Wayne State University Dissertations

January 2020

Why They Care: An Exploration Of Adjunct Faculty Loyalty

Sara Elizabeth Barnwell
Wayne State University

Recommended Citation

WHY THEY CARE: AN EXPLORATION OF ADJUNCT FACULTY LOYALTY

by

SARA ELIZABETH BARNWELL

DISSERTATION

Submitted to the Graduate School

of Wayne State University,

Detroit, Michigan

in partial fulfillment of the requirements

for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

2020

MAJOR: LEARNING DESIGN AND

TECHNOLOGY

Approved By:

_____

Advisor   Date

_____

_____

_____

DEDICATION

This dissertation is dedicated to the memory of my Great Aunt Elizabeth (Aunt Betty) Wagner. Aunt Betty loved her family, worked tirelessly to better her community, and valued education. Aunt Betty was special and influential for generations of nieces and nephews. I am forever grateful for her love and support to me and the rest of our family. I am certain she would be proud of my accomplishment!

This dissertation is also dedicated to the children in my life. My sister's children: Alexander, Maya, and Abigail Burak; my sister-in-law's children: Leora and Asher Zook; and special family friends: Jacob, Madelyn, and Isabelle Bocian. It is my hope that you all enjoy learning, challenge yourselves with new opportunities, and give back to your communities.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First, thank you to my committee and other faculty at Wayne State University. Dr. Ingrid Guerra-Lopez - I am thankful for your support throughout this entire process and I especially appreciate your encouragement to try something a bit unique with this dissertation. Dr. Ke Zhang - thank you for the great feedback, kindness, and believing in me over the past few years. Dr. Tim Spannaus - thank you for your contribution to my research; your questions helped me improve my work. Dr. Ariel Levi - I am incredibly thankful for your feedback on my research; your contributions and perspectives helped broaden my work and certainly made it better. Dr. Anne Blake - you were the first person at Wayne State to suggest I would do well in a PhD program and I have never forgotten those conversations. Dr. Jasmine Ulmer - I appreciate your encouragement and support during some of the challenging aspects of this journey; I am thankful to have learned from you as I considered how to approach my dissertation.

I am extremely grateful for the wonderful friends I found at Wayne State. Dr. Linda Jimenez - thank you for your friendship, support, and help navigating this process. Preston Kelly (PTKx) - you have been a great friend and supporter on this journey; I appreciate your thousands of questions as you reviewed my drafts! Linda and Preston - you have both taught me much more than I could have ever expected! Dr. Dustin Saalman - thank you for being a great teammate, support, and inspiration along the way. Thank you to all of my other classmates and friends at Wayne State. I have enjoyed getting to know and learning from all of you.

To everyone who helped me recruit participants, thank you. Your time and efforts are so appreciated. To my participants, thank you. I value your contributions to your students and higher education. Thank you for your time and willingness to share your experiences. I hope this research leads to improved opportunities for all of you!

A special thank you to my amazing colleagues - current and past - at Cleary University. I appreciate all of your kindness, support, and encouragement as I have been on this journey. The creativity and dedication I see in your work inspires me to always improve and work both harder and smarter for the benefit of our incredible students.

Thank you to the many wonderful friends in my life. I am thankful to have friends in many different circles, all of whom have provided unique perspectives as I have been on this journey. I am especially thankful for my many friends in Rotary, The Torch, and other community focused groups. I am also incredibly thankful for my horse friends. Learning to ride and creating an incredible community of amazing and supportive friends over the past several years has provided balance in my life that was absolutely necessary for my success. I am looking forward to having more time for fun and adventures!

Last but certainly not least, thank you to my family, especially my parents and siblings: James Barnwell, Linda Barnwell, Joe Barnwell, Jared Bickford, Katie Burak, and John Burak. I am certain you are all just about as excited as I am to have this chapter in my life behind me.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER ONE - INTRODUCTION

Why I Care

Bob works three part-time jobs. His work hours vary throughout the year, and he rarely has work during the summer. At least three times per year, Bob talks to his supervisors to try to negotiate additional work and ensure that the hours of each job do not conflict with the others. His wife works a full-time job, and they juggle caring for a teenage son with special needs. They also have two older children who are in college. Bob used to work full time at a private, for-profit institution, but the campus closed. His car is getting older and that causes tremendous stress since he needs to commute up to an hour each way for his jobs. Bob has a master's degree in biology and is an adjunct faculty member. When Bob has a good year, he is able to teach four classes in the fall and spring and two classes in the summer. During these good years, Bob makes $22,000 before taxes among his three teaching jobs.

Julia has five young children, including four-year-old twins, and helps her husband with his new financial planning business. Julia has a master's degree in communications and left a full-time job to raise her children and contribute to her husband's business. When Julia decided to look for an additional job, she thought it might be fun to teach college classes. Now, Julia teaches four afternoons per week at a small university as an adjunct faculty member. Because of the commute, she has to leave her home by 10:00 in the morning. After her classes and office hours, she typically arrives back home at 6:00 in the evening. Julia loves teaching but finds it difficult to manage grading and preparation when she is juggling five children and her husband's business.

Daniel works in operations at a local manufacturing company. He and his wife have three children in high school and college and recently adopted two preschool-age children from the foster care system. He has always been interested in helping young professionals who are

interested in business. He made an arrangement with his boss to work a couple of evenings each week so he can take time out of the week, two mornings per week, to teach a class at the university in town. Because of his connections in the community, Daniel has brought numerous guest speakers in to talk to his classes about career opportunities. Daniel has also helped several students obtain internships. Daniel is an adjunct faculty member.

Bob, Julia, and Daniel are all based on real adjunct faculty members I have worked with over the past few years; however, names and identifying details have been changed. They are extraordinary teachers and have made a tremendous difference for students. Loyal adjunct faculty are an asset to institutions of higher education, and their experiences are deserving of additional attention and research.

Problem Statement

The industry of higher education has grown increasingly dependent on adjunct faculty due to fluctuating enrollment, tight budgets, and the need for specific types of knowledge and experience (AFT Higher Education, 2010; Center for Community College Student Engagement, 2014; Dolan, Hall, Karlsson, & Martinak, 2013; Lyons, 2007; Martin & Samels, 2015). At the same time, higher education has been challenged to be more accountable and operate more efficiently both for accreditation and to be able to use federal financial aid (Martin & Samels, 2015). Adjunct faculty are a critical part of the success of higher education institutions despite their contingent employment status and lack of additional involvement at the institution (Center for Community College Student Engagement, 2014; Lyons, 2007; Othman, Mokhtar, & Asaad, 2017).

Research in a variety of industries, including education, indicates that employee loyalty is an important factor in organizational success (Reichheld, 1996). However, there has been limited

research in the area of adjunct faculty loyalty (Guillon & Cezanne, 2014; Hoyt, 2012). Exploring the experiences of adjunct faculty as it relates to loyalty could lead to better success within higher education institutions.

Research Questions

The purpose of this research study is to explore the following questions:

1. How do adjunct faculty experience loyalty towards their institutions?
    ○ How do adjunct faculty define the concept of loyalty?
    ○ How do adjunct faculty describe the feeling of loyalty?
    ○ What types of experiences contribute to the feeling of loyalty?
    ○ How do feelings of loyalty develop and evolve over time?
2. Are there common themes that emerge from the experiences of adjunct faculty who identify themselves as loyal or disloyal to their institutions?

Significance

Higher education is a big business. However, people working in higher education are people who bring unique talent and skills to the business: the business of educating students. Bob, Julia, and Daniel are based on real people - real people who bring their unique talents and skills to educate students and make the world a better place. Their value, and the value of all adjunct faculty, is often ignored in the busy atmosphere of higher education. Administrators should take the opportunity to slow down and value their adjunct faculty. Creating a culture of loyalty could make all the difference in improving the higher education system.

Higher education is an ever-evolving system with increasing accountability (Martin & Samels, 2015). There is an unlimited number of aspects of higher education that could be studied

in an effort to improve the experience for students. Given the increased use of adjunct faculty, this is an area that should be focused on for additional research. A deeper understanding and appreciation of adjunct faculty loyalty will provide opportunities to improve the experience for adjunct faculty, which should subsequently improve the experience for students (Center for Community College Student Engagement, 2014). This study will also improve the overall understanding of the adjunct faculty experience, which will open up additional research opportunities in the future.

In this research study, I will create and apply a new qualitative methodology in an attempt to thoroughly answer my research questions. This new method, Intuitive Empathic Exploration, was developed because conventional qualitative traditions did not effectively fit with the research questions. This research study is also an opportunity to provide an example of how Intuitive Empathic Exploration could be used in qualitative research in the future.

Assumptions of the Study

The following assumptions are being considered when planning for this research study:

1. This study will focus on adjunct faculty who are only associated with their institution as adjunct faculty. Since the goal is to look at the adjunct faculty/institution relationship, adjunct faculty who have other associations with the institution could have trouble focusing on their role as adjunct faculty. I will be unable to confirm this definitively, but I am making the assumption that participants will be honest about their affiliation with their institution(s).

2. This study will assume that the participants are being thoughtful, accurate, and open about their experiences.

3. This study will assume that increased loyalty is a concept that is considered valuable and beneficial to the adjunct faculty who participate.

Limitations of the Study

The following limitations were present for this study:

1. The sample size of 14 was relatively small, despite pulling participants from across the country, from a variety of backgrounds.

2. While I included an assumption of having participants who are only affiliated with their institutions as an adjunct faculty, the lines of this assumption were blurry. Based on self-disclosure, each participant was affiliated with at least one institution as an adjunct faculty member only. However, some of the participants had previous affiliations with other institutions in other roles. While this was not the focus of the study, it did appear to influence the participants at times.

3. Each participant participated in one interview using Zoom. For some of the participants, we had minor technical issues that impacted the use of video or caused minor audio glitches.

Researcher Identity

I am currently employed in higher education, working at a small, private, non-profit, non-union institution. My title at the beginning of my work with this study was Director of Undergraduate Curriculum and Faculty Development. At the conclusion of this study, my title is now Associate Dean of Academic Operations. While I did not know any of my study participants and they do not work at or have any affiliation with my institution, I have worked with adjunct faculty for over a decade in different capacities. My job responsibilities have included hiring

faculty, training faculty, scheduling classes, managing the academic budget, and advising students. I have also taught classes as part of my primary position or in addition to my primary position for the past thirteen years. I love working with adjunct faculty. Each one is different and has a story; some stories are inspiring, and others are sad. My background and experiences are helping to guide my research interests, though I am making every effort to look at my data openly and objectively.

Definitions of Terms

Adjunct Faculty:

Part-time instructional staff in higher education (Lyons, 2007).

Institution of Higher Education ("Institution"):

An educational institution in any State that --

(1) admits as regular students only persons having a certificate of graduation from a school providing secondary education, or the recognized equivalent of such a certificate;

(2) is legally authorized within such State to provide a program of education beyond secondary education;

(3) provides an educational program for which the institution awards a bachelor's degree or provides not less than a two-year program that is acceptable for full credit toward such a degree;

(4) is a public or other non-profit institution; and

(5) is accredited by a nationally recognized accrediting agency or association, or if not so accredited, is an institution that has been granted pre-accreditation status by such an agency or association that has been recognized by the Secretary [of Education] for the granting of pre-accreditation status, and the Secretary has determined that there is satisfactory assurance that the

institution will meet the accreditation standards of such an agency or association within a reasonable time (1998 amendments to the Higher Education Act of 1965, 2003).

CHAPTER TWO - REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

The concept of adjunct faculty loyalty is appealing for a number of reasons. First of all, it is clear from professional experiences that adjunct faculty are critical to success in higher education, especially in private, non-profit institutions. Adjunct faculty, like Bob, Julia, and Daniel, demonstrate a commitment to students on a daily basis, and student feedback confirms that adjunct faculty help with academic and career goals. While many different aspects of the adjunct faculty experience could be considered for research, loyalty is an aspect that has not been extensively studied at this point. In fact, organizational and employee loyalty, in general, is not as well defined as one might expect, despite an abundance of literature on the topic and related topics.

This literature review will focus on three main topics. First, I will review the extremely limited research that has previously been conducted in the area of adjunct faculty loyalty and closely related topics. Then, I will look at literature related to the adjunct faculty experience, both from the perspective of the adjunct faculty and the higher education institution. It is important to recognize how many adjunct faculty are working in higher education, especially when compared to full-time instructors and faculty. Finally, I will describe the concept of employee and organizational loyalty along with personal and organizational factors related to loyalty. There have been a number of explanations of loyalty in the literature, so I will look at a variety of definitions to try to explore the whole scope of the concept. I will also include a few theories that are related to loyalty.

Recent Research on Adjunct Faculty Loyalty

When looking at research on the topic of adjunct faculty loyalty and closely related topics over the past ten years, there are only six dissertations and one other research study that are related to adjunct faculty and loyalty. The majority of these are not focused on loyalty alone, but combine the topic with others, such as satisfaction.

According to Hoyt (2012), while research has been done regarding full-time faculty and loyalty, none had been done regarding part-time faculty. Hoyt looked at loyalty simply as the "intent to stay" (2012, p. 132). Later in this literature review, I explore additional and more comprehensive descriptions of loyalty, which will better guide my own research. Hoyt's research looked at predictors for both job satisfaction and loyalty using a survey that collected quantitative data (2012). One of the recent dissertations also focused on both job satisfaction and loyalty within Christian higher education and appeared to be directly related to the work previously completed by Hoyt (Couch, 2014). This research study was quantitative and focused on factors that predicted both satisfaction and loyalty among adjunct faculty members in Christian higher education institutions (Couch, 2014).

Two of the studies focus on the adjunct experience within the specific discipline of nursing (Himmelberg, 2011; Shannon, 2011). The dissertation by Shannon (2011) is a qualitative study focusing on factors that influence online adjunct faculty members' choice to teach for a specific institution. While this research states it is related to loyalty, it is approached from a very different perspective than my own. Himmelberg (2011) also studied faculty members in the area of nursing, but focused more on the general perceptions of newer faculty members. This dissertation was also qualitative and looked broadly at topics related to loyalty, satisfaction, and retention of faculty (Himmelberg, 2011).

