to more than one area.

Table 4.4. Adjunct teaching load by area

	Number of Sections Taught by an Adjunct					
Area of Teaching	0	1	2	3	4	5 or more
General Education Courses	193	116	94	77	58	124
Developmental /Remedial Courses	307	36	25	13	17	20
Vocational Courses	252	51	36	24	15	33
Non-credit Courses	301	12	*	*	*	15
Other Undergraduate Courses	203	73	60	39	34	64
Other	203	16	*	*	*	*

*Indicates less than 10 respondents were represented.

Respondents were asked to identify the primary reason they choose to work at their respective community colleges. Of the 285 respondents, 31.9% (n = 91) reported they enjoy the experience, 26% (n = 74) reported they need the extra money, 20.7% (n = 59) reported that they enjoyed the students, 15.4% (n = 44) reported plans to use this experience as a career ladder and finally, 6% (n = 17) reported other primary reasons (see Table 4.3).

To gain a better understanding of the employment goals of Iowa community college adjunct faculty, participants were asked if they would have preferred a full-time position for the 2008-09 Academic Year. Over half (57.1%) of the respondents preferred not to be in a full-time position while 42.9% would have preferred a full-time position (see Table 4.5).

Table 4.5. Primary reason of teaching as an adjunct (*N* = 285)

Variable	*N*	Percent
Enjoy the Experience	91	31.93
Need the Extra Money	74	25.96
Enjoy the Students	59	20.70
Plan to use This Experience as a Career Ladder	44	15.44
Other	17	5.96
Would you have preferred Full-time Work		
N = 590		
Variable	*N*	Percent
Yes	253	42.9
No	337	57.1

Job Satisfaction

The focus of this study was to expand on previous research related to adjunct faculty job satisfaction by describing more accurately the current job satisfaction of adjunct faculty, more specifically the adjunct faculty in the state of Iowa. In an effort to answer *Research Question 2: How do adjunct faculty members working at Iowa community colleges rate their overall job satisfaction?* a section of the Iowa Community College Adjunct Faculty Survey 2009 was devoted to exploring job satisfaction more thoroughly. Participants rated 24 job satisfaction items in this section of the survey. Table 4.6 shows the results of the frequency analysis of adjunct faculty member job satisfaction on the 24 items, including overall job satisfaction. To examine the central tendency of the job satisfaction measured by 23 job satisfaction variables, each items mean was computed to generate an overall mean score for 23 job satisfaction variables. The intent was to compare overall mean score of the 23

Table 4.6. Job satisfaction (N = 931)

Variable	Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Marginally Satisfied	Not Satisfied	Responses	Mean
Autonomy and Independence	486	383	41	14	924	3.45
Freedom to Determine Course Content	449	389	65	19	922	3.38
Course Assignments	288	526	88	21	923	3.17
Competency of Colleagues	289	500	100	20	909	3.16
Equipment and Facilities	308	445	120	45	918	3.11
Relationship With Administrators	323	429	111	57	920	3.11
Departmental Leadership	334	399	121	60	914	3.10
Professional Relationship With Other Faculty	318	372	174	52	916	3.04
Clerical/Administrative Support	260	431	139	71	901	2.98
Professional Relationship With Other Adjunct Faculty	262	371	200	75	908	2.90
Support for Teaching Improvement and Professional Development	207	432	188	89	916	2.83
Teaching Load	129	550	181	63	923	2.81
Quality of Student	117	542	230	37	926	2.80
Institutional Support for Implementing Technology-based Instruction	160	447	187	101	895	2.74
Social Relationships With Other Faculty	168	413	219	93	893	2.74
Social Relationships With Other Adjunct Faculty	166	423	218	89	896	2.74
Job Security	154	426	188	146	914	2.64
Salary	97	444	283	101	925	2.58
Office/Lab Space	114	395	228	172	909	2.50
Availability of Child Care at this Institution	103	349	140	201	790	2.44
Prospects for Career Advancement	63	337	264	214	878	2.28
Institutional Funding of Travel for Professional Development	71	307	228	267	873	2.21
Benefits Available	42	208	179	463	892	1.81
Overall Job Satisfaction	223	562	115	25	925	3.06

Note: All items were rated using a 4-point Likert scale: 4 = very satisfied; 3 = somewhat satisfied; 2 = somewhat dissatisfied; and 4 = very dissatisfied.

variables with the single question of overall job satisfaction. Values were assigned to the responses were: (4) very satisfied; (3) satisfied; (2) marginally satisfied; and (1) not satisfied**.** The overall mean score on the 23 variables was M = 2.81. On the single question of overall job satisfaction, the mean score was M = 3.06.

Table 4.6 shows the mean score for all 24 items related to job satisfaction, including overall job satisfaction. Values were assigned to the responses were: (4) very satisfied; (3) satisfied; (2) marginally satisfied; and (1) not satisfied. Adjunct faculty were most satisfied with the autonomy and independence of their job M = 3.45, followed by freedom to determine course content M = 3.38, course assignments M = 3.17, competency of colleagues M = 3.16, equipment and facilities M = 3.11 and relationship with administrators M = 3.11. Adjunct faculty were least satisfied with benefits available M = 1.81, followed by institutional funding for professional development M = 2.21, prospects for career advancement M = 2.29, availability of child care M = 2.44, office lab space M = 2.50 and salary M = 2.58.

In an effort to answer *Research Questions 3: How do levels of job satisfaction of adjunct community college adjunct faculty members differ according to the background characteristics of gender, age, racial/ethnic background and marital status?* cross tabulations were conducted for the purpose of examining the frequency distributions disaggregated gender, age, race/ethnic background and marital status and overall job satisfaction (see Table 4.7).

When considering gender, 88% of the male adjunct faculty subgroup reported and overall job satisfaction rating of satisfied or very satisfied while only 83% of the female

subgroup reported being satisfied or very satisfied. Sixty-year olds and older reported the highest percentage of responses as satisfied or very satisfied at 89%, followed by 40-49 years

Table 4.7. Overall job satisfaction by demographic

Variable	Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Marginally Satisfied	Not Satisfied	Total
Overall job satisfaction ratings by Gender (N = 928)					
Male	95	238	34	12	379
Female	127	322	81	13	543
Total					922
Overall Job Satisfaction Ratings by Age (N = 924)					
Age					
22 -29	11	51	15	4	81
30 -39	41	115	25	5	186
40 -49	44	159	27	3	233
50-59	65	140	31	8	244
60 and Older	62	93	15	4	174
Total					918
Overall job satisfaction ratings by Race/Ethnic Background (N = 926)					
Asian	*	*	*	*	*
Black or African American	*	*	0	0	*
Latino, Hispanic	3	11	1	0	15
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific islander	0	*	0	0	*
White, Not Hispanic	213	530	108	23	874
Other	3	8	3	0	14
Total					903
Overall Job Satisfaction Ratings by Marital Status (N = 923)					
Single	26	64	19	6	115
Married/Living with partner or significant other	174	441	78	15	708
Separated, divorced or widowed	22	51	17	4	94
Total					917

*Indicates less than 10 respondents were represented.

old at 87%, 30-39 and 50-59 at 84%, and the lowest percentage reported as satisfied or very satisfied was the 22-29 year olds at 77%.

When race/ethnic background was examined, 83% of the White, not Hispanic subgroup rated their overall job satisfaction satisfied or very satisfied. The majority (93%) of all other race/ethnic background groups combined reported an overall job satisfaction rating of satisfied or very satisfied.

When marital status was explored, 87% of the subgroup married/living with partner reported satisfactory or very satisfactory ratings, while 78% of singles reported satisfied or very satisfied, followed by 57% of the separated, divorced or widowed subgroup who reported either being satisfied or very satisfied with their adjunct status.

Finally, years of teaching experience at the adjunct faculty member's respective institution and overall job satisfaction were examined. Ninety-one percent (91.5%) of the participants with 16 to 20 years of teaching experience reported satisfactory or very satisfactory ratings, 90.9% of the participants with 21 years or more of experience reported satisfied or very satisfied, 86.3% of the participants with 11-16 years of teaching experience reported either being satisfied or very satisfied, 83.4% of the participants with 6-10 years of teaching experience reported either being satisfied or very satisfied, and 85.2% of the participants with 1-5 years of teaching experience reported either being satisfied or very satisfied.

Psychometrics of Iowa Community College Adjunct Faculty Survey

In an effort to answer *Research Question 4: How do adjunct faculty members rate their satisfaction/dissatisfaction as it relates to Herzberg's Motivation Hygiene Theory?* an

exploratory factor analysis was conducted on 23 survey items using a principal component extraction and varimax rotation methods from the sample of 930 respondents. The purpose of the exploratory factor analysis was to determine how the job satisfaction variables loaded. Using data extraction techniques, four constructs were identified as a result of using the exploratory factor analysis as a data reduction technique. For this study, factor loadings more than .608 were used to conduct a robust statistical analysis. Additionally, Cromrey and Lee's work (as cited in Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007) suggested that loadings in excess of .71 are considered excellent; .63 very good; .55 as good; .45 fair; and .32 and below poor. In this research only one loading fell below the .63 level, indicating the variables are a pure measure of the factor. The results of the loadings of variable on factors are shown in Table 4.8. Variables are grouped by value of loading to facilitate interpretation.

Cronbach's alpha (α) was used to determine the reliability of the analyses. Eight factors were extracted from the data set due to the low loading values of these variables, thus leaving 16 variables within the constructs with the lowest *a* resulting from the Cronbach reliability analysis of .717.