Another dissertation examined the for-profit career college segment and looked more broadly at the adjunct experience within that type of institution (Pyram, 2016). This qualitative study looked at a broad range of topics related to adjunct faculty, including working conditions, job satisfaction, student achievement, support for faculty, and recognition (Pyram, 2016). Loyalty was mentioned throughout the study, specifically as it related to adjunct faculty's loyalty to their students (Pyram, 2016).

Another recent dissertation focused on satisfaction just among online adjunct faculty (Hensley, 2015). This study asserted that satisfaction of adjunct faculty is linked to satisfaction of students, which is linked to institutional success (Hensley, 2015). Using qualitative methodology, this interview study looked at general issues that relate to satisfaction of adjunct faculty. Similar to other studies, this researcher included the concept of loyalty, even though it was not the focus of the study (Hensley, 2015).

The final study considered just community college adjunct faculty from the perspective of institutional support (Colwell, 2011). This study is unique from all of the others because it compared the perceptions of the adjunct faculty and administrators in community colleges using a quantitative approach (Colwell, 2011). While adjunct faculty loyalty was not a focus of this research, it is discussed throughout the dissertation as an important factor for community colleges (Colwell, 2011).

These examples of research used a variety of methods and attempted to answer different questions, all with some similarities to mine. All of these earlier research studies provide context for my research, but it is important to further explore the topics of adjunct faculty and their experiences with loyalty. In addition to what I am trying to accomplish, it is apparent that there are many other opportunities for further research.

Adjunct Faculty

Put simply, adjunct faculty are part-time instructors in colleges and universities (Lyons, 2007). There are many terms used within institutions and in the literature to describe this large, diverse group of people. Some of the more common terms include contingent faculty, adjunct instructors, and adjunct professors (Lyons, 2007). Contrary to their low pay and lack of benefits, adjunct faculty bring a great deal of value to the institutions by having specialized knowledge and industry experience (Center for Community College Student Engagement, 2014; Wallin, 2005). Adjunct faculty are also useful in accommodating student and class needs when there are dramatic or unexpected enrollment changes and limited budgets (Charlier & Williams, 2011; Coalition on the Academic Workforce, 2012).

Statistics about adjunct faculty.

It has been estimated that there are over 600,000 adjunct faculty in the United States (Lyons, 2007). At community and technical colleges, approximately two-thirds of classes are taught by adjunct faculty (Wallin, 2005). While it is typical to discuss and describe all adjunct faculty as if they belong to one homogeneous group, adjunct faculty can be separated into different groups based on characteristics, backgrounds, and motivation.

The majority of adjunct faculty have multiple jobs. Only about one-third of adjunct faculty have just one teaching job. The others have two or more jobs - either multiple teaching jobs or additional jobs that are not related to teaching (AFT Higher Education, 2010). According to Lyons (2007) and Kezar & Maxey (2016), adjunct faculty generally fit into one of the following categories:

1. **"Specialists, experts, professionals"** This category of adjunct faculty includes people who are employed full-time, generally outside of higher education. These adjunct faculty are

often motivated to give back and share their knowledge and experiences with students. While adjunct faculty in this category rarely have a background in education, they are able to bring practical and relevant knowledge into the classroom.

2. **"Freelancers"** Freelance adjunct faculty includes people who are working several part-time jobs by choice, including teaching. This group includes consultants and stay-at-home parents. Adjunct faculty in this category may or may not have relevant professional experience to share with students.

3. **"Career enders"** This group of adjunct faculty are teaching as a semi-retirement job. They often have an extensive career background and a lot of experience to share with students.

4. **"Aspiring academics"** Adjunct faculty in this group are those attempting to pursue a career in academics. As they work to obtain a full-time faculty position, they work as adjunct faculty members in an attempt to gain experience and to try to get an advantage when a full-time position becomes available.

The groups listed above are not inclusive of all scenarios, but they do indicate the wide variety of backgrounds and motivations for people working as adjunct faculty. The Center for Community College Student Engagement (2014) adds to the groups by including graduate students and other staff or administrators who teach. One survey suggests that over half of adjunct faculty members (57%) are working as adjuncts because they enjoy teaching, and compensation is not a major factor for them (AFT Higher Education, 2010). This group of adjunct faculty is often working another full-time job or may be semi-retired. The others are teaching either because of the income/benefits or with the hope of it turning into a full-time position (AFT Higher Education, 2010). Satisfaction is directly linked to the reasons for teaching as an adjunct faculty member. Those who are teaching for enjoyment and not for compensation are more satisfied with the

working conditions than those who are working to try to obtain a full-time position (AFT Higher Education, 2010).

Higher education has evolved over recent decades. In all types of institutions, there is an increasing reliance on adjunct faculty (Coalition on the Academic Workforce, 2012; Curtis, 2014). From 1976 to 2011, the percentage of total instructional staff who were classified as part-time went from 25.1% to 41.5% (Curtis, 2014). Similarly, the same report showed the percentage of faculty who were classified as part-time increased from 31.4% to 51.4% over the same time period (Curtis, 2014). There was considerable variation depending on the type of institution, but part-time faculty made up the largest percentage of total instructional staff in every institution category. The lowest was 32.9% at doctoral and research institutions, and the highest was 72.8% at for-profit institutions. Public associate's institutions were just behind for-profit institutions at 70.3% (Curtis, 2014).

Some states have attempted to regulate the use of part-time or adjunct faculty. For example, Maryland has a regulation that at least half of the credits delivered must be taught by full-time faculty (as cited in Dolan, Hall, Karlsson, & Martinak, 2013). In the California Community College System, adjunct faculty are not able to teach more than two-thirds of all classes at one campus (Karpf, 2015).

Working conditions and support of adjunct faculty.

Since adjunct faculty are part-time employees, the working conditions vary and are usually significantly different from full-time faculty and other full-time employees in higher education (Coalition on the Academic Workforce, 2012). Generally, adjunct faculty are paid based on the courses they teach. The national median compensation for a three-credit course was just $2,700 according to a report in 2012 (as cited in Karpf, 2015). Adjunct faculty schedules can be different

each semester, and adjunct faculty may find that they do not have any work during some semesters. Conversely, some adjunct faculty have nearly the same course load as full-time faculty or instructors without full-time compensation or benefits (Coalition on the Academic Workforce, 2012; Dolan, Hall, Karlsson, & Martinak, 2013). In addition, they may have to teach courses at nontraditional times or locations, which can lead to isolation within the institution's community (Lyons, 2007). While adjunct faculty are able to accept or decline each course offered, they often find they need to accept what has been offered because not doing so could result in fewer courses to teach in the future.

Class assignments can take place very close to the start of each semester, giving adjunct faculty very little time to prepare for teaching (Center for Community College Student Engagement, 2014; Lyons, 2007; Dolan, Hall, Karlsson, & Martinak, 2013). In addition, classes can be added or canceled at the last minute, resulting in additional instability. Adjunct faculty are often assigned courses that may have lower enrollment, so it is more likely that their classes will be canceled than for full-time faculty, or they may find their classes are given to full-time faculty at the last minute when the full-time faculty member's class has been canceled.

Training and ongoing support for adjunct faculty can be robust or very limited (Center for Community College Student Engagement, 2014; Coalition on the Academic Workforce, 2012). Some colleges and universities have established training programs to help onboard new adjunct faculty, which could include teaching "certifications" to ensure they are prepared to teach. Other colleges and universities hire new adjunct faculty and provide little or no access to training and support. This variation is due to a number of factors, including the size of the institution and other resources available (Coalition on the Academic Workforce, 2012). There are also circumstances

where training programs are in place, but new adjunct faculty are unable to participate due to conflicts with other commitments (Dolan, Hall, Karlsson, & Martinak, 2013).

Adjunct faculty also do not have access to the same resources as others in higher education. While shared office or work space may be available, adjunct faculty rarely have private offices or space to leave their belongings or meet with students (Center for Community College Student Engagement, 2014; Dolan, Hall, Karlsson, & Martinak, 2013). It is also typical for adjunct faculty to have to use their personal computers for their teaching.

Communication with adjunct faculty varies considerably. There has been an increased focus in higher education to involve adjunct faculty, but there are challenges with trying to do this. Due to the nature of adjunct faculty work, adjunct faculty are not always available or interested in being part of other activities on campus. Some adjunct faculty are interested, but it is still a challenge to include them in committees or other meetings.

Employee Loyalty

The concept of employee loyalty has been discussed in the literature for years. There is not one agreed-upon definition at this point, and the existing definitions vary significantly with some common themes. Employee loyalty is often studied in combination with concepts such as commitment, retention, engagement, and satisfaction. While all of these concepts are related, it is important to identify a unique description of employee loyalty.

Coughlan (2005) suggests the following description of loyalty: "Loyalty is reflected in behavior that can be tied to an implicit promise, voluntarily made by an individual operating in a community of interdependent others, to adhere to universalizable moral principles in pursuit of individual and collective goals" (p. 46). He goes on to suggest that loyalty is based on three things: personal characteristics, organizational efforts, and characteristics of others in the organization

(Coughlan, 2005). Another definition describes loyalty as "whether or not employees are committed and assume personal responsibility for their work, and whether or not they feel inclined to look for another job" (Eskildsen & Nussler, 2000, p. 582). In one study about employee loyalty during downsizing, loyalty was defined as "active behaviors that demonstrate pride in and support for the organization" (Niehoff, Moorman, Blakely, & Fuller, 2001, p. 96). A simpler definition describes loyalty as "affection for and attachment to the organization; a sense of belongingness manifesting as 'a wish to stay'" (Cook & Wall, 1980, p. 40). Even more simply, Hirschman, who developed a theory regarding loyalty, described loyalty as "a 'special attachment' to the organization" (Cusack, 2009, p. 21).

In a critical review, Guillon and Cezanne (2014) discuss loyalty in terms of both attitude and behavior. From the attitudinal perspective, loyalty can be described as a feeling of attachment or commitment to an organization. From the behavioral perspective, loyalty can be seen as a reaction to dissatisfaction. Rather than react more negatively, employees who react to dissatisfaction with loyalty tend to shift their behavior in constructive ways and may even appear to be tolerating the dissatisfaction (Guillon & Cezanne, 2014). Other definitions of loyalty in this critical review include "significant length of service in the company, very little tendency to seek or examine outside job offers and, generally, a strong sense of belonging," and "a feeling of belonging combined with staying in the organization over the long term" (Guillon & Cezanne, 2014, p. 841). A final, summarized definition was, "Employee loyalty can be seen as an attitudinal inclination toward identification, attachment, commitment, or trust vis-a-vis the organization, which finds expression in different behaviors, forms, or indicators" (Guillon & Cezanne, 2014, p. 842).

The various definitions and descriptions of organizational or employee loyalty can be seen quite differently, but a few general themes emerge. First, loyalty is an intrinsic feeling towards an organization. Second, loyalty includes longevity with the organization or a desire to stay long-term. Finally, employees who are loyal exhibit a variety of behaviors consistent with their feelings towards the organization.

Importance of loyalty.

According to Reichheld (1996), "Employees who are not loyal are unlikely to build an inventory of customers who are" (p. 91). While there are many aspects of organizational culture that can be considered, loyalty is certainly one that is important to success. In an article about Hirschman's Theory regarding loyalty, Cusack (2009) states, "Loyalty is the sustaining wind that keeps an organization afloat and on course" (p. 20). Just like with sailing, there are a number of important factors in organizations that contribute to a successful journey. Loyalty, like the wind, is essential and could possibly go unnoticed when there are so many other important factors. Cusack also states that "No business can survive without loyal customers and loyal employees" (2009, p. 21). Coughlan concludes that loyalty is critical to organizations because it influences morality, and loyal employees are more likely to make ethical decisions for the organization (2005). It is important to include the fact that employee loyalty is not the same as employee retention. There are employees in all industries who stayed with an organization for a long time, but who do not produce value associated with loyalty (Reichheld, 1996).

Organizational factors.

Organizational and leadership factors should be considered when looking at employee loyalty. According to Reichheld (2001), "Loyalty is impossible without trust. Trust is impossible

without accurate, reliable information" (p. 149). Communication is a key element in ensuring both trust and loyalty within an organization. However, communication must be effective, not just abundant. In order for this to happen, relationships are critical, and organizations need to focus extensively on strengthening relationships throughout and include all stakeholders (Reichheld, 2001). Similarly, the perception that an employee has a voice in the decision-making process in an organization can strengthen employee loyalty (Watson & Shepard, 2000).

While it seems obvious that compensation could impact employee loyalty, the research is mixed on that. In fact, one study in Italy with over 200 organizations and over 2,000 employees found there is no relationship between wages and employee loyalty (Borzaga & Tortia, 2006). However, Couch (2014) found that compensation is a factor that could help predict loyalty, along with a number of other factors. There are a number of things organizations can do that help promote loyalty and reward loyal employees. For example, having high expectations, offering additional training, and increased autonomy can help encourage loyalty (Linz, Good, and Busch, 2015). Similarly, another study also found that training practices and socialization within work groups impact employee loyalty (Coughlan, 2005). Coughlan (2005) also suggests that loyalty is more likely in communities with integrity and trustworthiness. Research has also found that non-profit organizations are more likely to have loyal employees than other types of organizations (Borzaga & Tortia, 2006).

Personal factors.

In looking at employee loyalty, it is interesting to consider if certain people or types of people are more likely to be loyal. It is also interesting to see if there are common characteristics of people who are more likely to be loyal. Coughlan found that some personal characteristics can

be associated with employee loyalty, including higher levels of self-efficacy, self-confidence, and cognitive moral development (2005).

In one study, it was found that loyal employees tended to "self-report high performance, have seniority, hold supervisory positions, and have not recently experienced unemployment" (Linz, Good, & Busch, 2015, p. 183). Loyalty also tended to be higher with employees who were married and worked in health care or education (Linz, Good, & Busch, 2015). It did not appear as though there were any significant generational differences in loyalty (Linz, Good, & Busch, 2015).