In summary, following the exploratory factor analysis of the 23 questions related to job satisfaction, 16 questions were used to create four constructs: (a) relationships, (b) benefits, (c) instruction, and (d) physical environment. The constructs were used to conduct linear regression analyses intended to examine the relationship between the constructs (independent variables) and overall job satisfaction (dependent variable). Based on the results of the exploratory factor analysis (see Table 4.8), the researcher concluded that the null hypothesis for Research Question 4 was rejected due to the relationships discovered between both motivator and hygiene factors present in each construct. Herzberg (1968/2003) stated

Table 4.8. Summary of factor loadings (N = 930)

Variables	Factor Loadings
Relationships (a = .929)	
How satisfied are you with the following aspect of your job? - Social relationships with other adjunct faculty	0.893
How satisfied are you with the following aspect of your job? -Social relationships with other faculty	0.877
How satisfied are you with the following aspect of your job? - Professional relationships with other adjunct faculty	0.842
How satisfied are you with the following aspect of your job? - Professional relationships with other faculty	0.793
Benefits (a = .781)	
How satisfied are you with the following aspect of your job? - Prospects for Advancement	0.701
How satisfied are you with the following aspect of your job? – Benefits	0.692
How satisfied are you with the following aspect of your job? - Teaching Load	0.667
How satisfied are you with the following aspect of your job? - Job Security	0.666
How satisfied are you with the following aspect of your job? – Salary	0.629
Instruction (a = 7.17)	
How satisfied are you with the following aspect of your job? - Autonomy and Independence	0.770
How satisfied are you with the following aspect of your job? - Freedom to determine course content	0.752
How satisfied are you with the following aspect of your job? - Course Assignments	0.632
Physical environment (a = .700)	
How satisfied are you with the following aspect of your job? - Equipment and facilities available for classroom instruction	0.760
How satisfied are you with the following aspect of your job? - Institutional support for implementing technology-based instructional activities	0.732
How satisfied are you with the following aspect of your job? - Office/lab space	0.617
How satisfied are you with the following aspect of your job? - Institutional support for teaching improvement and professional development	0.608

that people are motivated by interesting work, challenge, and increasing responsibility. These represent only motivator factors. This exploratory analysis revealed a relationship between motivator and hygiene factor in each construct and both types of factors contribute to overall job satisfaction.

Regression Analysis

In an effort to answer *Research Question 5: To what extent do background characteristics, benefits, instruction, relationships and physical environment factors predict overall job satisfaction?* a hierarchical multiple regression analysis was performed to predict adjunct faculty overall job satisfaction from their self-ratings on the questions related to job satisfaction. To conduct a robust regression analysis, respondents who did not answer any of the job satisfaction questions were excluded resulting in a final sample of 930 adjunct faculty members. The dependent variable for this regression is overall job satisfaction. Based on the results of the exploratory factor analysis, four composite variables (relationships, benefits instruction and physical environment) were computed. The correlation matrix among independent variables and the dependent variable are presented in Appendix D. The independent variables were gender, age, relationships, benefits, instruction and physical environment. A *p*-value of < .05 was established for statistical significance. The results are shown in Table 4.9.

Table 4.9. Summary of regression analysis for variables predicting overall job satisfaction (N = 930)

	Standard regression coefficients (β)		
Variable Blocks	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
Gender	-0.04	0.01	0.01
Age	0.112**	0.072**	0.06
Benefits		0.509***	0.43
Instruction		0.351***	0.272*
Relationships			0.112***
Physical environment			0.144***
Adjusted R Squared	0.013**	0.533***	0.563***

*p <.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001

The results of Model 1, gender and age predicting overall job satisfaction showed the adjusted R^2 = .013, sum of squares (*SS*) = 5.767, degrees of freedom (*df*) = 2, the mean square (*MS*) = 2.884, f-ratio (*F*) = 6.278 and the statistical significance (*p*) .002. Because the *p*-value is less than .05, there is a statistically significant difference on how current Iowa community college adjunct faculty members rate their level of overall job satisfaction when age and gender are considered.

The results of Model 2 gender, age, benefits and instruction showed an adjusted R^2 = .533, sum of squares (*SS*) = 198.176, degrees of freedom (*df*) = 4, the mean square (*MS*) = 49.542, f-ratio (*F*) = 228.069 and the statistical significance (*p*) .000. Because the *p*-value is less than .05, there is a significant difference on how current Iowa community college adjunct faculty members rate their level of overall job satisfaction when benefits and instruction variables are considered.

The results of Model 3 gender, age, benefits, instruction, relationships and physical environment showed an adjusted R^2 = .563 sum of squares (*SS*) = 209.446, degrees of freedom (*df*) = 6, the mean square (*MS*) = 34.908, f-ratio (*F*) = 171.555 and the statistical significance (*p*) .000. Because the *p*-value is less than .05, there is a significant difference on how current Iowa community college adjunct faculty members rate their level of overall job satisfaction when relationship and physical environment variables are considered.

In Model 1, variables included age and gender. Model 2 added variables related to benefits and instruction and Model 3 added variables related to relationships and physical environment. The coefficient of determination, adjusted R squared are included to indicate how well the linear prediction fits the data, and the standardized regression coefficients (Betas – β) to illustrate the relative strengths and relationships between variables.

Table 4.10 presents the results of the hierarchical analysis of unstandardized (*B*) coefficients, standardized (β) coefficients and standard error (*SE*), and probabilities (*p*). Of the six variables entered into the regression, all had positive final betas. In Model 3, two composite variables, benefits and instruction, revealed the highest coefficients in the model; others also revealed statistical significance, but lower coefficients. This can be interpreted to suggest that adjunct faculty members who feel satisfied with benefits (β = .426, $p < .001$) and instruction (β = .272 $p < .001$) are more likely to experience overall job satisfaction. Two additional variables suggest a positive association with the dependent variable. Relationship (β = .112 $p < .001$) and physical environment (β = .144 $p < .001$) variables can also be interpreted to have a positive association with overall job satisfaction.

Table 4.10. Complete summary of regression analysis for variables predicting overall job satisfaction (*N* = 930)

Independent Variable Blocks	*B*	*SE*	β	*p*
Model 1				
Gender	-0.059	0.049	-0.042	0.233
Age	0.007	0.002	0.112**	0.002
Model 2				
Gender	0.018	0.034	0.013	0.595
Age	0.004	0.001	0.072**	0.003
Benefits	0.109	0.006	0.509***	0.000
Instruction	0.146	0.011	0.351***	0.000
Model 3				
Gender	0.010	0.003	0.007	0.769
Age	0.003	0.001	0.056*	0.020
Benefits	0.091	0.006	0.426***	0.000
Instruction	0.114	0.012	0.272***	0.000
Relationships	0.024	0.006	0.112***	0.000
Physical Environment	0.037	0.008	0.112***	0.000

*p <.05; **p<.01; ***p<.001

In summary, the survey respondents' ratings on how job satisfaction was perceived were regressed on six independent variables associated with job satisfaction. The six independent variables accounted for 56% of the variance explained in the regression model and were statistically significant at the last step. Based on the results of the regression model, the researcher concluded that the null hypothesis for Research Question 5 was rejected. The findings revealed a strong relationship between independent variables and the dependent variable, overall job satisfaction.

CHAPTER 5. SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION

Summary

The Iowa Community College Adjunct Faculty Survey was developed in conjunction with Iowa State University Office of Community College Research and Policy to gather information pertaining to adjunct faculty members teaching in Iowa's 15 community colleges during the 2008-09 Academic Year. This study used the Iowa Community College Adjunct Faculty Survey 2009 to study 930 adjunct faculty members at all 15 Iowa community colleges to gain further insight into the current demographics and their perceptions of adjunct faculty job satisfaction. This survey was the first attempt to collect data on a statewide basis regarding Iowa adjunct faculty. It was designed to serve as a snapshot of the current adjunct faculty population in Iowa's community colleges and their perceived job satisfaction.

For the purpose of this survey, respondents who did not complete questions regarding job satisfaction were eliminated from the sample. A total of 930 participants representing all 15 Iowa community colleges remained in the sample, for a 27.3% return rate.

After the data were cleaned, descriptive statistics, exploratory factor analyses, and multiple regression analyses were conducted in an effort to gain new insight into the variables affecting job satisfaction. Participants were asked to respond to 24 questions related to job satisfaction, including overall job satisfaction.

This research assists in developing a more accurate understanding of the perception of adjunct faculty in Iowa's community colleges and builds upon previous works in an effort to describe more accurately the current job satisfaction of adjunct faculty members. Finally, this

study sought to identify the relationship between the job-satisfaction variables identified in the Iowa Community College Adjunct Faculty Survey 2009.

These findings and conclusions are intended to inform policymakers, administrators and individuals who work directly with adjunct faculty. The findings of this study provide insight into factors that affect adjunct faculty job satisfaction in Iowa's community colleges. The data collected by the Iowa Community College Adjunct Faculty Survey 2009 spans far beyond the reach of this study and many opportunities for future research. This chapter is organized into four sections: (a) Discussion; (b) Limitations; (c) Implications for Future Research and (d) Final thoughts.

Discussion

To establish a general demographic profile of the 930 participants, the study began with an exploration of background characteristics of the participants. In terms of gender, results from the survey indicate nearly 60% of the adjunct faculty members in Iowa during the 2008-09 Academic Year were female. National data (NSOPF: 04) indicates only 52.3% of part-time instructors in public associate degree institutions are female. Male respondents (87.9% satisfied or very satisfied) rated their overall satisfaction slightly higher than female respondents (82.7% satisfied or very satisfied). Overall job satisfaction ratings reported in these findings by gender were nearly identical with males reporting an overall job satisfaction rating of 3.0 and females reporting a 2.9 on a four-point Likert scale. Values were assigned to the responses were: (4) very satisfied; (3) satisfied; (2) marginally satisfied; and (1) not satisfied. Little variance in overall job satisfaction can be explained by gender alone.

The average age of the participants in the sample was 47.4 years old. The average age of part-time instructors nationally in 2004 was 49.2 (NSOPF: 04). Ages ranged from 22 to 83 years old, with the most commonly reported age (mode) of 57. Over half (51.8%) of those responding to the survey reported being between the ages of 40 and 59 years old, with over 19% of the respondents being over 60 years old. Hagedorn (2000) posited that, on average, job satisfaction increases with advanced life stages and can be affected by family-related circumstances, with married faculty reporting higher levels of job satisfaction than either their single or divorced counterparts, while lower levels of job satisfaction were reported for individuals experiencing change.

Results from the Iowa Community College Adjunct Faculty Survey 2009 support Hagedorn's findings, with those 60 years old and older reporting the highest percentage of responses as satisfied or very satisfied (89.1%). The 40-49 year olds reported a slightly higher percentage of being satisfied or very satisfied (87.1%) than the 50-59 year olds (84.9%). A cross tabulation was conducted for the purpose of examining the relationship between age and satisfaction with benefits. Results indicated that 60 year olds and older reported the highest percentage of responses as satisfied or very satisfied at 33.5%, followed by 50-59 year olds at 27.5%, 40-49 years old at 26.9%, 30-39 year olds at 25.7%, and the lowest percentage of satisfaction with benefits reported was by 22-30 year olds at 24.7%. These findings indicate there is predictive power when considering age. Age was a stronger indicator of overall job satisfaction when combined with gender in the regression model.