Part-time employee loyalty.

Part-time employees have often been ignored in organizational studies and have even been referred to as "missing persons" (Jacobsen, 2000; Tansky, Gallagher, & Wetzel, 1997). There has been some research done regarding part-time employees and loyalty or related concepts. In a study on commitment and loyalty among part-time workers, Jacobson (2000) found that many part-time workers would work more if given the chance, and the level of commitment and loyalty was related to the time spent working (to differentiate between employees who work very few hours per week versus those who work closer to full time).

Theories Related to Loyalty

While loyalty has been discussed throughout the literature, there are not any theories that are consistently applied to the concept of loyalty. I have, however, found several different theories that are or could be related to loyalty. None of these theories seem to apply closely to my research questions, though I intend to consider them when I consider my research results.

Systems theory.

When thinking about adjunct faculty loyalty, it is important to view higher education institutions from the perspective of systems theory. A systems approach is an operational concept referring to a scientific, systematic, and rational procedure for optimizing outcomes of an organization or structure by implementing a set of related operations to study an existing system, solve problems, and develop new or modify existing systems (Richey, Klein, & Tracey, 2011, p. 17).

When using systems thinking as it applies to the culture of an organization, the stakeholders, results, and related activities or actions can all be considered (Pershing, 2006). It is important to analyze the parts of the system - both the larger system and the smaller subsystems. Improvement opportunities can include changing relationships between parts in the system or creating new parts and relationships (Richey, Klein, & Tracey, 2011).

Herzberg two-factor theory and positive psychology.

Herzberg's theory of employee satisfaction, known as Two-Factor Theory or Motivation-Hygiene Theory, and more recent developments in Positive Psychology are related to concepts of employee loyalty. Herzberg proposed that satisfaction and dissatisfaction among employees are not direct opposites (Herzberg, 1968; Sachau, 2007). For example, things such as "fair pay, good interpersonal relations, fair policies, and pleasant working conditions do not appear to provide much satisfaction, but they do prevent dissatisfaction" (Sachau, 2007, p. 380). On the other hand, job satisfaction was related to things such as "achievement, recognition, interesting work, increased responsibility, advancement, and/or learning" Sachau, 2007, p. 379). While this research is not directly related to loyalty, satisfaction and loyalty are often studied together, so this research could be useful when studying loyalty.

When combining Herzberg's work with Positive Psychology, additional insight into employee satisfaction can be identified. Intrinsic motivation is strongly linked to satisfaction, which includes activities that provide a mental challenge, job enrichment, and employee engagement (Sachau, 2007). This research is also consistent with what others have found regarding financial rewards. While fair pay is important to prevent dissatisfaction, compensation alone does not account for employee satisfaction (Sachau, 2007).

Organizational commitment.

Organizational commitment is a concept that relates to how people connect with and their level of involvement in an organization. Organizational commitment is based on three factors: believing in and sharing the organization's values and goals, a willingness to go above and beyond for the organization, and interest in remaining connected to the organization (Allen & Meyer, 1990; Fiorito, Bozeman, Young, & Meurs, 2007). There are a couple of different ways to look at organizational commitment. One is an attitudinal perspective, or the way people think about their relationship with the organization. This can also be considered their mindset about the organization (Allen & Meyer, 1990). The behavior perspective is more about behaviors people exhibit as it relates to their commitment to the organization. Researchers look at the behaviors and the conditions under which the behaviors are repeated (Allen & Meyer, 1990).

The three-component model of organizational commitment identifies a number of factors that impact an individual's commitment to an organization. Some of these factors include personal characteristics, behaviors exhibited at work, work experiences, socialization, and organizational investments (Allen & Meyer, 1990). This model is not specific to any particular industry, but it could be considered when looking at adjunct faculty loyalty within higher education.

Psychological contracts.

Within organizations, contracts are a regular part of business. Contracts are created for employment with temporary employees, with suppliers, and in many other situations. There is an interesting concept of psychological contracts that has to do with the mental model of a contract and how it is created (Roussou, 1995). Psychological contracts are created based on the combination of two sets of factors. First, there are messages, social cues, and the setting within an organization. This is combined with how the individual interprets and constructs meaning based on this information (Roussou, 1995). It appears as though these psychological contracts could create expectations for what may happen in the future with the employment.

Give and take.

Grant (2013) has been doing some interesting research regarding how people interact with others professionally. He is specifically looking at givers, those who help others based on how one can help others despite any personal costs, and takers, those who tend to help others more strategically and focus on the benefit to themselves (Grant, 2013). He also considers those he refers to as matchers, those who balance between giving and taking (Grant, 2013). In the case of matchers, people tend to look at reciprocity in their interactions with others (Grant, 2013). While each of these three styles is unique, most people do experience all three types as they progress in their career or as they move between different situations and jobs (Grant, 2013).

Maslow's hierarchy of needs.

Maslow's hierarchy of needs is one of the more well-known theories in psychology, and it can be applied to education, organizational behavior, and many other disciplines. Maslow's theory proposes that there are five levels of needs: physiological/survival needs, safety needs,

social/relationship needs, esteem/self-worth needs, and self-actualization/growth needs (Stum, 2001). It is important to recognize that, while the hierarchy of needs is presented as a triangle, it is not necessary or realistic to assume each lower level of need to be satisfied at 100% to move up to the next level (O'Connor & Yballe, 2007).

Research conducted in an effort to understand and improve employee commitment and retention resulted in a variation of Maslow's original theory. The first of five levels of workplace commitment is safety/security, which includes both physical and psychological safety (Stum, 2001). The second level is rewards, which includes compensation and benefits. This research is consistent with others in stating that compensation alone is not a motivator, but it is an important foundation on which commitment can develop (Stum, 2001). Similar to the original theory, the third piece of this model is affiliation, which is based on relationships and includes communication, involvement, and a sense of belonging (Stum, 2001). The fourth level in this model is growth, which includes opportunities to "change, learn, and have new experiences on the job," which is consistent with what Herzberg proposed in the Motivation-Hygiene Theory (Stum, 2001, p. 7). The final level is work-life balance, which is seen as very important for commitment and retention (Stum, 2001). Since each level in this model is important, organizations should make an effort to meet employee expectations at each level. However, meeting a higher-level need while a lower-level need is not met will not be successful in developing workplace commitment (Stum, 2001).

Hirschman's theory: exit, voice, and loyalty.

In 1970, Albert Hirschman proposed two different ways that employees respond to performance challenges in organizations - exit and voice - and how the presence of loyalty influences employee response (Hirschman, 2007; Keeley & Graham, 1991). Hirschman (2007)

refs to loyalty as a "special attachment to an organization" (p. 77). Hirschman's work can be applied to how people react to dissatisfaction with an organization or product. From the perspective of employees at an organization, when dissatisfied, Hirschman proposed that people either exit the organization, communicate their dissatisfaction, or tolerate the situation (Hoffman, 2006). When loyalty exists, it was found that employees were much less likely to exit the organization and, instead, actively engage to try to improve the situation (Cusack, 2009; Hirschman, 2007; Hoffman, 2006). There are also times when employees choose to stay and tolerate the situation but, due to a lack of loyalty, disengage and do not speak up to improve the situation (Cusack, 2009).

Conclusion

The business of higher education is critical to our society. The literature demonstrates an increased use of adjunct faculty across all types of institutions. There are a lot of stories about adjunct faculty - adjunct faculty like Julia, Daniel, and Bob. Most of these stories remain hidden, but additional research can help change this. The review of the literature demonstrates a gap in research regarding adjunct faculty loyalty. Looking at this topic is one way to provide more insight into the experience of adjunct faculty. It has been demonstrated, in a variety of industries, that employee loyalty can be a factor in customer loyalty and organizational success. It has not been studied extensively enough to say that increased adjunct faculty loyalty will increase student loyalty and the success of higher education institutions. However, by looking at all of the research, this is a likely conclusion. It is my hope that this research study will be a solid next step in improving the adjunct faculty experience by better understanding them.

CHAPTER THREE - METHODOLOGY

Introduction

Qualitative methodologies focus on exploration and the way people construct meaning in their experiences (Creswell, 2013; Merriam, 2009). In this research study, I am interested in the experiences of adjunct faculty as they relate to loyalty. One way to consider experiences is through exploration, and these research questions are closely aligned with qualitative methodologies.

In this dissertation, I am proposing a new methodology that draws, in part, from the concepts of empathy, phenomenology, in-depth interviewing, and intuitive inquiry. I developed this new methodology upon realizing that existing methods did not fit the research questions and intent of my study. Instead of trying to adapt my research to fit a method, or pick a method that did not quite work, I created a new methodology that does work and could be used for other research opportunities in the future.

In this chapter, I will start by introducing Intuitive Empathic Exploration. Then I will explain why Intuitive Empathic Exploration is appropriate for my research. Finally, I will describe the specific plans I used for implementing this methodology in my dissertation. Since Intuitive Empathic Exploration is a new methodology, my research will provide an opportunity to explore and further define the methodology.

Foundations of Intuitive Empathic Exploration

    Empathy.

Empathy is frequently used in research and practice in a variety of disciplines, including psychology, medicine, and design. Empathy is a technique that is used in interviewing throughout

qualitative research (Adams, 2010; Brinkmann & Kvale, 2015).   Typically, empathy is conceptualized as "the experience of understanding another person's thoughts, feelings, and condition from their point of view, rather than from your own" (Psychology Today, n.d, para. 1). To expand on this, I am also considering the perspective that empathy is "a chance to be completely other than that which you usually are and in so doing, to discover so many other things about life and about living" (Kolawole, 2016, 0:22). This perspective comes from the discipline of human-centered design, but it can be applied to research as a way to uniquely consider the perspective of the participants and their experiences in the world. Similarly, in medicine, empathy is seen as the "adequate understanding of the inner processes of the patient concerning his health-related problems" (Gelhaus, 2012, p. 103).

In Intuitive Empathic Exploration, the researcher sees their entire process, from reviewing the literature, to forming research questions, to developing the data collection strategy, to interviewing or otherwise interacting with participants, to analyzing data, through the concept of empathy. This happens by the researcher thinking through the entire process from the perspective of the group of people being researched. Part of this, which is included as a guiding principle of this method, is based on the idea that empathy or an empathic researcher could impact change. This concept has been researched extensively in the psychotherapy field, as summarized by Watson, Steckley, and McMullen (2014). While this research does not indicate that the positive results could translate to qualitative research, the existing research is compelling and is being included as a goal, which will need extensive research to see if it works in a similar way in this methodology.

Phenomenology.

Phenomenology, as a method, is described as the lived experience of a concept (Creswell, 2013). Without looking deeper, this appears to be a good description of the methodology I am using for this study. I am interested in the experience of loyalty in adjunct faculty. However, when looking in more depth at phenomenology, it is important to realize that it is guided by a strong philosophical focus, which deviates from the perspective I am taking (Creswell, 2013). Several other, similar studies claim to be phenomenologies, but they are not developed from a philosophical perspective. As a result, I would consider them to be based on a qualitative method with similarities to phenomenology. In Intuitive Empathic Exploration, the researcher is interested in the way the participants experience something coming from the perspective of empathy.

Intuitive inquiry.

Intuitive inquiry is an iterative, qualitative practice that incorporates pre-understanding and intuition into research (Wertz et al, 2011). This is a relatively new process created by Rosemarie Anderson, who has experience in spirituality, philosophy, and psychology. While this background is quite different from my own, this method is quite compelling and has some similarities to Intuitive Empathic Exploration.

Some aspects of intuitive inquiry are closely aligned with the type of methodology I am creating. For example, intuitive inquiry researchers write in their own voice with compassion, and the written research report should invoke sympathy in the reader (Anderson, 2004). In Intuitive Empathic Exploration, the researcher works through the entire research process from the perspective of empathy, which is related to Anderson's perspective. In addition, Intuitive Empathic Exploration is written from a more personal perspective. Intuitive inquiry combines intuition and intellectual precision (Anderson, 2004). Research topics using intuitive inquiry tend

to be compelling, manageable, clear, focused, concrete, researchable, and promising (Anderson, 2004). "As a method, intuitive inquiry seeks to both describe what is and envision new possibilities for the future through an in-depth, reflective process of interpretation" (Anderson, 2004, p. 307).

However, there are also aspects of intuitive inquiry that do not fit what I am trying to accomplish with my new methodology. Intuitive inquiry can be closely linked to spirituality (Anderson, 2004). The intuitive inquiry researcher is often very close to the topic, so much so that the researcher may have experienced similar things as the participants, and the researcher may also be a participant (Anderson, 2004). For example, a researcher may be interested in studying the healing process from a traumatic experience that the researcher also experienced. This researcher may consider himself a participant and study his own healing process along with those of his other participants. With Intuitive Empathic Exploration, it is important for the researcher to have empathy for the participants, but this method is not intended to be used for researchers who will also function as participants.

In-depth interviewing.

While interview research can be approached from a flexible, unstructured perspective, using an interviewing methodology can help promote an organized, quality outcome. This interviewing methodology is being considered when developing Intuitive Empathic Exploration. The interview approach described by Brinkmann and Kvale (2015) contains seven distinct stages in the process: thematizing, designing, interviewing, transcribing, analyzing, verifying, and reporting. While this approach is fairly intuitive, it is helpful to review to ensure an organized approach.

The first stage of interview inquiry, thematizing, is identifying the purpose and clarifying the reason for the inquiry. At this initial point, the method is likely undetermined. Next, the study

design is planned, taking into account both the knowledge and any moral/ethical implications. During the third stage, the actual interviews are conducted. Once the interviews are complete, transcripts are created in preparation for analysis. Transcription can be done while additional interviews are conducted, as this is not an exact linear process. Next, the data is analyzed using an appropriate method for the topic and purpose of the study. Once the data is analyzed, or during the analysis phase, the researcher should make an attempt to verify the findings. This verification can include checking understanding with the participants or looking back at the literature for confirmation. Finally, the interview results can be reported along with the methods (Brinkmann & Kvale, 2015).

Intuitive Empathic Exploration often uses some of the interviewing strategies described above. The data analysis phase is usually done by identifying themes. Complete transcripts are not always necessary; with Intuitive Empathic Exploration, the transcription process can be guided by what works best for the researcher. While interviewing is not the only data collection strategy used in Intuitive Empathic Exploration, it is the primary strategy.

Intuitive Empathic Exploration Guiding Principles

The following characteristics (broadly) describe this method:

1. The researcher is interested in a distinct group of people (sharing culture, experience, or characteristic).

2. The researcher wants to understand the experience of this group. The experience could be related to their culture, a shared characteristic, or how they experience something specific (a feeling, a type of event, etc).

3. The researcher thinks through the entire research process with empathy. As a result, research tends to be written from a more personal perspective than is common for other research reports.

4. Researcher intuition is an important aspect of the process. While the research is still guided by the research questions and existing literature, the researcher is encouraged to use personal experience and intuition to guide research decisions.

5. The researcher relates to and reacts to the participants intuitively from the perspective of empathy. Researcher interactions could include interviews, focus groups, or other semi-structured data collection techniques. The researcher does need to have a planned approach that allows for flexibility and adjustments throughout the process.

6. The research goal/outcome is to thoroughly understand the experience of a distinct group of people using thematic analysis. This thematic analysis can describe the experience, along with external factors that influence the group's experience.

7. A secondary goal of the process is to leave the participants with the experience of feeling empowered. This, along with the researcher's empathic approach, could lead participants to act on this in a way that improves their experience going forward.

Why Intuitive Empathic Exploration?

When considering my dissertation research questions, existing methodologies did not fit for what I was trying to accomplish. However, Intuitive Empathic Exploration is developed to perfectly address my research questions, while still remaining consistent with existing qualitative traditions and providing an opportunity to use it for other research. Going into this project, I have some understanding of and empathy for adjunct faculty. I have worked with adjunct faculty, in a

variety of capacities, for thirteen years. I am going into this project with an open mind to learn something new, but am also aware of the experiences and intuition I bring to my research.

Similar to intuitive inquiry, I am bringing a great deal of caring and compassion for my research topic and participants. I have worked in higher education, and with adjunct faculty, for over a decade. I have witnessed incredible loyalty from adjunct faculty and have also seen the hardship they often go through. In part, many adjunct faculty have shared with me that they feel invisible in higher education when, in fact, they have so much they can contribute beyond teaching their classes. I have seen the enormous difference they make for students, and I would like to use this research opportunity to improve my own understanding, which could lead to improvements in my own work with adjunct faculty and the work of others who read my research. Additionally, and just as important, I am interested in using empathy to empower the participants.

Participants

I used purposeful sampling to attempt to recruit fifteen to twenty participants who work as adjunct faculty, with the goal of achieving representativeness among the participants (Creswell, 2013; Maxwell, 2013). According to Brinkmann and Kvale (2015), interview studies tend to have around 15 participants (+/-10). Given the large population of adjunct faculty, I wanted to ensure I had a fairly large, but still manageable, group of participants for my research. My strategies for recruiting included contacts I have at other colleges and universities through my personal network and the network of my colleagues, graduate classmates, and friends. I have a large network, so I started by recruiting participants through my own contacts. I also had some participants who were recruited through referrals from other participants. While recruiting, I asked some preliminary questions as a means to ensure variety in my sample. These questions were designed to make sure the participants represented a variety of ages, types of institutions, educational backgrounds, and

teaching subjects. However, it is important to note that this variation does not allow me to draw conclusions based on different participant demographics. In addition, I did not have any defined quotas for certain characteristics. Since I am not interested in trying to draw conclusions based on characteristics, a specific distribution is not going to help.

I did not recruit any participants who I know or who work at my university. I also attempted to recruit participants who were unlikely to work at my university, either because of their location or credentials. I also asked that each participant is only affiliated with their institution as an adjunct faculty member. I did not interview graduate students who teach or staff/administrators who also teach. It was important for each participant not to have these additional affiliations that could influence their experiences or perspectives on adjunct faculty loyalty. I did expect that some participants would have experience teaching at multiple institutions, and most did have this experience. This influenced the data I collected, but it gave me the opportunity to hear additional stories and collect richer data.

Recruiting Plan

My plan to recruit participants was to start by using my network to connect me with their networks at other institutions. While it was important that I did not recruit participants who I know personally, this strategy was able to connect me with adjunct faculty who know people in my network. My network was also able to connect me with full-time faculty or administrators at other institutions who then connected me with their adjunct faculty. I did attempt to recruit participants by reaching out to administrators at a number of institutions around the country by consulting higher education institution websites and other higher education online directories. While I did hear back from a few people, this was generally an unsuccessful attempt at recruiting participants. Those I did hear back from were uninterested in participating and one institution shared that they

already survey their faculty extensively and were not interested in asking them to participate in other research. As anticipated, I was most successful using the networks of my personal contacts.

I used email to connect with people who could share my request with their network of adjunct faculty members. I asked them not to connect me with the adjunct faculty members, but instead, to ask the adjunct faculty to contact me directly. When adjunct faculty members contacted me expressing interest, I then sent them an information sheet that indicated implied consent by proceeding to schedule an interview. I asked for adjunct faculty to contact me directly to attempt to ensure they were genuinely willing to participate rather than trying to do a favor to our mutual connections. I did have a few people who reached out whom I was not able to actually use as participants. For one person, she expressed interest and then never replied to schedule an interview. Another individual expressed interest but was unable to find time in his schedule to complete an interview. A third individual expressed interest but shared concern over the interview length and did not reply to schedule an interview.

Challenges

While it was important to establish a realistic plan, it was also a good idea to think about alternatives and managing challenges throughout the process. There were a number of things that could have impacted my research plan. One of the biggest potential challenges was the possibility that I would not be able to recruit successfully enough qualified participants. I thought I may also find that some participants would end up dropping out or deciding not to complete the entire interview. There was also the possibility that I may run into technical issues and miss collecting some of my data. All of these challenges were considered when determining the number of participants I intended to recruit. I initially said I would plan to recruit 15 to 20 participants. Throughout the process, I intended to recruit closer to 20 participants. This gave me a few "extras,"

so it was not a problem if a few dropped out or if I ended up with technology challenges (as long as that was not widespread). Before beginning my research, I determined that I would consider it a success as long as I had complete data from a minimum of 12 participants though more would certainly be ideal. In the end, I was able to conduct a complete interview with 14 participants.

Data Collection Methods

I started collecting data when I recruited the participants. I asked interested participants some basic demographic and general experience questions (See Appendix A). This is information I was interested in collecting, but I also collected it as part of my purposeful sampling strategy. I wanted to make sure the participants had a broad range of backgrounds to try to ensure as much diversity in my sample as possible. In an attempt to obtain a complete understanding of each participant's experiences, I conducted an in-depth, semi-structured interview using an online videoconferencing service (see Appendix B). I initially expected that the interviews would take approximately 60 to 90 minutes. The interviews were all recorded.

At the beginning of the interview, I provided a little bit of information about the structure of the interview and answered any questions they had. I also reiterated that they could skip questions, if they wished, or stop the interview at any time. In addition, I requested that they not name the institutions where they teach as another layer of confidentiality. Most of the participants did not ask any questions, though a few asked about my background or asked questions about my doctoral program at Wayne State University. Most of the people who asked questions regarding my doctoral program were either also in a doctoral program or had very recently completed a doctorate.

The first interview question asked the participant to describe their own educational and professional background. This initial question was designed to give me an overall understanding

of the participant, along with giving the participant an opportunity to get comfortable talking to me. This question also helped me begin to learn the participant's motivations and priorities. The information I learned helped to guide my intuition to ask follow-up questions to my other questions later in the interview. Next, depending on how much information they already provided, I asked additional questions regarding their decision to work as an adjunct faculty member and about the institution(s) where they work. To protect the adjunct faculty members' confidentiality, I specifically requested that they not share the name of the institution(s) where they work currently or where they have worked in the past. I asked the participants about their experiences of being loyal or disloyal to their institutions. I then asked follow-up questions to try to completely understand how their feelings have evolved and what contributed to their feelings.

There is tremendous variation in the literature regarding the definition of loyalty. I initially considered sharing a working definition based on my literature review. However, I was more interested in how adjunct faculty consider the experience of loyalty. It was my hope that I would be able to use their answers along with the literature to obtain a description of loyalty for adjunct faculty that can be applied in research going forward.

While the plan was to ask the questions in the order they are listed, I was open to change the order, as needed, in an effort to obtain as much meaningful data as possible. In Intuitive Empathic Exploration, it is important to plan, but it is also important to leave room for flexibility. In addition, I wanted the participants to have a positive experience in the interview process so that could have required me to ask questions in a different order and possibly also lead to me ask a variety of appropriate follow-up questions. It was important to ask all of my questions, if possible, but I would not compromise depth to ask each question if it did not work out that way. I had a total of seven primary questions, so I anticipated 60 to 90 minutes would be sufficient for most

participants. In practice, I generally did ask the questions in order, though I did occasionally go back to earlier questions, as needed, to further explore the concepts. In addition, the majority of the interviews lasted approximately 60 minutes with some shorter or slightly longer.

Interview Protocol Development

Through the process of planning for this research study, I reviewed several other dissertations and research studies. While I did not find an interview protocol that fit my study, I did use the knowledge gained from reviewing other researchers' work in an attempt to create a good protocol (Himmelberg, 2011; Shannon, 2011). I also consulted with other researchers and academics to get their perspectives on my interview protocol. The order of the questions was intentional. I started with background-type questions and then moved into more specific, thoughtful questions. Since empathy is a primary focus in Intuitive Empathic Exploration, some of my questions are empathy based, for example, by asking the participants to tell a story (IDEO.org, 2015).

I presented several theories related to loyalty in my review of the literature. While these theories do not directly address my questions regarding adjunct faculty loyalty, I kept them all in mind when creating my interview protocol. From the perspective of systems theory, I asked participants some general questions to try to get a sense of the system in which they work at their institutions. I anticipated the information I learned would help put loyalty in the context of a system. I would also likely learn how the system works to support adjunct faculty. This understanding of the organizational environment could also align with Maslow's hierarchy of needs. Additionally, I expected to learn how adjunct faculty respond to organizational challenges, which could align with Hirschman's research.

Interview Protocol Test

Upon receiving approval from the Institutional Review Board, I conducted an informal practice interview with a friend who would have met my participant qualifications. I would have been unable to use him as an official participant, but I did request that I try my protocol with him to ensure that timing was realistic and that he understood the wording of my questions. I used videoconferencing software and recorded the interview to replicate an actual interview setting. I also shared my preliminary information and offered to answer any questions. This test interview lasted approximately 45 minutes, not including the preliminary information and our follow up conversation. This was unsurprising since this person had not had much experience as an adjunct faculty member. Upon completion, I asked this friend to share any thoughts he had regarding my protocol and subsequently felt that I could proceed with my interview protocol as I had it developed.

Data Analysis

I analyzed these data in an attempt to identify patterns and themes that help to better understand the adjunct faculty experience as it relates to loyalty. I also wanted to make sure to notice unique and unexpected experiences from the participants. Ultimately, I wanted to be able to understand the wide range of experiences of adjunct faculty, primarily as they relate to loyalty to their institutions. If possible, I hoped to discover opportunities or ideas that improve the experience of adjunct faculty in higher education.

I began by compiling a table of basic information about each participant (identified by a pseudonym). This table included demographics along with basic information about their adjunct teaching experiences. Then I used an exploratory method of coding the interview data, which

allowed for a more open-ended way to evaluate these data (Saldana, 2016). I was most interested in trying to identify patterns and themes that could provide some insight into the overall experience of the participants (Brinkmann & Kvale, 2015). Since Intuitive Empathic Exploration is focused on the data more holistically, I did not plan to have the interviews transcribed in their entirety. Instead, I intended to review each interview in its entirety, taking detailed notes (leaving out any identifiable information). When partial transcription needed to be done, I did all transcription myself.

While it is important to keep an open mind about potential results, I will be focusing on several broad themes. I want to look at the backgrounds and motivations of adjunct faculty. I am interested in seeing which faculty identify as loyal to their institution and how loyalty evolves/emerges. I will also see how adjunct faculty understand and describe the concept of loyalty. Considering the wide range of definitions found in the literature, I will be interested in seeing if a new definition emerges from my research or if my findings are consistent with a definition that already exists. I am also interested in seeing how the structures, systems, and initiatives at institutions impact (or do not impact) loyalty in adjunct faculty. When looking at each general theme, I will see how my findings are consistent with or dissimilar to the theories presented in my literature review.

Conclusion

Throughout this dissertation, I will explore a new qualitative research methodology, Intuitive Empathic Exploration, to consider the topic of adjunct faculty loyalty. Since this is a new methodology, in addition to conducting research on adjunct faculty loyalty, this study will provide an opportunity to explore the new methodology. As a result, it is expected that the method will evolve and be further refined throughout the process. This is consistent with the way intuition is

used in Intuitive Empathic Exploration. It is important to have a plan and a process, but it is also

important to allow intuition to guide the process and make adjustments.

CHAPTER FOUR - FINDINGS

Introduction

In this chapter, I will share the findings of my research. I will begin by sharing stories about each of the participants. These stories are intended to provide an overview of each participant, a few details about their backgrounds, and aspects of their experiences as adjunct faculty members. Next, I will provide some overall information regarding the participants in general. After that, I will discuss what I learned about loyalty from the perspective of these adjunct faculty members. I will then discuss the themes I identified as they relate to adjunct faculty members and their experiences of being loyal, disloyal, or neither. Finally, I will share some results using Intuitive Empathic Exploration in conducting this research.

Participant Stories

Julianne.

Julianne was the first participant I interviewed. Julianne shared a lot about her background. She has multiple graduate degrees and worked for many years outside of education. She had opportunities to teach while she was working on one of her graduate degrees and found that she loved it. Julianne now works as a consultant for an educational company and works as an adjunct instructor. She is currently teaching for five different schools, mostly online. One thing Julianne likes is that she can accept or decline different classes and they are typically short-term commitments. Julianne enjoys traveling and is able to work vacations into her schedule. She did point out the downside to contract work. She does have to sacrifice pay when taking a break, whether it be for a vacation or for other reasons. She also had the opportunity to live in a different

location for a time while continuing to teach. Overall, Julianne shared that the flexibility is worth the sacrifices.