Race/ethnic background indicates the number of minorities reporting represents a lesser percentage than that of Iowa's population. White, Not Hispanic represented 95% of the sample compared to Iowa's population of 90.3% (U.S. Census Bureau, 2009). Nationally,

White not Hispanic represented 83.8% of the part-time faculty population in 2004 (NSOPF: 04). Due to the lack of non-white participants, overall job satisfaction ratings may not accurately reflect the perception of the non-white population. Eighty-five percent (n = 874) of the White, not Hispanic participants responded satisfied or very satisfied to the question on overall job satisfaction, while all other race/ethnic background variables combined (n = 49) rated their overall job satisfaction as satisfactory or very satisfactory (77.6%). Non-white participants accounted for only 4.7% of the survey sample while the non-white population in Iowa accounts for nearly 9.7% of the population. Participants reported that 98.7% speak English as their primary language while less than 2% reported speaking another language. In addition, over 99% of the participants reported being a U.S. citizen.

When considering the demographic characteristics of age, race/ethnic background and primary language and citizenship, the sample used in this research is relatively homogenous. Considering that 10.7% (U.S. Census Bureau, 2009) of Iowa's population is non-white, and 11% of the community college student population is non-white (Fall Enrollment Report, 2008) community colleges should develop and implement policies to actively recruit non-white adjunct faculty members. These findings provide support for community colleges in Iowa to increase the number of adjunct faculty from minority groups to at least the percentage of minorities reflected in Iowa's general population and the student populations they serve.

Married/living with a partner accounted for over 77% of the participants responding to the question regarding marital status followed by 12.6% reporting being single and 10.2% report being separated, divorced or widowed. Hagedorn (2000) found that married faculty reported higher levels of job satisfaction than either single or divorced counterparts. The

findings of this study support Hagedorn's previous findings with married/living with a partner reporting the highest levels of overall job satisfaction. The current research found 86.9% married/living with a partner were satisfied or very satisfied, followed by single (78.3%) and divorced or widowed (77.7%), respectively. A recommendation is made for community college leaders when researching the possibility of allowing adjunct faculty members to access counseling services, if provided by the institution or their health care provider. Access to marriage and other counseling services could enrich the personal and professional lives of adjunct faculty members and ultimately lead to less employee dissatisfaction.

Years of teaching experience at their respective institution and overall job satisfaction indicate that satisfaction increases with the addition of years of teaching experience within the institution. Ninety-one percent (91.5%) of the participants with 16 to 20 years of teaching experience reported satisfactory or very satisfactory ratings, and 90.9% of the participants with 21 years or more of experience reported they were satisfied or very satisfied.

While background characteristics certainly have an influence on overall job satisfaction ratings, these variables do not explain much variability when considered alone. For the purpose of this study, overall job satisfaction was treated as a stand-alone variable. The sample for this variable contained 930 respondents. Respondents were asked to rate their overall job satisfaction on a Likert scale: (4) very satisfied; (3) satisfied; (2) marginally satisfied; and (1) not satisfied. The mean score for this question was 3.06, which suggests an overall satisfaction rating between satisfied and very satisfied. This overall satisfaction rating supports findings by Leslie and Gappa (2002) that part-time faculty members are not as

universally dissatisfied with their jobs as popularly assumed. Nearly 85% of all adjuncts included in this survey reported their overall job satisfaction as satisfied or very satisfied.

Of the 590 adjuncts responding to whether they would have preferred working full-time during the 2008-09 Academic Year, only 42.9% reported a preference of working full-time at their respective institutions. These findings suggest that a majority of the adjuncts prefer to work on a part-time basis and are generally satisfied with the position they are currently assigned. This study supports Leslie and Gappa (2002), and NSOPF (2000) findings that revealed over half of all part-time faculty members in community colleges prefer to teach on a part-time basis. In the current research more females (46%) preferred a full-time position than males (39%) for the 2008-09 Academic Year.

When reviewing all job satisfaction variables, the six variables in the survey receiving a mean score of 3.0 or higher were: autonomy and independence (M = 3.45), freedom to determine course content (M = 3.38), course assignments (M = 3.17), competency of colleagues (M = 3.16), relationship with administrators (M = 3.11) and equipment and facilities (M = 3.11). The six satisfaction variables with the lowest mean score were: benefits (M = 1.81), institutional funding of travel and professional development (M = 2.21) prospects for career advancement (M = 2.29), availability of child care at this institution (M = 2.44), office/lab space (M = 2.50) and salary (M = 2.58).

Herzberg (1968/2003) determined that motivator factors are involved in producing job satisfaction while hygiene factors contribute to job dissatisfaction. Of the 12 variables discussed in the previous two paragraphs, the three highest mean scores autonomy and independence (M = 3.45), freedom to determine course content (M = 3.38), course assignments (M = 3.17) would be categorized by Herzberg as motivators. The motivator

variable with the lowest mean score was prospects for advancement (M = 2.29). Leaders can use this information to build upon the strengths cited in this research. If Herzberg's theory is correct and motivator factors produce long-term job satisfaction, then college leaders should strategically plan to address these motivator factors (achievement, recognition, work itself, responsibility, promotion and growth).

Five of the six variables reporting the lowest mean scores (benefits (M = 1.81), institutional funding of travel and professional development (M = 2.21), availability of child care at this institution (M = 2.44), office/lab space (M= 2.50) and salary (M = 2.58) are categorized as hygiene factors. Herzberg (1968/2003) determined that hygiene factors were the primary cause of dissatisfaction or unhappiness on the job. He suggests that by improving satisfaction on ratings on hygiene factors does not lead to satisfaction, rather only less dissatisfaction. Leaders who focus on improving hygiene factors may only obtain short-term increases in overall job satisfaction, but it is clear in the current research that hygiene factors do contribute to overall job satisfaction when blocked with motivator factors. Herzberg believes that the prevention of dissatisfaction is just as important as encouragement of motivator satisfaction.

The findings of this study support the seminal research conducted by Frederick Herzberg (1968/2003) that suggests job satisfaction is very complex. Herzberg studied job satisfaction in a business setting, but the application to the education setting deserves consideration. He attempted to define job satisfaction by separating satisfaction into two categories; motivators (psychological needs) and hygiene (physiological needs). According to Herzberg, motivator factors (achievement, recognition, work itself, responsibility, advancement and growth) lead to satisfaction while hygiene factors (company

policy/administration, supervision, relationship with supervisor work conditions, salary, relationship with peers, personal life, relationship with subordinates, status and security) lead to dissatisfaction.

The job satisfaction variables used in this study can be sorted to align with Herzberg's Motivation Hygiene theory. However, the factor loadings used in the regression model identified relationships between both motivator and hygiene variables, indicating that both types of factors contribute to overall job satisfaction.

An exploratory factor analysis was conducted to determine how the 23 job satisfaction variables loaded. The following four constructs were created as a result of this analysis; relationships, benefits, instruction and physical environment. These constructs contained 16 of the 23 variables related to job satisfaction.

For the purpose of conducting a hierarchical regression, the four constructs were compressed into two blocks with two demographic variables (gender and age) defining the third block. These blocks served as the independent variables and overall job satisfaction served as the dependent variable in the regression model. The model builds a more comprehensive framework and builds upon Herzberg's framework by applying his Motivation Hygiene theory to an educational setting.

In predicting overall job satisfaction, the variables added increased the significant effects as each step is added model. Gender was the only variable in the model that produced a significance level that exceeded the $p < .05$ level, which was the established threshold for the study. Therefore gender alone cannot be used to reasonably predict overall job satisfaction.

The second step increased the variance explained in the regression model. With the addition of the benefits and instruction variables, the adjusted R^2 increased from .013 in step one to .533 in step two. These variables can be used to explain 53.3% of the variability in overall job satisfaction. Step three continued to explain more variability with the final adjusted R^2 for the model being .563.

Results from the regressions indicate the model constructed is statistically significant at the $p < .001$ level. Adjusted R^2 provides the most robust measure of how much variance is explained. The strength of the regression model increases as each step was added. The final adjusted R^2 represents all 16 variables and explains 56.3% of the variability related to overall job satisfaction.

Considering the number and diversity of the variables included in the regression model, the ability to explain 56.3% of the variability speaks to the relative strength of the relationships between variables and the predictive power of the model. Academic administrators can use these findings to improve the working conditions and overall job satisfaction of adjunct faculty. The findings of this study suggest that improving overall job satisfaction does not necessarily have to be an expensive endeavor. Results from the survey indicate adjunct faculty is satisfied with autonomy and independence, freedom to determine course content, and course assignments. Additional involvement and attention to these three motivator factors may increase satisfaction, but the real opportunity may lie in addressing those motivator factors that were not rated as highly as the aforementioned factors. These factors include prospects for career advancement, teaching load and support of teaching improvement and professional development. By focusing efforts to improve job satisfaction

on motivational factors, long-term satisfaction is more likely to occur. This is not to suggest that hygiene factors can be ignored.

Hygiene factors cause dissatisfaction, and the findings of this study indicate Iowa's community college adjunct faculty rate a majority of hygiene factors below the satisfied level. Specifically, benefits available, institutional funding of travel for professional development and equipment and facilities received the lowest satisfaction ratings of the hygiene factors included in the survey. By improving these hygiene factors, adjunct faculty members may experience less job dissatisfaction.

Finally, this research provides valuable information regarding job satisfaction that human resource directors and other campus administrators can use to gain a better understanding of the adjunct faculty members they hire, develop and evaluate. Summary data collected by the Iowa Community College Adjunct Faculty Survey 2009 will be provided to each community college. This summary includes both institutional and statewide data. Summary data, coupled with the findings of this research will provide insight into the background characteristics, academic/professional background, instructional responsibilities and workload, current employment, institutional resources, scholarly activities, other activities, educational goals for students, professional development, job satisfaction and opinions of their adjunct faculty members and allow them to compare institutional findings with a statewide sample.