Alice.

Alice worked in corporate jobs throughout a big part of her career. She decided to get out of corporate America and move into an area where she could make more of a difference - higher education. It was a difficult move, financially, but she loved learning and the environment of higher education. Alice spent some time teaching in higher education but also spent some time in higher education administration. She is now a "full-time" adjunct faculty member and contractor. Alice shared that she started her education as an adult and has now completed a doctorate. She is nearing retirement and plans to continue teaching as long as she can in retirement. Alice has taught both face-to-face and online. She expressed an incredible passion for connecting with her students. She reiterated multiple times that she loves teaching and her students. While she has attempted to get a full-time position, she has not been able to do this. On average, she generally teaches at four institutions at a time.

Marta.

Marta started her career in business, and then education became a second career for her. She loves technology and has always enjoyed integrating technology both in business and in education. Marta has a doctorate and has worked as an adjunct faculty member for about five years. She teaches online for one institution. Marta feels that continuing to teach is a good extra source of income, but she mostly teaches because she absolutely loves it. She emphasized how much she loves communicating and working with students online, especially one-on-one. She feels that teaching as an adjunct faculty member is also a great way to add to her resume without

all of the other responsibilities as a professor (full-time faculty member). She likes to focus on teaching and her students without having meetings, committees, and research.

Lilly.

Lilly is an example of an adjunct faculty member who has been trying for years to obtain a full-time faculty position. Lilly has taught at over ten different institutions and has taught a variety of modalities. Lilly loves teaching but expressed frustration and disappointment with not being able to obtain a full-time position. Lilly shared stories about applying for full-time positions, not being chosen, and then finding out later that the selected candidate was not kept in the position, though she does not know why that happened. She shared that she has gone above and beyond over and over again (her example of being loyal), but it has not resulted in anything in return. Lilly shared some of the little things that make such a huge difference in her loyalty as an adjunct faculty member. Her list included things such as being invited to participate in meetings and committees, having birthdays acknowledged, and having office space.

Brenda.

Brenda has a master's degree and is getting ready to begin a doctorate. She currently works as an adjunct faculty member and is hoping for a full-time opportunity because she loves teaching. However, for now, she does have a full-time job within the government. She does have past experience working at another university in another role. She shared that she "got the bug for teaching" when she worked at a university before. Brenda enthusiastically described her love for teaching and for her students.

Lois.

Lois has a background in K12 education and currently has her own consulting business within the field of education. Lois became an adjunct faculty member after being approached by someone she knows at a university. She has only worked as an adjunct faculty member for a couple of semesters; her adjunct faculty role is fairly narrow, and she works to mentor students at specific parts of their programs. She started working as an adjunct faculty member when her consulting business was not as busy, and she felt it was a good opportunity to support the profession of K12 education. She emphatically shared that her loyalty is not to the institution, but she feels loyalty to her students and is passionate about improving the field of education. She shared that she feels a responsibility to help prepare students to teach because people helped her on her journey, so this is her way of giving back. Wendy.

Similar to some of my other participants, Wendy started by sharing that she was a nontraditional college student. She has a master's degree and works in the mental health field. Wendy works a full-time job in her field and is in a supervisory role. As a result, she spends a bit of time hiring new employees within her organization. She is really interested in helping people in her field, which is part of her motivation for teaching. Wendy first became an adjunct faculty member when a school she previously attended reached out to her to ask her to teach. She had maintained relationships with people in the program, so when they reached out to her, she was interested in contributing to the success of both the program and the graduates of the program. Since then, she started teaching for another institution. Wendy values and enjoys the relationships she has with her students, and she loves teaching and working with her students, specifically in a face-to-face class.

John.

John has a master's degree in a field in the social sciences. He shared that he is married with two children. He was initially planning to teach in K12 after completing his education. Instead, after completing his master's degree, he started working as an adjunct faculty member. He was under the impression that he would be starting as an adjunct faculty member with the plan that he was on a path to full-time employment. He felt that it was implied that he was going to be under a probationary period and would then evolve into a full-time position. After many years, things did not change, so he began teaching as an adjunct faculty member at a second institution. He feels that he will likely remain an adjunct faculty member forever. He said he used to feel that things would change, but they have not. John says he enjoys teaching and balancing the teaching work with his responsibilities with his family at home. John also shared that part of the appeal of teaching, even as an adjunct faculty member, was to be able to tell people that he is a college professor.

Charlene.

Charlene has a background in a variety of industries and took an opportunity to start teaching as an adjunct faculty member at a small, private school. Given her unique training and skill set, she was able to do this with just an undergraduate degree. After having that opportunity, she obtained a master's degree. She then began teaching as an adjunct faculty member at another school. She mentioned that, in both situations, she felt it was implied that the jobs may lead to a full-time position but "that never happens." She has now taught for a total of three different schools, all of which are quite different from one another. She shared that one of the schools expects way too much out of adjunct faculty members. She shared feeling taken advantage of at that particular school.

Mark.

Mark is an older gentleman with a background teaching high school and working within his religion. He is now mostly retired but does some teaching at a local university. Interestingly, Mark had his first experience teaching higher education decades ago. He teaches classes face-to-face only but uses technology, as needed, to supplement his teaching. He shared how he has learned to record lectures to provide to his students, as needed. Mark's kindness and care for his students was abundantly clear throughout the entire interview. Mark teaches classes that are not directly related to his students' careers. He wants his students to understand that their careers are not their whole lives, and he tries to teach in a way that helps them recognize this distinction. He shared his interest in his students' lives and his wish for them to have a well-rounded educational experience.

Christy.

Christy had a really interesting path to becoming an adjunct faculty member. She started teaching as a sabbatical replacement for a year, and she absolutely loved it. She had intended to take a different career path since she had just completed a master's degree, but the teaching experience changed her plan. That motivated her to start a doctorate. She shared a story about having three children during her doctoral program. After completing her doctorate, she taught as an adjunct faculty member, which worked really well as a balance with raising her children. In addition to teaching, Christy has worked in some other jobs in her field and had some research positions.

Lisa.

Lisa is primarily a stay-at-home mom who teaches at just one institution. She said the schedule is ideal because it allows her to do something she loves and earn a little extra money while still being there for her kids. Lisa loves the people at her institution. She feels they are all working towards the same goal of helping students be successful. She has taught at this school for about eight years. Lisa is now starting to consider her future teaching because she feels like she needs to be earning more money now (her kids are getting more expensive). It is clear that Lisa would like to continue teaching, but she shared that she may need to find additional teaching work or she may need to pursue something different to provide better support towards her family.

Tracy.

Tracy has so much passion for her students and teaching. Tracy decided to teach because of the influence of some of her previous professors. She wanted to be like them and influence her students the way she was influenced in the past. Near the beginning of the interview, Tracy shared that she has tried to obtain full-time teaching positions several times. While she really wanted those jobs, she said it was okay to just be an adjunct instructor. She recognized that the full-time jobs would come with many other responsibilities, commitments, and "extra crap." Tracy went on to tell me some detailed stories about extra initiatives she started at one of the schools where she teaches. She felt the program she created added so much value for the students and community. However, she does not always feel she gets that much support from her colleagues or the school's administration. As our conversation progressed, it was abundantly clear that Tracy is facing tremendous sadness about this, which also connects with the lack of opportunity for full-time work. Tracy shared that teaching is the greatest thing she has ever done but it is starting to wear on her that she does not feel valued. She said she has worked hard to keep those feelings from impacting

her teaching or her students. If it gets to that point, she said she will then need to stop teaching. She was very clear that her quality as an instructor is a priority, and she will not compromise that.

Will.

Will has worked in the automotive field for a number of years. However, he has always been interested in teaching. He has a master's degree and obtained it with a primary motivation to be able to teach. He spent a lot of time trying to find a job teaching but struggled due to his lack of teaching experience. After some time, he obtained a job teaching for a 100% online institution. He has only been teaching for a few semesters and really enjoys it. He has been able to teach a number of different classes and has had the chance to even train some new faculty. He joked that it was similar teaching undergraduate students and the faculty. He has tried to obtain other adjunct faculty jobs but has not had much success. He is unsure of why he cannot find other teaching jobs. He has continued to work full-time in the automotive field while teaching online.

Participant Information

I interviewed a total of fourteen participants in this study. The participants were located across the United States. While I did not ask for or attempt to record specific locations, to maintain confidentiality, the participants were located in three different time zones and at least six different states across the country. The interviews took place between October 2018 and April 2019. The participants were between the ages of 35 and 70. Two were in their 30s, two were in their 40s, 7 were in their 50s, two in their 60s, and one participant was 70. I interviewed three men and eleven women. When recruiting participants, I did not plan any particular age and gender distribution. I did notice that more women contacted me expressing interest. When I observed this, I did not think it was a good idea to change my recruiting strategies in the middle of my study. The

difference between the number of men and women could be considered a limitation and have an impact on the results. I also considered that there may be significantly more women than men who work as adjunct faculty members. However, this is likely not the case based on research done by the Coalition on the Academic Workforce (2012) and AFT Higher Education (2010) who reported approximately that 62% and 48% (respectively) women make up the adjunct or part-time faculty population. Since the data obtained in these two reports is still quite different, I am unable to identify what the actual distribution is between men and women teaching as adjunct faculty members but it is unlikely to be as skewed as my data reflects.

The participants represented a diverse adjunct faculty experience. Four of the participants were relatively new to working as adjunct faculty members (less than two years experience) while the other ten had worked as adjunct faculty members for much longer. Four of the participants had experience with just one institution and the other ten had experience with two or more institutions. While the participants were explicitly requested not to share their institution names in the interviews, many did so when contacting me to express interest in participating. As a result, I do not believe that any more than two of the participants taught at the same institution. Even in the cases where I was aware of two participants teaching at the same institution, one or both participants also teach or have taught at other institutions. In addition, the participants had experience with different types of institutions, including larger state universities, smaller private colleges, technical colleges, community colleges, and for-profit. online colleges. Many of the participants had experience teaching both online and face-to-face while others only have experience in one modality. Some of the participants had taught graduate classes, but the majority have only taught undergraduate students. Several of the participants have also taught high school students involved in dual enrollment or early college programs.

The participants had a variety of educational experiences themselves. Five of the participants have earned doctorates (JD, PhD, and EdD), and the other nine all have at least a master's degree. Some had multiple master's degrees, and at least one identified that they were working on a doctorate. Their disciplines included a wide range of topics, including science, business, communications, and humanities areas. For purposes of confidentiality, I am not sharing specific subjects since that does not appear to have an impact on the information shared during the interviews. I asked the participants to share approximately how many total classes they had taught. Most of the participants were only able to give an approximate answer to this question, so I am unsure on the accuracy. Their answers ranged from six to approximately 400. Four of the participants had taught between six and ten classes. Six of my participants had taught between ten and approximately 100 classes (some of these responses were estimates). The other four participants all provided estimated answers ranging between 150 and 400.

The participants all have unique stories about what they are currently doing in addition to teaching as adjunct faculty members. Two of the participants are primarily stay-at-home parents and teach as adjunct faculty members. One is semi-retired and sees teaching as a way to stay active and give back. Two of the participants have full-time jobs and teach as evening and weekend jobs. The majority of the participants, however, are in positions of piecing together multiple jobs. Some of these people explicitly shared that they needed to have multiple jobs to earn enough money. Some of them are teaching for multiple institutions. Others have different part-time or temporary jobs; consulting and other contract work related to education was most common. Some of the participants expressed the desire to have a full-time position in teaching at a higher education institution. Most, however, did not and were generally satisfied with the adjunct faculty arrangement.

Findings Related to Research Questions

Question 1: How do adjunct faculty experience loyalty towards their institutions?

○ How do adjunct faculty define the concept of loyalty?

○ How do adjunct faculty describe the feeling of loyalty?

○ What types of experiences contribute to the feeling of loyalty?

○ How do feelings of loyalty develop and evolve over time?

Several of the participants were hesitant to claim loyalty towards an institution. A couple refused to use the word loyalty at all, in any way, as it relates to their experience as adjunct faculty members. Some suggested loyalty was linked to the institutions where they previously attended as students. Others had loyalty to the institutions that gave them a chance as new faculty members when they felt they were unprepared or otherwise unqualified to teach. However, for most of these participants, they did not describe much or any loyalty to the institution(s) where they teach.

Even when participants described a lack of loyalty to the institution, we explored what loyalty could look like for them. For some of the participants, loyalty to the institution meant meeting the requirements and doing a good job in their roles as adjuncts. For others, loyalty was equal to going above and beyond. In some cases, this "above and beyond" included taking on extra work without additional pay. For example, committee work, course development work, training, or other project work was asked of the participants. They felt that if they agreed to help with these projects, they were loyal and doing extra work for the greater good of the institution and, ultimately, the students. Interestingly, even when participants described a lack of loyalty to the institution, they also shared stories about doing things such as those described above. Nearly all of the participants shared stories about going above and beyond what was included in their teaching contracts.

A number of the participants reflected on the concept that loyalty is or should be a two-way street. They felt that loyalty was expected of them (as adjuncts, by the institutions) but the institutions had no loyalty to them. For example, one participant said, "They don't have any loyalty to us. They want us to be completely, 100% loyal." Another participant shared that "adjunct teaching almost by definition requires almost no loyalty on either side." This participant went on to say (later in the interview), "There must be loyalty on both sides for it to be healthy. Healthy relationships require both sides." Interestingly, even when participants described a lack of loyalty to the institutions, they also shared stories about doing things consistent with their descriptions of being loyal.