Limitations

There are several limitations that should be addressed when considering the results and findings of this study:

1. The data gathering procedure entailed utilizing an electronic survey instrument; the willingness, interest and ability of the individuals to respond to all questions, to respond within the timeline of the survey, and to respond accurately could not be controlled by the principal investigator.
2. This study is limited in that it does not provide information about the adjunct faculty members who chose not to respond to the Iowa Community College Adjunct Faculty Survey 2009. Perhaps the length of the survey caused adjunct faculty members to not complete and submit the survey.
3. This study is limited to adjunct faculty who self-reported on Iowa Community College Adjunct Faculty Survey.
4. The study relied on voluntary participation from those who received the survey via e-mail.
5. A contact person was identified in each of the 15 community colleges. The contacts were asked to provide the e-mail addresses of all adjunct faculty members who taught in their respective institutions during the 2008-09 academic year. The principal investigator confirmed that not "all" adjunct faculty were identified by each institution, thus the sample is defined by the 3,412 e-mails provided by the designated facilitator at each college.
6. This study was cross-sectional in nature and did not allow the researcher to measure change over time.

Implications

Job satisfaction and employee motivation continue to be a topic discussed in management and research circles. Each community college in Iowa can benefit from

reviewing the data collected in this study. Results from this study raised numerous questions for researchers to consider. These findings have implications at the state/federal policy level, institution level and for practice.

Implications for State and Federal Policy

1. Budget constraints will continue to force community colleges to rely on adjunct faculty to deliver a large percentage of the instructional program.

At the state and federal level, policymakers need to be cognizant of the state and national data already being collected regarding community college instruction. Policy change and changes in funding often produce unintended consequences and by tracking some basic demographic information, such as percent of courses taught by full/part-time instructors, professional preparation and teaching assignments, policymakers can determine how their actions impact instructional assignments and other significant background characteristics of community college instructors.

State and federal policymakers should develop and implement policies that require institutions to annually collect and submit data relative to the adjunct faculty staffing patterns at each institution. In addition, a narrative should be required to justify any increase in the use adjunct faculty. This information can inform policymakers of the positive or negative impact of legislation or funding changes.

2. There is a disproportionate percentage of minority representation among adjunct community college instructors in Iowa.

If state and federal leaders desire to have faculty minority percentages equal representative of the general population and student population, then adjunct faculty members need to be considered. This is significant due to the finding that nearly two-thirds

of faculty at public community and technical colleges throughout the nation are part-time (Wallin 2004).

If equity is to be achieved, state and federal agencies must develop policies that require institutions to adhere to the same basic hiring regulations when hiring full-time faculty. Hiring adjunct faculty members is often a last minute response to increased enrollment making a long hiring process cumbersome and unrealistic, but policy language requiring the advertisement of potential part-time positions on an annual basis will provide minority candidates access to employment.

3. The current status of state and federal budgets suggests an increased use of adjunct faculty in all college settings.

Colleges and universities across the country will likely increase the use of adjunct faculty members in difficult economic times. Wallin (20004) determined that the striking increase in the use of adjunct faculty members since the 1980's was due to a number of factors, the most significant of which were an economic recession and a large increase in enrollments.

State and federal leaders must develop policies that improve salary and provide access to benefits for adjunct faculty members. The state should consider adopting policies that reward adjuncts for their experience, rewards degrees and provides for the professional development of this faculty group.

4. Issues surrounding the preparation, instruction and professional development needs of adjunct faculty members continue to be a concern of state and federal agencies.

Policies are now in place in Iowa that will require part-time faculty members to participate in continuing education/professional development activities. State and federal

leaders should develop and implement policy that requires adjunct faculty to enhance their knowledge base and improve their instructional skill. By engaging adjunct faculty members in these activities, adjunct faculty members will become more engaged in their work and in the institutions they serve. These types of professional experiences will lead to professional growth, which will have a positive effect on adjunct faculty job satisfaction (Herzberg 1968/2003).

A more theoretical issue for state and federal officials to consider is the need to know and understand the factors that motivate faculty. Policy can impact both motivator and hygiene factors, and by understanding the factors that produce long-term job satisfaction, policymakers can better predict the impact of their actions.

Implications for Institutions

At the institutional level, these findings can inform practice and assist in meeting the needs of adjunct faculty members.

1. It is recommended by the researcher that institutions develop a survey that can be completed by adjunct faculty members on an annual basis.

Institutions can use the information collected to benchmark current job satisfaction and track changes over time. This information should be publicly reported and become a part of the continuous improvement process. In addition, this research allows institutions to compare locally collected data with a statewide data set. The Iowa Community College Adjunct Faculty Survey 2009 can be used as a guide for the development of a survey instrument. Hardy and Laanan (2000) determined by understanding the characteristics, opinions and degree of satisfaction, adjunct faculty can be managed most effectively.

Benchmarking employee satisfaction is the beginning of the process to understand and support adjunct faculty members more effectively.

2. Institutions must address the hygiene factors that lead to dissatisfaction.

In addition to recommendation number one, the researcher recommends an additional study that explores the current policies and working condition affecting adjunct faculty. Pay, benefits, institutional policy, physical environment supervision and job security represent hygiene factors that deserve consideration. Additional research is recommended to determine "best practices" in supporting, developing and retaining adjunct faculty members. The results of these studies can guide policy development that reflects a greater appreciation for the important role adjunct faculty members play in community colleges. One such policy could be the development of a career ladder leading to additional pay, benefits and/or full-time employment.

3. Institutions must provide professional development opportunities to adjunct faculty members.

Policies must be developed to support professional development for adjunct faculty members beyond the minimum state requirements. These policies should include a formal orientation process, a full-time faculty mentor and access to quality professional development opportunities.

College administrators should use these findings from this research, as well as the research recommended above to evaluate and revise their practices in hiring, supporting, allocating resource and developing adjunct faculty members.

Implications for Practice

The findings of the current research supported the previous findings of Herzberg. The most significant implication may come as a result of reviewing Herzberg's Motivation Hygiene Theory. Wallin (2005) supports Herzberg's findings by agreeing that part-time faculty are more likely to be motivated internally than externally.

1. College leaders should focus their resource on actions that provide a work environment that supports achievement, recognition, responsibility promotion and growth.

The researcher recommends college leaders conduct internal research to determine the current adjunct job satisfaction levels in the areas of achievement, recognition, responsibility promotion and growth. The results enable leaders to identify the areas that can be affected most readily and provide a benchmark for future study. The results can be used to develop an action plan designed to improve job satisfaction in the areas identified as most likely to improve motivation and job satisfaction. When implemented, these action plans can lead to enriching the work of adjunct faculty member and ultimately making their instructional role more satisfying.

2. College administrators must begin to address the dissatisfaction of adjunct faculty with benefits, pay.

The recent research revealed an overall dissatisfaction with the benefits and salary received by adjunct faculty and these findings were supported in the review of literature conducted for this study. Institutions should begin to address these issues by either providing a stronger salary and benefit package or by identifying ways to provide alternate benefits at a

lower cost. These benefits could include: a gym membership, reduced or free day care, tuition assistance for spouse and children, or an employee sponsored life insurance policy.

3. College leaders should provide quality professional development opportunities for adjunct faculty and pay them to participate.

A comprehensive professional development plan should be developed and implemented for all adjunct faculty members. The plan should include resource materials, orientation, faculty mentors and courses that assist adjunct faculty members in their role as an instructor. It is recommended that this plan be constructed by interviewing a variety of adjunct faculty members to gain insight into their perceived needs. The survey created for this study collected data regarding professional development needs and desires. Future research should be conducted using this data set to extrapolate these data.

The very nature of employing adjunct faculty suggests there will be an evolving workforce that is different from term to term and year to year. Slightly over half (52.5%) of the adjunct faculty members responding to this survey indicated they had worked for their respective institutions four years or less. Conducting job satisfaction surveys on a regular basis will provide feedback that represents the most current adjunct faculty members employed working in an institution. Research has shown that motivating employees is an ongoing process. By surveying faculty and conducting qualitative research on a regular basis, it is possible for those who hire, supervise and evaluate adjunct faculty members to identify and address concerns of adjunct faculty members.

Findings from this study indicate the adjunct faculty members teaching in Iowa during the 2008-09 Academic Year reported being quite satisfied. Future studies that are

longitudinal in nature should be employed to measure the change of adjunct faculty job satisfaction over time.

Finally, the survey instrument used for this study should be shortened for institutional use. The survey was long and took approximately 20 minutes to complete. The survey can be shortened to include items that are most relevant to the institution. The electronic survey was easy for participants to complete, and easy for the researcher to collect and interpret data.

Future Research

Adjunct faculty members are part of the fabric of every community college in Iowa. This was the first attempt at collecting adjunct faculty data on a statewide basis. More and more adjunct faculty members are teaching at multiple institutions, and collecting data from this faculty group using an online survey instrument is the logical method for future data collection. This study did not explore all of the variables collected by the Iowa Community College Adjunct Faculty Survey 2009. In addition to job satisfaction, several areas of interest were surveyed for future researchers to consider. Areas for consideration include: scholarly activity, educational goals for students, and professional development. Furthermore, a variety of opinion questions were asked that provide important insight into the role and experiences of the adjunct faculty member.

The next logical step would be to use forecasting techniques including trend line analysis and extrapolation in order to predict changes in job satisfaction that would result from new and/or different levels of independent variables such as additional benefits, increased salary, better office space or additional support for travel and professional development.

Results from this research raise numerous issues that warrant future research. For example, research should be conducted to determine whether age or experience has the greatest affect on overall job satisfaction. Additional research is also suggested to determine if the area of teaching impacts overall job satisfaction and how previous teaching experience outside of the community college environment affects overall job satisfaction.

This research did not address the group of community college adjunct faculty who did not respond to the survey. The limited personal information provided by the institutions made it impossible to perform accurate statistical analyses regarding the non-respondents. Future researchers should consider collecting additional personal data so that this group can be analyzed.

Finally, in addition to the quantitative components of this study, incorporating qualitative components in future research would yield valuable information from adjunct faculty members. Interviewing adjunct faculty members would allow the researcher to collect data that was not asked or easily accessible by a survey instrument. Information gained through qualitative methods would provide useful information that can be used to expand upon the findings of this research.