This experience evolved for some of the participants over time. For example, one of the participants explained that he was loyal until he felt it was not reciprocated. He continued to teach and had no bad feelings about the institution, but the sense of loyalty had definitely changed. A number of other participants shared similar experiences. They appeared to think the loyalty was naturally there for them, as adjunct faculty members, until they recognized the apparent lack of loyalty from the institutions. Depending on the situation, the loyalty may have lessened slightly or gone away completely. However, loyalty appeared to be a natural, "initial" feeling for many of the participants.

When I asked one participant about an experience where he felt loyal, he responded with "loyal, that is an interesting phrase." He went on to share many positive examples about his experiences at his institution. He appeared to be content, comfortable, and have good feelings about his institution, students, and his experience there. Upon follow up, he responded by saying, "How would I know I am loyal? Other than a vague feeling." He then shared many other positive things about his experiences, along with some less positive experiences he has heard about from

others. At that point, he followed up with the concept of loyalty by explaining, similar to what several other participants shared, that the institutions have no loyalty to their adjunct faculty, and it should go both ways.

Question 2: Are there common themes that emerge from the experiences of adjunct faculty who identify themselves as loyal or disloyal to their institutions?

Themes were identified based on a consistent pattern from multiple participants. While I did not create a definitive threshold for identifying something as a theme, each of the four themes occurred in the conversations with at least six of the fourteen participants. Two of the four themes occurred in conversations with all fourteen participants.

Theme 1: Loyalty as connection and sense of belonging.

Every single participant discussed the value of connections and relationships in their adjunct faculty experiences. They all shared about a relationship with their supervisors, other adjunct faculty, and other staff and faculty. These connections were one of the most important things for most participants, and several discussed loyalty to a person at the institution - frequently a dean, department head, or other administrator for a program. These relationships were a huge driver for the participants to continue to teach, even when other factors may not be overly positive.

Many participants referenced how important it was for them to feel connected and have opportunities to contribute in ways other than only teaching. I had participants discuss being involved in committees and developing courses. They shared that they had a lot to contribute and wanted to have the opportunity to do so. Those who did not have these types of connections expressed an interest in wanting them. Most participants suggested an interest in being useful, contributing their skills and knowledge, and working in a collaborative environment.

Theme 2: Loyalty to students.

Each and every participant was enthusiastic about their loyalty or connection or love for their students. The participants strongly suggested that they care deeply about their students and love the experience of teaching and connecting with students. Some participants even referenced teaching as being a highlight of their career or their life. For example, one participant said, "Teaching has been the greatest thing I have ever done… Teaching, I love it. It is the best thing I have ever done." Her comments were full of emotion reflecting how incredibly deep these feelings are.

This loyalty to students also extended to having a deep level of care and concern for their students' experiences with the institutions. A couple of the participants have had experiences with institutions with accreditation issues or other issues that reflect not treating students appropriately (for example, taking advantage of students or possibly misusing financial aid funding). The participants shared that they were not teaching for these institutions any longer because of their own ethics and care about the students. While it does not appear as though they did anything further about bad situations (though I did not specifically go down that path of questions), the participants made it very clear that they needed to trust the ethics of the institutions for which they were teaching.

This interest in the student experience also extended to the way institutions managed faculty. One participant shared about an experience teaching for a school where their teaching was micromanaged to an extent that they were actually not able to really teach. They were monitored for activities like frequency of log ins, posts on discussion forums, and other activities. Both ensuring all of the standards were met and tracking the activities was extremely tedious and time consuming. Unfortunately, these activities took away from the time and effort needed to

really engage with and teach the students. This participant shared that this institution paid extremely well compared to any other experience. However, the expectations and lack of ability to actually teach well led her to leave that position, despite the higher compensation. She reflected that while the better pay was nice, she was unable to teach well in that environment.

A couple of the participants did reference liking being called "professor" even without a doctorate. They admitted that their egos liked the positions even if they were "only" adjuncts. One also reflected on enjoying having "control" of a classroom and enjoying the environment of being able to lead classes. Many participants shared a positive feeling about sharing their knowledge and experience with students. They felt strongly about the future success of their students, both in school and in their lives beyond school.

Theme 3: Loyalty to profession or discipline.

Several of the participants discussed an interesting concept about feeling loyal to their profession or their discipline. Two of the participants (in different fields) discussed an interest in preparing students to be successful future employees in their fields. This interest came from an interest in being able to hopefully hire better employees or an interest in continuing a profession that they feel very passionate about. Both of these participants shared very specific details about how they work to teach their students about the profession and teach them both the knowledge and skills they need to be successful.

Other participants shared their passion for and loyalty to their disciplines and how important it was to share that with their students. Three different participants expressed gratitude for their institutions for offering their disciplines to the students, especially when the classes were not directly related to the majors or programs. The participants felt strongly about their classes and the content and were thrilled to have the opportunity to share their passion and knowledge

with their students. Some participants were especially happy to teach classes that were electives, which meant a number of their students were also interested in the classes.

Theme 4: What adjunct faculty want - surprise - is not more money (though that matters, too).

While most of the participants expressed an interest in more money, their stories very clearly reflected that money is not the most important thing. Several said that as long as the pay is competitive or "good enough", it does not really matter. Another said that compensation should be "appropriate" but distinguished that it should not be as much as what full-time faculty make. One participant reflected on the pay for adjunct teaching, given a situation where the money was not an important factor for her personal situation. She shared a feeling of guilt about continuing to teach. She said, "I feel like I am propping up an immoral system by continuing to accept this job." She went on to share that she understands how important the money is for other adjunct faculty. She felt that her willingness to teach for the pay was hurting others who were struggling financially.

Many of the participants said it is important for the institution to demonstrate that they value, respect, and appreciate their faculty. This can be done in a number of ways, and many emphasized (again) that it is not about the money. They shared that there are other ways to show this respect and appreciation, including other financial incentives (benefits, stipends for participation), training and development opportunities, being included in meetings, committees, and decision-making processes, or recognition of birthdays, anniversaries, and holidays. A couple of the participants commented on how their institutions recognized birthdays, anniversaries, and holidays for "regular" employees and faculty but not for adjunct faculty. They shared that it could be as simple as a birthday card, small holiday gift card, or acknowledgement on an anniversary of

employment. While there is a cost to these types of initiatives, the participants emphasized that it is not about the money.

One of the participants also suggested a pathway for adjunct faculty that would allow them to have their professional development "count" towards their development as an adjunct faculty member. There could also be professional development and training available for adjunct faculty, and this, combined with teaching, could allow longer-term adjunct faculty to earn some sort of credential or recognition. This could be linked to a small increase in compensation, but the participants suggested that the training opportunities, support, and recognition are actually the more important parts.

For the majority of the participants, the community, connections, relationships, and sense of belonging appeared to be the most important things for them. The participants suggested that these connections led to both a sense of loyalty and also to their satisfaction in the job.

The participants also discussed how important it was to have a good experience with their students. They did not seem to care about having academically strong students but rather an enjoyment with the students and working with them. The personal connections with students made a huge difference in the happiness and loyalty experienced by the participants. These personal connections were discussed both with face-to-face classes and online teaching. In fact, the participants who teach exclusively online expressed even more about the personal connections with students than those who taught in a classroom.

In addition, a number of the participants expressed the importance of having the necessary knowledge and resources to help their students. This included being able to support students with their academic experiences and having the knowledge to either answer questions or know where to direct the students for additional information. Several participants expressed concern with being

"only an adjunct," which led to being out of the loop, which could have been considered a disservice to their students.

Methodology Findings - Using Intuitive Empathic Exploration

Developing a methodology to use for this dissertation was a critical key for me to focus and align my research based on my research questions. Upon developing and describing Intuitive Empathic Exploration, I had a clear and consistent framework to use in my interactions with both the participants and later with my data. Before each interview, I took some time to briefly review and position myself in the concepts of Intuitive Empathic Exploration. I did the same thing in advance of and while reviewing my data. Since my interviews were all recorded (audio and video), I was able to listen to and watch these interviews a number of times. At times, I just listened and absorbed the data. I was able to listen to and think about my data through the framework of Intuitive Empathic Exploration. Other times, I went through my data and took extensive, nearly transcription quality, notes for each interview. I did not directly transcribe each interview completely since I was looking at the data more holistically with a goal of identifying themes. This method for analyzing my data worked really well for me. It was time-consuming to review the data but also provided a richer experience beyond "coding" or focusing on the words alone. I was able to listen to the words, study body language (for most participants), and listen for inflection and emotion.

Since I work with adjunct faculty in my position at a university, using Intuitive Empathic Exploration was a helpful tool in separating my research from my work. That being said, I am the same person, so they could never be truly separate. However, interviewing the participants and experiencing the data through the framework of my methodology allowed me to consistently think through this perspective with every single interaction with the participants and with my data.

It is also important to discuss that Intuitive Empathic Exploration was a natural way to conduct these interviews and think with my data. I am uncertain if this would translate to another researcher or research project. However, I am hopeful that it could be useful for others, and I would be very interested in seeing how it can be applied to other research projects in the future.

The interactions with the participants were interesting and quite deep, especially considering we were connecting over technology. The majority of the participants were extremely engaged and maintained focus throughout the interviews. Because of the use of videoconferencing, I was able to get a glimpse into the participants' homes and lives. The majority of the participants met with me from their homes, so I was able to see home offices, kitchens, and living rooms. I was able to hear or meet several pets (dogs and cats) through the interviews. I was also able to see or meet three spouses and one teenage child. This increased connection seemed to help the conversations be quite personal and comfortable. Two of the participants displayed obvious emotion through the interviews when talking about particularly sensitive topics.

Conclusion

This chapter discussed the results of my research regarding adjunct faculty loyalty. The participants each shared a unique perspective regarding their experiences as adjunct faculty members and their reflections on the experience of being loyal or not loyal. The results reflected some common themes with adjunct faculty; however, there were also a number of unique stories about adjunct faculty experiences. Using Intuitive Empathic Exploration provided an opportunity to learn a tremendous amount about the participants and their experiences.

CHAPTER FIVE - DISCUSSION & RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

In this chapter, I will explore the concept of loyalty for adjunct faculty members and how this impacts the adjunct faculty and higher education. I will look at connections between my results and the theories I explored in Chapter Two along with some of the previous research conducted on loyalty and related concepts. Next, I will offer some recommendations for supervisors and administrators within higher education. I will provide some areas of focus and recommendations for those who hire, supervise, or support adjunct faculty. Finally, I will explore using a new methodology for research, along with discussion based on my experiences using Intuitive Empathic Exploration and how I would recommend it be used in the future.

The Meaning of Loyalty for Adjunct Faculty

Prior to conducting these interviews, I was thinking about organizational loyalty in a couple of ways. First, I expected that loyalty was related to intrinsic, positive feelings towards the organization along with an interest in staying connected to the organization. Second, I saw loyalty as an experience of trust and on-going commitment to the organization. This conceptualization was my own based on the research and reading I had done regarding the topics of loyalty and other similar topics related to organizational commitment and behavior (Cook & Wall, 1980; Coughlan, 2005; Cusack, 2009; Eskildsen & Nussler, 2000; Guillon & Cezanne, 2014; Niehoff, Moorman, Blakely, & Fuller, 2001; Reichheld, 2001).

When conducting these interviews, the reactions to the concept of loyalty were quite diverse. Loyalty seems to fairly consistently point to a two-way commitment between the adjunct faculty member and the institution (or representatives of the institution). While it often appeared

as though loyalty existed immediately after an adjunct faculty member was hired, it disappeared quickly unless a more sustained loyalty was earned, and this was related to trust between the adjunct faculty member and the people at the institution. This idea about loyalty being earned is consistent with the work of Reichheld (2001) who describes how trust is an important element in the development and maintenance of loyalty. This commitment is longer-term and may imply an increased future relationship between the adjunct faculty member and the institution.

When considering my previous working conceptualization of organizational loyalty, I realized that I missed the major point about including a two-way commitment. While the institutions typically cannot actually have loyalty to adjunct faculty members due to the nature of adjunct faculty work, adjunct faculty members can get this perception based on the relationships they have with supervisors or other administrators. Whether actual loyalty for adjunct faculty members exists or not, this perception impacts their own feelings of loyalty. It appears as though many adjunct faculty members begin with loyalty, which could be linked to personality or other factors. However, that loyalty can only be maintained and strengthened with building trust and the perception of loyalty in return.

After completing this research, I believe my previous understanding of loyalty as it relates to adjunct faculty is accurate but incomplete. Loyalty does include a positive, intrinsic feeling and an interest in remaining long-term at an organization. I would add to this description that loyalty also involves a trusting relationship and a perception of loyalty from the organization or the other individuals at the organization.

Importance of Loyalty to Adjunct Faculty

It seems to me that loyalty is important, to some degree, for most of the adjunct faculty. I think the level of importance for this loyalty is somewhat dependent on the adjunct faculty

member's personality, motivations to be an adjunct faculty member, and other factors in their life. For example, an adjunct faculty member who only works as an adjunct faculty member may feel that loyalty is very important. On the other hand, an adjunct faculty member who works a full-time job in their industry and teaches one class at a time may feel that loyalty is less meaningful. This tendency is a generalization and does not appear to apply consistently to everyone. The circumstances surrounding an adjunct faculty member's employment are nearly as unique as each adjunct faculty member. As a result, the importance of loyalty to each adjunct faculty member varies greatly and would be challenging to accurately predict based on circumstances and personality only.

One dynamic that makes this question difficult is that loyalty does not appear to have a consistent meaning for all people. The meanings that do exist also overlap with other concepts that also have varying levels of importance for adjunct faculty members. It is hard to think about adjunct faculty loyalty without considering concepts such as job satisfaction, job security, commitment, relationships with others, and support within the job. Even if we were able to consistently define loyalty, it could not exist in isolation without considering those other concepts at the same time.

Importance of Adjunct Faculty Loyalty to Higher Education Institutions

While many higher education institutions rely on adjunct faculty members to teach, this reliance does vary for different institutions (ATF Higher Education, 2010). As a result, the importance of loyalty from adjunct faculty members likely depends on the institution. In an ideal world, I think it should be important and probably is, at least to some extent, for most institutions. I think institutions should want and strive for having a loyal adjunct faculty population. However, that does take work on the part of the institution - both to develop loyalty and to maintain it. This

work needed has a cost associated - time, money, and resources. Since having adjunct faculty is a necessity for most institutions at this point, I would argue that having loyal adjunct faculty is important.