Final Thoughts

This research has shown the use of adjunct faculty members will continue to play a major instruction role in Iowa's community colleges. Wallin (2004) stated, "It is not an overstatement to say that without the use of adjunct faculty, most community colleges could not come close to meeting the student demand for courses" (p. 373).

Iowa is no exception to the national trend of using adjunct faculty members to meet student needs, nor can Iowa community colleges remain financially sound without the use of adjunct faculty. On October 8, 2009, Iowa Governor Chet Culver announced a 10% across the board budget cut. This cut will have a dramatic impact on all of Iowa's community colleges and their ability to employ additional full-time faculty to meet the increasing student needs.

The economic conditions and current employment trends reinforce the importance of the adjunct faculty role in Iowa's community colleges. This research has indicated that adjunct faculty currently working in Iowa's community colleges rate their overall job satisfaction slightly above satisfactory level. At face value, this seems to be a positive sign, but a more in-depth review of the data reveals a different story. Fifteen of the 24 variables explored in the study were rated below the satisfactory level, indicating there are many opportunities to improve the working conditions of adjunct faculty.

The challenge for Iowa's community colleges will be to develop a system to assess, monitor, and ultimately affect adjunct faculty job satisfaction. In addition to this research, there is an abundance of research regarding the need for college leaders to commit additional resources to support adjunct faculty members. This study revealed Iowa's adjunct faculty are most dissatisfied with the benefits they receive, funding for travel and professional development, and prospects for career advancement. College leaders will be hard pressed to find additional funds to support adjunct faculty members; however, by prioritizing the needs of adjunct faculty members, leaders can expect to attract, develop, and retain a more satisfied and more effective part-time workforce.

The burden to use the data collected in this study to improve the working conditions and job satisfaction falls squarely on the shoulders of college leaders. My hope is these findings will cause colleges to review their current practices related to adjunct faculty. If colleges have not been surveying adjuncts on annual basis, I hope this research will move them to do so. The involvement of Iowa adjunct faculty in the Quality Faculty Plan will also provide an opportunity for Iowa community colleges to involve their adjunct faculty in new and meaningful ways. I hope this research will add value to the conversation regarding the important role adjunct faculty play in community colleges as well as the need for institutions to recognize and celebrate their work.

APPENDIX A. HUMAN SUBJECTS APPROVAL

IOWA STATE UNIVERSITY

Institutional Review Board
Office of Research Assurances
Vice Provost for Research
1138 Pearson Hall
Ames, Iowa 50011-2207
515 294-4267
FAX 515 294-4566

DATE: 22 May 2009

TO: Steven Dwight Schulz
906 N. Grant Road, Carroll, IA 51401

CC: Larry Ebbers
N225A Lagomarcino

FROM: Jan Canny, IRB Administrator
Office of Research Assurances

TITLE: **Iowa Community College Adjunct Faculty Survey**

IRB ID: **09-200**

Approval Date: **21 May 2009**
Date for Continuing Review: **20 May 2010**

The Chair of Institutional Review Board of Iowa State University has reviewed and approved the modification of this project. Please refer to the IRB ID number shown above in all correspondence regarding this study.

Your study has been approved according to the dates shown above. To ensure compliance with federal regulations (45 CFR 46 & 21 CFR 56), please be sure to:

- **Use the documents with the IRB approval stamp** in your research.
- **Obtain IRB approval prior to implementing any changes** to the study by completing the "Continuing Review and/or Modification" form.
- **Immediately inform the IRB of** (1) **all serious and/or unexpected adverse experiences** involving risks to subjects or others; and (2) **any other unanticipated problems involving risks** to subjects or others.
- **Stop all research activity if IRB approval lapses**, unless continuation is necessary to prevent harm to research participants. Research activity can resume once IRB approval is reestablished.
- **Complete a new continuing review form** at least three to four weeks prior to the **date for continuing review** as noted above to provide sufficient time for the IRB to review and approve continuation of the study. We will send a courtesy reminder as this date approaches.

Research investigators are expected to comply with the principles of the Belmont Report, and state and federal regulations regarding the involvement of humans in research. These documents are located on the Office of Research Assurances website [www.compliance.iastate.edu] or available by calling (515) 294-4566.

Upon completion of the project, please submit a Project Closure Form to the Office of Research Assurances, 1138 Pearson Hall, to officially close the project.

APPENDIX B. IOWA COMMUNITY COLLEGE

ADJUNCT FACULTY SURVEY 2009

Background Characteristics

1. Please select your gender.
   a. Male
   b. Female
2. Please indicate your age as of September 1, 2008?
3. Please select one or more of the following choices to best describe your racial/ethnic background.
   a. Alaska Native
   b. Asian
   c. Black or African American
   d. Hispanic, Latino or Spanish
   e. Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
   f. White, not Hispanic
   g. Other **BOX**
4. What is your primary language?
   a. English
   b. Spanish
   c. French
   d. Other (Please Indicate Below)
5. During the 2008-09 Academic Year were you
   a. Single
   b. Married/Living with partner or significant other
   c. Separated, divorced or widowed
6. Are you a United States citizen?
   a. Yes
   b. No

Academic/Professional Background

7. Were you ever enrolled in a community college as a student?
   a. Yes
   b. No
8. Indicate if you have completed any of the following degrees (AA, AS, AAS or AGS).
   a. Associate of Arts (AA)
   b. Associate of Sciences (AS)
   c. Associate of Applied Sciences (AAS)
   d. Associate of General Studies (AGS)
9. What is the highest degree you have completed? Do not include honorary degrees. (If you have none of the degrees or awards, select "Not applicable.")
   1=Doctorate
   2=Education Specialist
   3=Master's Degree
   4=Bachelor's Degree
   5=Associate's Degree
   6=Diploma
   7=Certificate
   8=High School Diploma/GED
   9=Less than High School Diploma/GED

10=Not applicable

10. In what field or discipline was your most advanced degree?
    a. Arts and Sciences (includes postsecondary education degrees)
    b. Agriculture
    c. Business and Office
    d. Family and Consumer Science
    e. Marketing Education
    f. Health Occupations
    g. Trade and Industry
    h. Other
11. Which of the following Arts and Sciences categories best describes your most advanced degree?
    a. Accounting
    b. Advertising
    c. Agriculture
    d. Alcohol/Drug Abuse Specialty
    e. American Government
    f. American History
    g. American Literature
    h. Anthropology
    i. Art
    j. Astronomy
    k. Biological Science
    l. Biology
    m. Business Administration/Management
    n. Business Law
    o. Career Prep
    p. Chemistry
    q. Communication Skills,
    r. Related Computer Science
    s. Dramatic Art
    t. Earth Science
    u. Economics
    v. Education
    w. English
    x. English Literature
    y. English-as-a-Second Language (ESL)
    z. French
    aa. General Business Subjects
    bb. General Science
    cc. Geography
    dd. German
    ee. Health
    ff. Health Care Administration
    gg. International Business/Relations
    hh. Japanese
    ii. journalism
    jj. Latin

kk. Law Enforcement
ll. Legal Assistant
mm. Mathematics
nn. Music
oo. Philosophy
pp. Physical Ed
qq. Physical Science
rr. Physics
ss. Physiology
tt. Political Science
uu. Psychology
vv. Reading
ww. Recreation Specialist
xx. Related Subjects
yy. Religion
zz. Russian
aaa. Sociology
bbb. Spanish
ccc. Special Education
ddd. Speech
eee. Statistics
fff. World History

12. Which of the following Agriculture categories best describes your most advanced degree?
    a. Agricultural Bio-Technology
    b. Agricultural Business Management
    c. Agricultural Economics
    d. Agricultural Mechanics
    e. Agricultural Production
    f. Agricultural Products/Processing
    g. Animal Grooming
    h. Animal Science
    i. Aquaculture
    j. Crop Science
    k. Enology
    l. Game management
    m. Horticulture
    n. International Agriculture
    o. Parks Management
    p. Plant Science
    q. Renewable Natural Resources
    r. Turf management
    s. Viticulture
13. Which of the following Business and office categories best describes your most advanced degree?
    a. Accounting/Computing
    b. Banking
    c. Related Financial
    d. Bookkeeping

e. Business Data
f. Entry Equipment
g. Business Data Processing
h. Court Reporting
i. Executive Secretarial
j. Legal Secretarial
k. Medical Secretarial
l. Micro Computer
m. Operation/Management
n. Multi-Occupations Preparatory
o. Office Supervisor/Management
p. Person/Training Programs
q. Shipping/Receiving/Stock
r. Clerk
s. Typing
t. General Office/Related Programs

14. Which of the following Family and Consumer Science categories best describes your most advanced degree?
    a. Child Care and Guidance Mgmt
    b. Consumer/Homemaking Home Economics
    c. Clothing Apparel/Textiles Management
    d. Dietetic Aide/Assisting
    e. Food Production/Management/Services
    f. Home Furnishing/Equipment Management
    g. Institutional, Home Management
15. Which of the following Marketing Education categories best describes your most advanced degree?
    a. Auctioneering
    b. Equipment Rental
    c. Farm and Garden Supplies Marketing
    d. Financial Services Marketing
    e. Food Marketing
    f. Freight Transportation Marketing
    g. General Merchandise
    h. Hotel/Motel Management
    i. Industrial Marketing
    j. Insurance Marketing, General
    k. International Marketing
    l. Marketing/Distribution
    m. Parts Clerk
    n. Petroleum Marketing
    o. Real Estate Sales
    p. Small Business Management
    q. Tourism
    r. Wholesaling
16. Which of the following Health Occupation categories best describes your most advanced degree?
    a. Alcohol/Drug Abuse Specialty
    b. Allied Health-Core Curriculum

c. Animal Technology
d. Central Supply Technology
e. Community Health
f. Dental Assisting
g. Dental Hygiene
h. Dental Laboratory Technology
i. Electroencephalograph Technology
j. Emergency Medical Technology - 1
k. Paramedic Emergency Medical Technology – 1
l. Exercise Physiology Health Care Administration
m. Interpretation and Translation
n. Medical Assisting
o. Medical Lab Technology
p. Medical Records Technology
q. Medical Records Transcription
r. Medical Technology
s. Mental Health/Human Services Technology
t. Nursing Assisting Nursing, Associate Degree
u. Occupational Therapy Assisting
v. Ophthalmic Medical Assisting
w. Pharmacy Assisting
x. Physical Therapy Assisting
y. Physician Assisting-Specialty
z. Radiograph Medical Technology
aa. Respiratory Therapy Surgical Technology
bb. Training Interpreter (Deaf)
cc. Ultrasound Technology
dd. Veterinarian Assisting
ee. Ward Clerk

17. Which of the following Trade and Industry categories best describes your most advanced degree?
    a. Aeronautical Technology
    b. Agricultural Equipment Technology
    c. Air Traffic Control
    d. Air Transportation
    e. Aircraft Mechanics
    f. Airplane Piloting/Navigation
    g. Architectural Design and Construction
    h. Architectural Drafting Technology
    i. Architectural Engineering
    j. Audio Recording Technology/Music
    k. Auto Mechanics
    l. Automotive Body Repair
    m. Automotive Component Assembler
    n. Aviation Computer Technology
    o. Aviation Management
    p. Band Instrument Repair Technology
    q. Barbering

r. Basic Housekeeping/Health Care Facilities
s. Bioengineering/Biomedical Engineering
t. Biomedical Equipment Technology Biotechnology
u. Blue Print Reading
v. Brick/Stone Masonry/Tile
w. Building Maintenance
x. Cable Installer - Television
y. Career Option Carpentry
z. Chemical Manufacturing Technology
aa. Chemical Technology
bb. Civil Technology Civil Technology-Structural
cc. Civil/Structural Drafting
dd. Climate Control Technology
ee. Coal Mining Technology
ff. Commercial Art
gg. Commercial Photography
hh. Communication Skills-Related
ii. Communication Technology
jj. Composition/Make-up/Typesetting
kk. Computer Aided Design/Drafting
ll. Computer Aided-Numerical Control
mm. Computer Integrated Manufacturing Computer Technology
nn. Concrete Placing/Finishing
oo. Construction Inspection
pp. Construction Technology
qq. Conventional Electric Power Generation
rr. Cosmetology Criminal Justice Technology
ss. Diesel Engine Mechanic Technology
tt. Drafting and Design Technology - Mechanical
uu. Drafting/Design Technology
vv. Dry Cleaning/Laundry Services
ww. Drywall Installation
xx. Educational Media Technology
yy. Electrical Technology
zz. Electrical/Electronics Drafting
aaa. Electronic Components Assembler
bbb. Electronic Technology
ccc. Electronic Technology-Communication
ddd. Electronic Technology-Diagnostic
eee. Electronic Technology-Telecommunications

18. Indicate the number of years of teaching experience you have in each of the following educational environments.
    a. K-12 Public and/or Private
    b. 2-Year Public Community College
    c. 2-Year Private Community College
    d. 4-Year Public College/University
    e. 4-Year Private College/University

f. Indicate the number of years you have been teaching at this institution. **BOX**

19. Indicate the number of years you have been teaching at this institution. _____

Instructional Responsibilities and Workload

20. What is your principal field or discipline of teaching at this institution?
    a. Arts and Sciences (includes postsecondary education degrees)
    b. Agriculture
    c. Business and Office
    d. Family and Consumer Science
    e. Marketing Education
    f. Health Occupations
    g. Trade and Industry
    h. Other
21. Which of the following Arts and Sciences categories best describes your primary field or discipline of teaching at this institution?
    a. Accounting
    b. Advertising
    c. Agriculture
    d. Alcohol/Drug Abuse Specialty
    e. American Government
    f. American History
    g. American Literature
    h. Anthropology
    i. Art
    j. Astronomy
    k. Biological Science
    l. Biology
    m. Business Administration/Management
    n. Business Law
    o. Career Prep
    p. Chemistry
    q. Communication Skills,
    r. Related Computer Science
    s. Dramatic Art
    t. Earth Science
    u. Economics
    v. Education
    w. English
    x. English Literature
    y. English-as-a-Second Language (ESL)
    z. French
    aa. General Business Subjects
    bb. General Science
    cc. Geography
    dd. German
    ee. Health
    ff. Health Care Administration
    gg. International Business/Relations

hh. Japanese
ii. journalism
jj. Latin
kk. Law Enforcement
ll. Legal Assistant
mm. Mathematics
nn. Music
oo. Philosophy
pp. Physical Ed
qq. Physical Science
rr. Physics
ss. Physiology
tt. Political Science
uu. Psychology
vv. Reading
ww. Recreation Specialist
xx. Related Subjects
yy. Religion
zz. Russian
aaa. Sociology
bbb. Spanish
ccc. Special Education
ddd. Speech
eee. Statistics
fff. World History

22. Which of the following Agriculture categories best describes your primary field or discipline of teaching at this institution?
    a. Agricultural Bio-Technology
    b. Agricultural Business Management
    c. Agricultural Economics
    d. Agricultural Mechanics
    e. Agricultural Production
    f. Agricultural Products/Processing
    g. Animal Grooming
    h. Animal Science
    i. Aquaculture
    j. Crop Science
    k. Enology
    l. Game management
    m. Horticulture
    n. International Agriculture
    o. Parks Management
    p. Plant Science
    q. Renewable Natural Resources
    r. Turf management
    s. Viticulture

23. Which of the following Business and Office categories best describes your primary field or discipline of teaching at this institution?
    a. Accounting/Computing
    b. Banking
    c. Related Financial
    d. Bookkeeping
    e. Business Data
    f. Entry Equipment
    g. Business Data Processing
    h. Court Reporting
    i. Executive Secretarial
    j. Legal Secretarial
    k. Medical Secretarial
    l. Micro Computer
    m. Operation/Management
    n. Multi-Occupations Preparatory
    o. Office Supervisor/Management
    p. Person/Training Programs
    q. Shipping/Receiving/Stock
    r. Clerk
    s. Typing
    t. General Office/Related Programs
24. Which of the following Family and Consumer Science categories best describes your primary field or discipline of teaching at this institution?
    a. Child Care and Guidance Mgmt
    b. Consumer/Homemaking Home Economics
    c. Clothing Apparel/Textiles Management
    d. Dietetic Aide/Assisting
    e. Food Production/Management/Services
    f. Home Furnishing/Equipment Management
    g. Institutional, Home Management
25. Which of the following Health Occupation categories best describes your primary field or discipline of teaching at this institution?
    a. Alcohol/Drug Abuse Specialty
    b. Allied Health-Core Curriculum
    c. Animal Technology
    d. Central Supply Technology
    e. Community Health
    f. Dental Assisting
    g. Dental Hygiene
    h. Dental Laboratory Technology
    i. Electroencephalograph Technology
    j. Emergency Medical Technology - 1
    k. Paramedic Emergency Medical Technology – 1
    l. Exercise Physiology Health Care Administration
    m. Interpretation and Translation
    n. Medical Assisting

o. Medical Lab Technology
p. Medical Records Technology
q. Medical Records Transcription
r. Medical Technology
s. Mental Health/Human Services Technology
t. Nursing Assisting Nursing, Associate Degree
u. Occupational Therapy Assisting
v. Ophthalmic Medical Assisting
w. Pharmacy Assisting
x. Physical Therapy Assisting
y. Physician Assisting-Specialty
z. Radiograph Medical Technology
aa. Respiratory Therapy Surgical Technology
bb. Training Interpreter (Deaf)
cc. Ultrasound Technology
dd. Veterinarian Assisting
ee. Ward Clerk

26. Which of the following Trade and Industry categories best describes your primary field or discipline of teaching at this institution?
    a. Aeronautical Technology
    b. Agricultural Equipment Technology
    c. Air Traffic Control
    d. Air Transportation
    e. Aircraft Mechanics
    f. Airplane Piloting/Navigation
    g. Architectural Design and Construction
    h. Architectural Drafting Technology
    i. Architectural Engineering
    j. Audio Recording Technology/Music
    k. Auto Mechanics
    l. Automotive Body Repair
    m. Automotive Component Assembler
    n. Aviation Computer Technology
    o. Aviation Management
    p. Band Instrument Repair Technology
    q. Barbering
    r. Basic Housekeeping/Health Care Facilities
    s. Bioengineering/Biomedical Engineering
    t. Biomedical Equipment Technology Biotechnology
    u. Blue Print Reading
    v. Brick/Stone Masonry/Tile
    w. Building Maintenance
    x. Cable Installer - Television
    y. Career Option Carpentry
    z. Chemical Manufacturing Technology
    aa. Chemical Technology
    bb. Civil Technology Civil Technology-Structural

cc. Civil/Structural Drafting
dd. Climate Control Technology
ee. Coal Mining Technology
ff. Commercial Art
gg. Commercial Photography
hh. Communication Skills-Related
ii. Communication Technology
jj. Composition/Make-up/Typesetting
kk. Computer Aided Design/Drafting
ll. Computer Aided-Numerical Control
mm. Computer Integrated Manufacturing Computer Technology
nn. Concrete Placing/Finishing
oo. Construction Inspection
pp. Construction Technology
qq. Conventional Electric Power Generation
rr. Cosmetology Criminal Justice Technology
ss. Diesel Engine Mechanic Technology
tt. Drafting and Design Technology - Mechanical
uu. Drafting/Design Technology
vv. Dry Cleaning/Laundry Services

27. Drywall Installation
    a. Educational Media Technology
    b. Electrical Technology
    c. Electrical/Electronics Drafting
    d. Electronic Components Assembler
    e. Electronic Technology
    f. Electronic Technology-Communication
    g. Electronic Technology-Diagnostic
    h. Electronic Technology-Telecommunications
28. How many of the following courses are you teaching during the 2008-09 Academic Year at <u>this</u> institution? Mark one for each activity. Responses: 1,2,3,4,5+
    a. General education courses
    b. Developmental/remedial courses
    c. Other undergraduate credit courses
    d. Vocational or technical courses
    e. Non-credit courses (other than above)
    f. Other **BOX**
29. Of the courses indicated in question 14, how many of these courses were courses offered to joint/concurrent enrollees (students taking courses for both high school and college credit)? **BOX**
30. Of the courses indicated in question 14, how many of these courses were delivered
    a. Face to face
    b. Online via an Internet platform
    c. Via the Iowa Communications Network (ICN)
    d. Correspondence
    e. Other