Loyalty Development and Maintenance

It seems that, for the most part, loyalty on the part of adjunct faculty members arises fairly naturally when starting in the role as an adjunct faculty member. The adjunct faculty member may begin with a feeling of loyalty because of a previous affiliation or affinity for the institution (either from an impression in the community, being an alumnus of the university, or having an appreciation for the education students receive from the institution). Good initial relationships with colleagues and supervisors can further secure this experience of loyalty. However, similar to how it seems to occur with other types of employees, adjunct faculty members tend to continue to be loyal until something happens (or a series of things happen), and once loyalty is lost, it does not reappear.

Lack of Loyalty or Disloyalty

Based on my research, it appears that there is a subset of adjunct faculty members who do not identify as either loyal or disloyal. It is unclear if this is simply a difference in terminology or a common understanding of the term, but I would like to suggest that there are some adjunct faculty members who are satisfied and extremely committed to their work but not necessarily loyal. While I would advocate that loyalty is still a good goal to strive for (as an institution), it is also acceptable to have adjunct faculty members who are neither loyal nor disloyal. In these cases, as long as the adjunct faculty member is satisfied and committed, there is nothing inherently wrong. These adjunct faculty members may be less likely to take on additional work and may be more likely to

leave for another opportunity, but those are risks always present with the adjunct faculty model. An absence of loyalty does not seem to imply a lack of commitment or any issue with faculty quality. However, the negative feeling that comes with disloyalty could be (and likely is) a potential problem.

Connections to Theory

Adjunct faculty loyalty and systems theory.

Higher education is a big system that is part of the system of society. Within each institution of higher education, there are smaller subsystems. Adjunct faculty play a part in several subsystems within higher education. They certainly play a role in many courses offered at an institution. They also play a role in different departments and how the people in each department relate to one another. In some cases, one might argue that adjunct faculty are not as much a part of that system as full-time faculty. However, that might vary depending on the institution and the proportion of adjunct faculty to full-time (or some other classification) of faculty.

Since each subsystem and each aspect of the subsystem has an impact on the greater system, when thinking about adjunct faculty, we should always be aware of how they can impact the entire institution (Pershing, 2006). When considering loyalty, if it is determined to be an important quality for adjunct faculty, it can be assumed that having or not having loyalty will have a great impact at the institution.

Adjunct faculty loyalty and Herzberg's two-factor theory and positive psychology.

Herzberg's work focuses on satisfaction and dissatisfaction in the workplace (Herzberg, 1968). While satisfaction and loyalty are clearly not the same thing, they seem to be related. It

seems as though loyalty and disloyalty are also related to one another in a similar way as satisfaction and dissatisfaction. I would argue that loyalty and disloyalty are also not direct opposites. There are things that happen that seem to lead to loyalty (relationships and the feeling that loyalty is reciprocated, for example), and there are other things that could prevent disloyalty (the experience of being valued and treated fairly, for example). However, the lack of loyalty does not necessarily mean that disloyalty exists. In fact, based on this research project, it is possible that the lack of loyalty and disloyalty is just as common as having either loyalty or disloyalty.

Another similarity between Herzberg's work and this discussion on adjunct faculty loyalty is related to compensation. According to Sachau (2007), fair compensation does not lead to satisfaction, but it can prevent dissatisfaction. Based on my interviews, it seems as though fair compensation for adjunct faculty members does not help build loyalty, but it can help to prevent disloyalty. While compensation came up as a topic in every interview, none of the participants implied a link between compensation and loyalty. It seems as though appropriate compensation is a necessity for adjunct faculty members, but it does not have any impact on creating either satisfaction or loyalty.

Adjunct faculty loyalty and organizational commitment.

The three-component model of organizational commitment presented by Allen and Meyer (1990) contains components that also appear to be related to adjunct faculty loyalty. For example, it seems as though personal characteristics are related to loyalty, just as they are related to commitment. In addition, other things that happen within the organization can impact both commitment and loyalty. Based on conversations with the participants, it is possible that some considered loyalty to be the same or very similar to organizational commitment. Since I did not specifically share a definition of loyalty (intentionally) and did not share about the concept of

organizational commitment, there is no way to know for sure. However, these two concepts are ones that could be considered in the future.

Adjunct faculty loyalty and psychological contracts.

One thing that appeared to have a role in the adjunct faculty experience was expectations. Some of the participants referenced an expectation that they were on a path to a full-time opportunity while working (and being loyal) as an adjunct faculty member. For some of these people, they had the perception that this was implied in working with colleagues or supervisors at their institution. They referenced some period of time (months or even years) when they were extremely focused on being loyal, going above and beyond, and doing everything possible to clear this path to full-time employment. At some point in time, for each of these people, something happened to change this. In some cases, they applied for numerous full-time positions only to be turned down. In other cases, nothing became available, and they were given a new message (directly or indirectly, explicitly or implied) that full-time opportunities were just not there. At this point, the experience of loyalty tends to change drastically. It is unclear if this change in loyalty impacts the adjunct faculty member's actual performance, but their feelings towards the institutions definitely shift. In most cases, they continue to work for the institution but the enthusiasm to go above and beyond is typically gone. They appear to have gone from loyal to defeated, and it is quite possible that impacts performance even if it is subtle.

Adjunct faculty loyalty and give and take theory.

When considering Grant's work with givers, takers, and matchers (2013), it seems that those who work as adjunct faculty tend towards being givers. Many of those who appear most loyal and content in their work as adjunct faculty members find the intrinsic value in sharing their

knowledge, helping students (or future professionals in their industry), and supporting the educational system. Those who are more interested in the extra income, relying on being an adjunct faculty member for the income, or using the job as a way to potentially get a full-time job, are more focused on what they will get and are less likely to be content or feel loyalty to their institution (or students). Based on conversations with the participants, most people do not quite fit either of these extremes, but it does appear as though adjunct faculty loyalty is somewhat connected to Grant's work on givers and takers (2013).

Adjunct faculty loyalty and Maslow's hierarchy of needs.

Based on conversations with the participants, their experiences of "needs" are absolutely consistent with Maslow's hierarchy of needs. What is interesting with adjunct faculty is that they are potentially fulfilling these needs in different places. If they have a full-time job and their adjunct faculty work is not their primary work, they may have their needs met (or mostly met) at their full-time jobs. That impacts the importance of their needs as adjunct faculty members, though it is possible, and unclear in the context of this research, that these "needs" could and should preferably be fulfilled in every job a person has, even if a person holds multiple jobs at the same time.

On the other hand, some adjunct faculty members expressed the importance of nearly every level of need based on Stum's work (2001). Most of the participants consistently referenced the concern over inconsistent work. This was more of an issue for those participants who were relying on their adjunct faculty work to pay the bills. All of the participants discussed the importance of relationships and communication. The relationships consistently appeared as an important factor in loyalty and satisfaction. In addition, most of the participants wanted the opportunity to learn more - whether it be through training, collaborating, mentorship, or feedback.

Adjunct faculty loyalty and Hirschman's Theory.

Hirschman's Theory is related to how employees respond to difficult situations in the workplace (Hirschman, 2007). When difficult or dissatisfying situations arise, employees have a choice of how they respond. In the case of adjunct faculty members, if they are dissatisfied, they have a choice to leave, try to resolve and better the situation, or just put up with the situation or dissatisfaction. If adjunct faculty members are more loyal, it seems they would be more likely to attempt to resolve or better the situation. However, even if they are more loyal, a difficult situation or dissatisfaction may lead to a lack of loyalty even if they choose not to leave the job.

Connections to Prior Research

As I described in Chapter Two, there has been some prior research on the topic of adjunct faculty loyalty and related concepts. However, since this is an area that appears to be meaningful due to the large number of adjunct faculty members in higher education and one that has not been extensively explored, it was important to look at it further.

One recent study was a quantitative study that looked at both job satisfaction and loyalty among adjunct faculty in Christian higher education. One of the weaknesses identified in this study was that the quantitative methodology lacked an opportunity to explore the concepts further. This researcher did find some factors that contribute to job satisfaction and loyalty that are fairly consistent with my themes. First, the researcher found that there was a strong relationship between job satisfaction and loyalty (Couch, 2014). While I was not explicitly looking at job satisfaction, the conversations I had lead me to believe these two things are likely related. Using a regression model, this researcher found the following factors are predictive of loyalty: recognition, quality of students, work preference, teaching schedule, and compensation (Couch, 2014). Based on my

research, along with the work of Herzberg, I do not agree that compensation is a predictor of loyalty (Herzberg, 1968). It appears as though compensation is important and necessary to prevent disloyalty or dissatisfaction but is not a predictor of either satisfaction or loyalty. However, my themes of connections and loyalty to students are likely consistent with the findings in this study as they relate to recognition and quality of students (Couch, 2014). While my findings were not specific to the quality of students, it was clear that the participants were committed to the relationships they had with students.

In another recent study, adjunct faculty loyalty was explored with online nursing faculty. This study was qualitative and was based on phenomenology. One of the themes of this study was compensation, which included pay, benefits, and flexibility. In this study, while the theme of compensation is one that appears to be a consideration for the participants, it also does not appear to be a strong contributing factor to loyalty (Shannon, 2011). Another theme in this study was related to administrative support. While connections were not specifically addressed, it, appeared as though the administrative support was, at least in part, about having a connection as I found with my participants (Shannon, 2011).

Himmelberg (2011) conducted another research study regarding nursing adjunct faculty. However, in this case, the focus was on novice adjunct faculty members. One of the major topics was regarding the development of relationships. The researcher found that novice adjunct faculty members often felt isolated or separate from the campus community. She found that the development of relationships and having strong support was important to the satisfaction of the adjunct faculty members (Himmelberg, 2011). This is consistent with what the participants in my research shared regarding connections and relationships.

In another qualitative study, job satisfaction was explored for online adjunct faculty. While job satisfaction and loyalty are not the same, the themes may be similar since the concepts are related. This research also linked compensation with satisfaction, though it is unclear if it is truly a predictor of satisfaction. Additionally, this research talked about the satisfaction that online adjunct faculty get from their students and the relationships they have with students (Hensley, 2015). While this study does not specifically address the concept of loyalty, the concept is mentioned numerous times and appears to be considered another term for satisfaction (Hensley, 2015).

Another recent study looked at adjunct faculty at for-profit institutions. This study considered a variety of aspects of adjunct faculty and their experiences at their institutions, including loyalty (Pyram, 2016). One finding of this study was that participants were generally satisfied with their compensation. This is consistent with what I found with some of my participants. In general, while compensation was not unimportant, it was not generally connected with loyalty. Many of my participants also felt the compensation was acceptable. In addition, this study also identified that adjunct faculty experience loyalty towards their students (Pyram, 2016). This is also consistent with what I found in my research. The adjunct faculty I interviewed care deeply about their students, and many stated that their loyalty is with their students.

The Role of Adjunct Faculty Members

It is abundantly clear that adjunct faculty are necessary for higher education. As discussed earlier, adjunct faculty provide more options for varying enrollment and specialized knowledge (Charlier & Williams, 2011). While the cost of adjunct faculty can be much lower, I would advocate for providing fair compensation, excellent training, and support for adjunct faculty. This makes the cost greater but the benefit to the institutions is worth it. It is possible that the increased

cost required to ensure good conditions for adjunct faculty members is more cost effective than the cost of increased turnover among adjunct faculty members and the potential risk to student retention and satisfaction.

Adjunct faculty need to feel valued in order to experience loyalty. This experience is not tied to compensation although compensation needs to be sufficient. Instead, adjunct faculty should be considered important members of the university community and treated as such. Adjunct faculty members come to an institution with a wealth of knowledge and experience. Many adjunct faculty members could be interested in other contributions to the institution in addition to teaching.

Recommendations for Academic Leadership at Higher Education Institutions

Higher education institutions need to ensure that education is a priority. While this may seem obvious, that is not always the reality. Many institutions prioritize other activities, like research, athletics, or innovation. If education is a priority, supporting everyone involved with the teaching and learning process should also be a priority. There needs to be the infrastructure, staff, and budget to make adjunct faculty compensation and support a priority.

One participant shared that adjunct teaching, almost by definition, does not require loyalty on either side. That is what the adjunct faculty model is all about. Other participants reflected similar thoughts. Perhaps institutions and administrators need to pick an adjunct faculty model, assuming there are two (which in reality, there are likely many, with these being simplified extremes). On the one hand, there is the "no loyalty" model. Adjunct faculty are hired on a class-by-class basis with no expectation of future work. Adjunct faculty can hop around, teach the classes they want, and walk away when they want. The institution is under no obligation to do anything for the adjunct faculty member other than provide the minimum needed for them to teach. On the other hand, institutions can choose to develop a loyalty model. This model takes more time

and money but will result in happier faculty, a more consistent adjunct faculty base, and, arguably, more satisfied students. With this model, adjunct faculty are considered part of the community at the institution. They are invited and included in trainings, meetings, committees, projects, and other opportunities. These activities are compensated with a stipend or other compensation that sends the message that their contribution is both welcome and valued. When possible, adjunct faculty have opportunities for longer term contracts or agreements that give them some guarantee of work. Adjunct faculty have dedicated space on campus, resources, and support to be successful in their teaching. They are celebrated in ways that other employees are - whether that be birthday recognitions, holiday celebrations, or academic year kick-off barbeques or picnics. There are activities and functions set up to encourage relationships among adjunct faculty and with other staff, faculty, and administrators.

From the perspective of adjunct faculty supervision, oversight, guidance, feedback, and "control," it seems the majority of the participants want to know that they have the support and involvement of their administrators. There are variations of what is preferred with this, though. This variation may be partly due to the fact that the participants' experiences vary greatly without knowledge or exposure to all options. They also want feedback and guidance on their teaching. I did not hear consistent preferences as far as faculty wanting to be given completely developed courses or to have the opportunity to build and create their own classes from scratch. However, the participants have had a wide variety of experiences in this area, and many have only experienced a limited range of options. The biggest and most important comment I heard was the interest in having support with whatever they need. This includes technical support, instructional design support, feedback on a syllabus, and guidance on assessment.