Current Employment

31. While employed at this institution, during the 2008-09 Academic Year, how many other jobs did/do you hold? Responses: 1,2,3,4,5+

32. Were you employed full-time at any of these other jobs during the 2008-09 Academic Year?
    a. Yes
    b. No
33. In which of the career clusters were you employed? Please match to the cluster that most closely describes your "other job".
    a. Arts and Communication (Arts, A/V Technology and Communications)
    b. Agriculture, Food and Natural Resources (Agriculture, Food and Natural Resources)
    c. Business, Information Management and Marketing (Business, Management, Administration, Information Technology, Finance, Marketing, Sales and Services)
    d. Engineering, Industrial and Technology Services ((Transportation, Distribution, Logistics, Architecture, Construction, Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics)
    e. Family, Consumer and Human Services (Hospitality, Tourism, Law, Public Safety, Security, Human Services, Education, Training, Government an Public Administration)
    f. Health Sciences
    g. Other
34. Would you have preferred a full-time position for the 2008-09 Academic Year at this institution?
    a. Yes
    b. No
35. During the 2008-09 Academic Year did you do any adjunct teaching at any other community college? If yes, how many other colleges?
    a. Yes _____
    b. No
36. What is the primary reason you choose to each at this community college?
    a. Need the extra money
    b. Enjoy the students
    c. Enjoy the experience
    d. Plan to use this experiences as a career ladder
    e. other

Institutional Resources

37. Mark all institutional resources available to you during the 2008-09 Academic Year as an adjunct faculty member at this institution. If yes, please indicate your level of satisfaction with the resource. Responses: Very Satisfied, Satisfied, Unsatisfied, Very Unsatisfied, Not Applicable.
    a. Use of private office
    b. Shared office space
    c. A personal computer
    d. An email account
    e. A phone/voicemail
    f. Clerical support
    g. Faculty mentor
    h. Paid office hours

Scholarly Activities

38. During the 2008-09 Academic Year, on average how many hours per week do you actually spend on each of the following activities? Mark one response for each activity. Responses: None, 1-4, 5-8, 9-12, 13-16, 17-20, 21-34, 34-44, 45+
    a. Research and scholarly writing
    b. Other creative products/performances

Other Activities

39. During the 2008-09 Academic Year, on average how many hours per week do you actually spend on each of the following activities? Mark one response for each activity. Responses: None, 1-4, 5-8, 9-12, 13-16, 17-20, 21-34, 34-44, 45+
    a. Scheduled teaching (give actual, not credit hours)
    b. Preparing for teaching (including reading student papers and grading)
    c. Advising and counseling of students
    d. Committee work and meetings
    e. Other administration
    f. Consultation with clients/patients
    g. Community or public service
    h. Outside consulting/freelance work
    i. Household/childcare duties
    j. Communicating via email
    k. Commuting to campus
    l. Other employment, outside of academia
40. Please indicate the extent to which you accomplish the following. Mark one response for each item. Responses: To a Great Extent, To Some Extent, Not at All
    a. Engage in academic work that spans multiple disciplines
    b. Achieve a healthy balance between your personal life and your professional life
    c. Experience close alignment between your work and your personal values

Educational Goals for Students

41. Indicate the importance to you of each of the following education goals for undergraduate students. Mark one response for each item. Responses: Essential, Very Important, Somewhat Important, Not Important
    a. Develop ability to think critically
    b. Prepare students for employment after college
    c. Prepare students for graduate or advanced education
    d. Develop moral character
    e. Provide for students' emotional development
    f. Prepare students for family living
    g. Help students develop personal values
    h. Enhance students' self-understanding
    i. Instill in students a commitment to community service
    j. Enhance students' knowledge of and appreciation for other racial/ethnic groups
    k. Promote ability to write effectively
    l. Help students evaluate the quality and reliability of information
    m. Engage students in civil discourse around controversial issues
    n. Teach students tolerance and respect for different beliefs
    o. Encourage students to become agents of social change
    p. Lifelong learning

Professional Development

26. Have you participated in the following professional development opportunities while employed as an adjunct faculty at this institution?

Workshops focused on teaching strategies in the classroom.
    a. Yes
    b. No

Did participation in this activity enhance your teaching?
    a. Yes
    b. No

Would you be interested in participating in this professional development activity?
    a. Yes
    b. No

Have you participated in the following professional development opportunities while employed as an adjunct faculty at this institution? Workshops focused on classroom technology

a. Yes
b. No

Did participation in this activity enhance your teaching?

a. Yes
b. No

Would you be interested in participating in this professional development activity?

a. Yes
b. No

Have you participated in the following professional development opportunities while employed as an adjunct faculty at this institution? Workshops focused on distance education such as online, Web Blended, ICN and other Electronic Delivery Systems

a. Yes
b. No

Did participation in this activity enhance your teaching?

a. Yes
b. No

Would you be interested in participating in this professional development activity?

a. Yes
b. No

Have you participated in the following professional development opportunities while employed as an adjunct faculty at this institution? Workshops on assessment and test construction

a. Yes
b. No

Did participation in this activity enhance your teaching?

a. Yes
b. No

Would you be interested in participating in this professional development activity?

a. Yes
b. No

Have you participated in the following professional development opportunities while employed as an adjunct faculty at this institution? Workshops focused on classroom policies and procedures, including student disciplinary procedures

a. Yes
b. No

Did participation in this activity enhance your teaching?

a. Yes
b. No

Would you be interested in participating in this professional development activity?

a. Yes
b. No

Have you participated in the following professional development opportunities while employed as an adjunct faculty at this institution? Workshops focused on promoting diversity among students (cultural, learning, socioeconomic, disability)

a. Yes

b. No

Did participation in this activity enhance your teaching?

a. Yes

b. No

Would you be interested in participating in this professional development activity?

c. Yes

d. No

Have you participated in the following professional development opportunities while employed as an adjunct faculty at this institution?
Workshops for developing administrative leadership

a. Yes

b. No

Did participation in this activity enhance your teaching?

a. Yes

b. No

Would you be interested in participating in this professional development activity?

a. Yes

b. No

Job Satisfaction

27. How satisfied are you with the following aspects of your job? Mark one response for each item. Responses: Very Satisfied, Satisfied, Marginally Satisfied, Not Satisfied, Not Applicable
    a. Salary
    b. Benefits available
    c. Teaching load
    d. Quality of students
    e. Office/lab space
    f. Equipment and facilities available for classroom instruction
    g. Institutional support for teaching improvement and professional development
    h. Institutional funding of travel for professional development
    i. Institutional support for implementing technology-based instructional activities
    j. Autonomy and independence
    k. Professional relationships with other faculty
    l. Professional relationships with other adjunct faculty
    m. Social relationships with other faculty
    n. Social relationships with other adjunct faculty
    o. Competency of colleagues
    p. Job security
    q. Relationship with administrators
    r. Departmental leadership
    s. Course assignments
    t. Freedom to determine course content
    u. Availability for childcare at this institution
    v. Prospects for career advancement
    w. Clerical/administrative support
    x. Overall job satisfaction

Opinion

28. Please indicate your agreement with the following statements. Responses: Agree Strongly, Somewhat Agree, Somewhat Disagree, Strongly Disagree
    a. Adjunct instructors at <u>this</u> institution:
        i. Are given specific training before teaching
        ii. Are required to attend orientation
        iii. Are provided course competencies/content standards
        iv. Are given opportunities to participate in professional development activities

v. Rarely get hired into full-time positions
vi. Receive respect from students
vii. Are primarily responsible for introductory classes
viii. Have no guarantee of employment security
ix. Are compensated for advising/counseling students
x. Are required to attend meetings
xi. Have good working relationship with administration
xii. Are respected by full-time faculty

29. Below are some statements about your adjunct experience at this community college. Indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each of the following statements. Mark one response for each item. Responses: Strongly Agree, Somewhat Agree, Somewhat Disagree, Strongly Disagree, Not applicable
    a. Faculty are interested in students' personal problems
    b. Racial and ethnic diversity should be more strongly reflected in the curriculum
    c. Faculty feel that most students are well-prepared academically
    d. This institution should hire more faculty of color
    e. Student Affairs staff have the support and respect of faculty
    f. Faculty are committed to the welfare of this institution
    g. Faculty here are strongly interested in the academic problems of undergraduates
    h. Most students are strongly committed to community service
    i. My teaching is valued by faculty in my department
    j. Many courses involve students in community service
    k. Gay and lesbian faculty are treated fairly here
    l. My department does a good job of mentoring new faculty
    m. Faculty are sufficiently involved in campus decision making
    n. My values are congruent with the dominant institutional values
    o. There is adequate support for integrating technology in my teaching
    p. This institution takes responsibility for educating under prepared students
    q. Most of the students I teach lack the basic skills for college level work
    r. This institution rewards good teaching
    s. Adjunct Faculty are treated fairly
30. Indicate how well each of the following statements describes your adjunct experience at this community college. Mark one response for each item. Responses: Very Descriptive, Somewhat Descriptive, Not Descriptive
    a. It is easy for students to see adjunct faculty outside of regular office hours
    b. There is a great deal of conformity among the students
    c. Adjunct faculty and administration work together to achieve common goals
    d. Students are provided individual attention and support
    e. Social activities are overemphasized
    f. Adjunct faculty are regarded as good teachers
    g. There is respect for the expression of diverse values and beliefs
    h. Adjunct faculty are rewarded for their efforts to use instructional technology
    i. Adjunct faculty are rewarded for their efforts to work with under prepared students
    j. Administrators consider adjunct faculty concerns when making policy
    k. The administration is open about its policies

Open Ended Questions

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

Describe the professional development experience that would assist you most in becoming a more effective adjunct instructor at this institution.

APPENDIX C. PARTICIPANT LETTER

June 25, 2009

Dear Participant,

We are conducting a study that focuses on the experiences of adjunct faculty members working in Iowa Community Colleges. The purpose of this study is to gain a better understanding of the demographics, beliefs, needs and behaviors of Iowa's adjunct community college faculty members.This research includes a brief web survey that asks about the academic and social experiences of adjunct faculty members at the institution where you were working during the 2008-09 Academic Year. The main objective is to learn more about the demographics, experiences and needs of adjunct faculty.

As an adjunct faculty member, you have been selected to participate in this study. I know this is a busy time of year, but please take approximately 15-20 minutes to answer the questions on this web survey. This is your opportunity to help us develop a better understanding of the experiences and needs of adjunct faculty members working in Iowa's Community College system.

Your participation in this study is voluntary, and your willingness to participate will have no effect on your current status as an adjunct faculty member at your respective community college. Summary data will be provided to the college at the conclusion of this study. Results containing less than 10 cases/respondents will be suppressed to protect any indirect identification of participants. Your e-mail address will be retained for follow-up communication only and will then be removed from the data set.

Your responses to this survey will remain completely confidential and secured and your name will never be associated with the answers you provide. In addition, you may skip any question(s) you do not wish to answer.

If you would like more information about this research project, or experience difficulty accessing the web survey, please to contact me at sdschulz@dmacc.edu or via telephone at (712) 792-1755. To contact the Iowa State University supervising faculty member for this research project, please call Dr. Larry Ebbers, at (515) 294-7292 or by e-mail at lebbers@iastate.edu.

If you have any questions about the rights of research subjects or related injury, please contact the IRB Administrator, (515) 294-4566, IRB@iastate.edu, or Director, Office of Research Assurances, (515) 294-3115, 1138 Pearson Hall, Ames, IA 50011.

Thank you for your time and attention and for supporting our efforts to to gain a better understanding of the demographics, beliefs, needs and behaviors of Iowa's adjunct community college faculty members.

Sincerely,

Steven D. Schulz, Ed.S.
Graduate Student, Educational Leadership and Policy Studies

APPENDIX D. CORRELATION MATRIX

		Overall Job Satisfaction	Gender	Age	Benefits	Instruction	Relationships	Physical Environment
Pearson Cor.								
	Overall Job Satisfaction	1.000	-0.057	0.118	0.653	0.557	0.480	0.528
	Gender	-0.057	1.000	-0.130	-0.097	-0.033	-0.048	-0.009
	Age	0.118	-0.130	1.000	0.065	0.039	0.100	0.091
	Benefits	0.653	-0.097	0.065	1.000	0.401	0.410	0.477
	Instruction	0.557	-0.033	0.039	0.401	1.000	0.430	0.443
	Relationships	0.480	-0.048	0.100	0.410	0.430	1.000	0.486
	Physical Environment	0.528	-0.009	0.091	0.477	0.443	0.486	1.000
Sig. (1-tailed)								
	Overall Job Satisfaction		0.054	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	
	Gender	0.054		0.000	0.003	0.179	0.090	0.000
	Age	0.000	0.000		0.033	0.137	0.002	0.396
	Benefits	0.000	0.003	0.033		0.000	0.000	0.005
	Instruction	0.000	0.179	0.137	0.000		0.000	0.000
	Relationships	0.000	0.090	0.002	0.000	0.000		0.000
	Physical Environment	0.000	0.396	0.005	0.000	0.000	0.000	
N								
	Overall Job Satisfaction	796	796	796	796	796	796	796
	Gender	796	796	796	796	796	796	796
	Age	796	796	796	796	796	796	796
	Benefits	796	796	796	796	796	796	796
	Instruction	796	796	796	796	796	796	796
	Relationships	796	796	796	796	796	796	796
	Physical Environment	796	796	796	796	796	796	796

REFERENCES

Banachowski, G. (1996). Perspectives and perceptions: The use of part-time faculty in community colleges. *Community College Review*, *24*(2). Retrieved January 25, 2006, from Infotrac database.

Bureau of Labor Statistics, U.S. Department of Labor. (n.d.). *Occupational Outlook Handbook, 2006-07 Edition*, Teachers-Postsecondary, Retrieved June 24, 2007, from http://www.bls.gov/oco/ocos066.htm

Cohen, A. M., & Brawer, F. B. (1996). *The American community college.* (3rd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Cohen, A. M., Brawer, F. B., & Florence, B. (1977). *The two-year community college*. New York: Praeger.

Center for Community College Student Engagement. (2008). 2008 College Faculty Survey of Student Engagement (CCFSSE:08). Austin, TX: Author.

Creswell, J. W. (2003). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed method approaches*, (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Freeland, R. S. (1998). Adjunct faculty in community colleges. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED346082)

Fulton, R. D. (2000) The plight of part-timers in higher education. *Change 32*, 38. Retreived March 12, 2006, from Infotrac database.

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

Garii, B., & Petersen, N. (2005). Adjuncts happen: Strong faculty, weak system. *Academic Exchange Quarterly*, 9, 285. Retrieved January 25, 2006, from Infotrac database.

Grubb, W. N. (Ed.). (1999). Honored but invisible: An inside look at teaching in community colleges. New York: Routledge.

Hagedorn, L. S. (2000). Conceptualizing faculty job satisfaction: Components, theories, and outcomes. *New Directions for Community Colleges, 105*, 5-20.

Hardy, D. E., & Laanan, F. S. (2006). Characteristics and perspectives of faculty at public 2-year colleges. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 30*, 787-811.

Herzberg, F. (1968/2003). Best of HBR 1986: One More Time: How Do You Moitvate Employees. *Harvard Business Review*, *81*(1), pp. 86-96.

Herzberg, F., Mausner, B., Peterson, R. O., & Capwell, D. F. (1957). *Job Attitudes: Review of Research and Opinion.* Pittsburgh, PA: Psychological Services of Pittsburgh.

Herzberg, F., Mausner, B., & Snyderman, B. B. (1959). *The Motivation to Work* (2nd ed.). New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Iowa Department of Education. (2008). *Fall enrollment report: 2008.* Des Moines: Iowa Department of Education.

Jacobs, F. (1998). Using part-time faculty more effectively. *New Directions for Community Colleges, 104,* 9-18.

Kelly, D. K. (1991). *Part-time faculty in the community college: A study of their qualifications, frustrations and involvement.* Paper presented at the Annual Forum of the Association for Institutional Research, San Francisco, CA, May 26-29. (ED 336 035)

Kozeracki, C. A. (2002). Faculty attitudes about students. *New Directions for Community Colleges, 118,* 47-55.

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

National Center for Educational Statistics. (2000). Digest of Educational Statistics. U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved January 25, 2006, from http//nces.ed.gov/pubs2000/Digest99/chapter3.html

National Center for Educational Statistics. (2004). *National study of postsecondary faculty design report.* (NSOPF: 04) Washington, DC: Author.

Outcault, C. L. (2002). *A profile of the community college professorate, 1975-2000.* New York: Routledge-Falmer.

Palmer, J. C. (2002). Disciplinary variations in the work of full-time faculty members. In C. L. Outcault (Ed.), *New directions for community colleges: Community college faculty: Characteristics, practices and challenges, 118,* 9-19.

Palmer, J. C., & Zimbler, L. J. (2000). *Instructional faculty and staff in public 2-year colleges. Statistical analysis report. 1993 National study of postsecondary faculty* (NSOPF: 93) NCES No. 2000192). Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics. (ED442518)

Community College Accreditation, Iowa Administrative Code.I.A.C. § 260C. Available from http://www4.legis.state.ia.us/aspx/ACODocs/DOCS/7-16-2008.281.24.pdf

Rifkin, Tronie (1998) *Differences between the professional attitudes of full- and part-time faculty.* Paper presented at the American Association of Community Colleges Convention. Miami, FL: (ERIC Reproduction Service No. ED417783)

Rifkin, Tronie (2000) *Public community college faculty. New expeditions: Charting the second century of community colleges.* Issues Paper No. 4. Washington, DC: American Association of Community Colleges. (ERIC Reproduction Service No. ED439739)

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

Scheutz, P. (2002). Instructional practices of part-time and full-time faculty. *New Directions for Community Colleges, 118,* 39-46.

Twombly, S., & Townsend S.(2008). Community college faculty: What we know and need to know. *Community College Review*, *36*(1). Retrieved September 2, 2008, from Infotrac database.

Tabachinck, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2007). *Using multivariate statistics* (5th ed.). Boston, MA. Person Education, Inc.

U.S. Census Bureau. (2009, September 4). Iowa. In *U. S. Census Bureau* [State & County Quickfacts]. Retrieved October 1, 2009, from http://quickfacts.census.gov/qfd/states/19000.html

Valadez, J. R., & Anthony, J. S. (2001). Job satisfaction and commitment of 2-year college part-time faculty. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, *25*(2), 97-108.

Wallin, D. L., & Wallin, J.S. (2004). Valuing professional colleagues: Adjunct faculty in community and technical colleges. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, *28*, 373-391.

Wallin, D.L., Wallin, J.S. (2005). *Adjunct faculty in community colleges: An academic administrator's guide to recruiting, supporting and retaining great teachers.* Boston: Anker.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

My journey through higher education has been long and I have had the good fortune of working with many great educators along the way. I owe a debt of gratitude to each of these individuals who have inspired and encouraged me along the way.

A sincere thank you to my major professor, Dr. Larry Ebbers. Through the Community College Leadership Initiative and his encouragement, I began this doctoral journey. Thanks also to my committee members who have supported me throughout the program. Drs. Frankie Santos Laanan, Robyn Cooper, Soko Starobin, and Richard Cruse have challenged and supported me in my work. A special thanks to Dr. Soko Starobin for sharing her expertise and guidance throughout the dissertation writing process.

Des Moines Area Community College (DMACC) has been extremely supportive of me and my colleagues in our pursuit of the doctoral degree. A special thank you to Dr. Rob Denson, President, and Dr. Kim Linduska, Vice President of Des Moines Area Community College for encouraging me to enroll in the Higher Education program at Iowa State University. Your support has made it possible to complete this degree and continue to serve in my role at DMACC.

Thank you to my editor Pat Hahn, who was edited this dissertation on a very short timeline. Her willingness to respond quickly and meet my timelines is greatly appreciated.

Most importantly, I would like to thank my family. My wife Cathie has provided support and encouragement to me personally, professionally and academically throughout our 20 years together. It is only through her support that I have persevered. My daughters

Caitlyn and Lindsey have shared their time and support, and have served as an inspiration to complete this academic journey.