Recommendations for Adjunct Faculty Supervisors

Those who supervise and work to support adjunct faculty need to identify a system that works best for their institution. While it is important to have processes that support all employees, the adjunct faculty population is a little unique due to the nature of their employment (Lyons, 2007). All activities should be developed with the intention of hiring, preparing, and supporting adjunct faculty with the goal of providing both an excellent learning environment for students and a good working environment for the adjunct faculty members.

First, I would recommend creating a clear adjunct faculty hiring process. It is important to have a strategy to recruit qualified adjunct faculty members. In addition, it is important to have a strategy for both interviewing and selection criteria. The interview is often the first opportunity for the candidate to interact with the institution. It is just as important for the institution and interviewers to leave the candidate with a good impression as it is for the candidate to impress the interviewers. This is a first opportunity to create loyalty and set expectations for employment. In this research, a few participants referenced getting the sense that becoming an adjunct faculty member would lead to full-time employment. They shared that they got this impression either during the interview or in very early conversations with supervisors. If that is a true plan and pathway, that is fine to share. If it is not, or if it is extremely rare, it is helpful to be up front with that information.

Once adjunct faculty have been hired, it is helpful to have a robust and supportive onboarding process (Lyons, 2007). Since adjunct faculty are working directly with students, it is important to ensure they are prepared to be successful. This preparation includes providing them access to university systems, resources, textbooks, and learning management systems. It also includes providing guidance regarding processes, expectations, and giving adjunct faculty the

appropriate context for their courses. Adjunct faculty should understand how their courses fit into the curriculum. They should also have an opportunity to learn about the culture and values of their institution. This onboarding process can be conducted in a number of ways. There could be online training and resources to support face-to-face or synchronous training sessions. It is important to provide opportunities that are convenient and accessible for adjunct faculty who may have a number of competing priorities, including other jobs.

Institutions need to consider and plan their strategy and process for supporting their adjunct faculty. This would likely be similar to how they support full-time faculty, but there may be adjustments based on adjunct faculty employment circumstances (especially if the adjunct faculty are 100% remote or spend very limited time on campus). This support system needs to address several different types of needs, including student-related concerns, technology challenges, and support to improve instructional strategies. Ideally, considering the wide variety of questions an adjunct faculty member could have, they should have individuals they can contact easily for help and support (as opposed to an impersonal call center, helpdesk, etc.). While they should be provided resources and easy-to-access information, they should also have people they can contact in order to discuss concerns and questions.

While most institutions have processes for evaluating their regular employees and full-time faculty members, it appeared from my research that fewer have clear processes for evaluating their adjunct faculty members. Adjunct faculty members should be given clear expectations and understand how they will be evaluated. An evaluation process can include a number of different pieces, including self-evaluations, teaching observations, online course audits, and peer evaluations. Ideally, an evaluation process will include a combination of strategies and opportunities for improvement. In addition to the evaluation process, there should be opportunities

and pathways to adjunct faculty training and development. This includes opportunities for adjunct faculty to learn about the institution and connect with colleagues. Adjunct faculty should also be encouraged to continue to learn about their own field along with learning and developing their teaching methods. There are a number of ways to implement training and development initiatives. The institution can offer training opportunities, either online or face-to-face, with incentives for adjunct faculty who participate. The institution can also provide incentives for adjunct faculty members who pursue training and development opportunities on their own. Incentives can include stipends or pay increases but there are other methods, as well. Adjunct faculty members who reach certain milestones could be given a different title, opportunities for teaching more classes, or other types of incentives.

It is also important for institutions to consider what benefits they can offer to their adjunct faculty members. Based on my research, benefits for adjunct faculty can range from health insurance and retirement plans to nothing at all. The financial implications of benefits can become unmanageable for some institutions, so it is important to consider what is realistic. There are creative opportunities that can be very inexpensive but meaningful to adjunct faculty members. For example, adjunct faculty can be given access to university sporting events, other activities, or facilities (perhaps gyms or other workout facilities). Adjunct faculty can be given tuition grant opportunities for themselves or family members. There could also be institutions that allow adjunct faculty to participate in larger benefit packages, including health insurance and retirement accounts, even if the cost is different from other full-time staff and faculty.

Finally, there are tremendous opportunities for having adjunct faculty involved in an institution. This is something that institutions should consider, and I would recommend providing opportunities for adjunct faculty to be as involved as possible. Adjunct faculty come with

tremendous knowledge and experience, and it is advantageous for institutions to involve them as much as possible. At a minimum, institutions should extend an invitation for adjunct faculty to attend meetings, trainings, strategic planning, and other academic-related projects. If possible, there should be a specific strategy for including adjunct faculty and appropriate compensation for their time.

Recommendations for Future Exploration

There are many opportunities to further explore the topic of adjunct faculty loyalty and other related topics.

Further exploration of the definition of loyalty, especially as it relates to adjunct faculty, could provide some additional clarity. This could be expanded to an exploration of loyalty in higher education, but adjunct faculty should be considered separately since their employment situation is different from full-time faculty and other staff and administrators. It would be helpful to replicate my study with a greater number of participants to further identify how adjunct faculty relate to the concept of loyalty. It could also be helpful to consider other concepts related to loyalty, such as commitment, trust, and satisfaction. In my interviews with participants, it was clear that every person considers these concepts differently and may even interchange certain concepts. This is not necessarily a problem, but I would be very interested in learning more about how adjunct faculty feel about all of these concepts as they relate to their employment and journey as adjunct faculty members.

As part of an expanded study, it would be helpful to look at further exploration of how loyalty develops and changes over time. It would also be useful to consider how different types of adjunct faculty members perceive loyalty. For example, I would be interested in learning more about the unique experiences of adjunct faculty who teach in addition to working another full-job

and see how that compares with "full-time" adjunct faculty members, those who are using adjunct faculty work as a potential stepping stone to full-time faculty work, and those who are intentionally teaching part-time in retirement (or while raising children). While I would anticipate a different experience for each of these groups, I am curious to see how consistent the experience is within each group. I would anticipate still seeing a lot of variation, but that may not be the case.

In higher education, student retention is often an important priority. This is a factor for accreditation and funding opportunities and is an important consideration for marketing and admissions. It could be useful to consider how student retention is impacted by adjunct faculty loyalty. There could be many aspects to this type of research, and it would need to be a larger-scale study. It would be helpful to first look at the impact of adjunct faculty (rather than full-time faculty) on student retention. Then, it would be helpful to consider how or if adjunct faculty loyalty impacts retention. In considering this type of research, it is hard to identify what this study would even look like, however, I would certainly recommend it to be considered.

I am also interested in further exploration regarding the ideal conditions for an adjunct faculty member. It is important to consider if all adjunct faculty members even want the same things. There could be variation based on adjunct faculty types and their goals as adjunct faculty members. There could also be variation based on personality and other individual factors for each adjunct faculty member. I would anticipate there being some common practices that would create a good environment for adjunct faculty. However, I would also anticipate a bit of variation.

Reflections on Creating and Using a New Methodology

In this dissertation, I made a decision to develop a new methodology for use in my research. I originally did this because I had a clear and specific vision for my research and what was appropriate for my research questions. Prior to learning that this was even an option, I spent

months researching different qualitative methodologies. I learned about several different methodologies but I also learned that none of them (even adapted) would work for my research. I briefly considered attempting to conduct general qualitative research without identifying a specific methodology. While this may have been an acceptable option, I did not feel it was appropriate for my research. I wanted to ensure a high-quality study, and I thought it was important to have clearly defined plans for my research.

As researchers consider future research, especially within the qualitative tradition, I would highly recommend using or creating methodology that works for the research questions and/or goals. I would first recommend studying what has already been created because it would be better to use an existing methodology but only if it works and fits. If nothing exists, I believe the additional work involved in creating something new is worth the investment to have quality results. That being said, there is some risk in developing new methodologies. There could be disagreements among researchers regarding the quality of the results. However, this risk seems to be worth taking.

Recommendations for Intuitive Empathic Exploration in the Future

The criteria I created for Intuitive Empathic Exploration provided a helpful framework for my research. While there was some flexibility, having a defined methodology helped me to be consistent in my interview strategy and in my analysis of the data. I would be interested in seeing how other researchers could apply this methodology in the future.

While I have shared Intuitive Empathic Exploration with a number of colleagues, I think it would be helpful to obtain feedback more broadly from researchers across different disciplines. In addition, I would like to see how other researchers might apply it to their own projects.

At this point, I do not see an objective way to determine the success or failure of Intuitive Empathic Exploration. Like many qualitative methodologies, Intuitive Empathic Exploration has guidelines and is also created for certain types of research. It is up to the researcher to apply it and determine its effectiveness in their own unique situation.

Intuitive Empathic Exploration was developed for the use in one research project, but I also created it with the intention that it could apply to other research. I would recommend this methodology for researchers in the fields of business, education, psychology, and other related fields. Intuitive Empathic Exploration is appropriate for researchers interested in rich, qualitative data. It is especially useful for researchers who already have experience (beyond research) in the area. Intuitive Empathic Exploration was created with the intention of allowing researchers to use their experience but also provide a consistent framework for considering data.

Discussion of Intuitive Empathic Exploration Guiding Principles

The following guiding principles were developed in advance of this research study. Now that I have implemented the methodology, it is important to reflect on and consider each of the guiding principles. I also hope this feedback is helpful for future researchers.

1. The researcher is interested in a distinct group of people (sharing culture, experience, or characteristic).

   This first guiding principle is fairly straightfoward. I knew and understood in advance that qualitative research often started with a distinct group of people (Creswell, 2013; Maxwell, 2013). This is something that is important for future researchers to include when considering a project using Intuitive Empathic Exploration.

2. The researcher wants to understand the experience of this group. The experience could be related to their culture, a shared characteristic, or how they experience something specific (a feeling, a type of event, etc.).

This second principle has to do with the information the researcher is trying to learn. In this case, the data is related to understanding something. This is similar to the "lived experience" concept in phenomenology (Creswell, 2013). I would recommend that future researchers be very clear on their research questions and what they are trying to learn or understand.

3. The researcher thinks through the entire research process with empathy. As a result, research tends to be written from a more personal perspective than is common for other research reports.

This guiding principle is more complicated than the first two. In hindsight, while it is very clear to me, I am still unsure if it is as clear to others as it needs to be. If I am able to pursue future projects with this methodology, I will want to conduct future exploration of this guiding principle. I want to ensure that other researchers understand my intention regarding empathy.

4. Researcher intuition is an important aspect of the process. While the research is still guided by the research questions and existing literature, the researcher is encouraged to use personal experience and intuition to guide research decisions.

This is another guiding principle that is less clear. My intention is that researchers using this methodology have some practical experience as well as researched knowledge of their topic. With practical experience, the researcher is able to use that to think through their topic and when interacting with the participants. This may include using intuition, along

with research, to justify interview protocol. It could also include using intuition when responding to participants or when including follow-up questions and exploration in the interview setting.

5. The researcher relates to and reacts to the participants intuitively from the perspective of empathy. Researcher interactions could include interviews, focus groups, or other semi-structured data collection techniques. The researcher does need to have a planned approach that allows for flexibility and adjustments throughout the process.

6. The research goal/outcome is to understand thoroughly the experience of a distinct group of people using thematic analysis. This thematic analysis can describe the experience along with external factors that influence the group's experience.

This guiding principle is related to the data analysis and could also use additional exploration. My intention here was to look at data holistically. Most traditional qualitative research relies on "coding" data, though it appears this practice is already evolving with other methods becoming more accepted (Saldana, 2016). While coding has its purposes in research, with Intuitive Empathic Exploration, I was interested in including other aspects of my data. I wanted to include emotion and inflection and also look at the words and beyond the words shared by participants. This research goal will need to be practiced with additional research to further describe how to best analyze, describe, and share the data.

7. A secondary goal of the process is to leave the participants with the experience of feeling empowered. This, along with the researcher's empathic approach, could lead participants to act on this in a way that improves their experience going forward.

This final principle of Intuitive Empathic Exploration was an important one for me. In my case, I was interested in a group of people who may not always feel that their voices are

being heard. I was interested in creating a research protocol where the participants were left with an experience of being empowered. This is something that is hard to create and is subjective, and the results may not be readily apparent. However, I would argue that it is a good guiding principle and is important for Intuitive Empathic Exploration even if we are never certain it has been achieved. That being said, I would encourage future researchers to explore this aspect of Intuitive Empathic Exploration and see if they can further develop this principle.

Conclusion

Exploring the concept of adjunct faculty loyalty in higher education is one small piece of what is likely a much greater puzzle. Those of us who work in higher education are committed to success for students, and all faculty are critical for that success. The adjunct faculty experience is an important one to consider. This research is just the tip of the iceberg. In this chapter, I attempted to provide some additional suggestions and opportunities for the future – both in practice and for additional research. I also considered previous research and the connections between my research and theory. Upon completing this dissertation, I am confident that I have extended the body of knowledge regarding adjunct faculty and provided a foundation for future research. It is my hope that other researchers will also see the value in exploring this important topic.

APPENDIX A – EMAIL QUESTIONS

These questions will be given to participants via email after they agree to participate and prior to scheduling the interview.

1.   Age

2.   Gender

3.   Highest degree completed:

4.   Approximate number of classes and subjects taught?

5.   For how many different institutions have you worked as an adjunct?

APPENDIX B – INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

These questions will be used as a guide for a semi-structured interview using an online video-conferencing service.

1.   Can you describe your educational and professional background?

2.   What led you to work as an adjunct faculty member?

3.   Without sharing the names of the institutions, can you describe the different institutions where you teach? [Unless this was discussed in Question #1]

4.   Tell me a story about a time where you felt loyal to an institution?

a.   What does it mean to you to be loyal?

b.   What happened to have you feel this way?

c.   Do you still feel loyal? If not, what led to that?

5.   Tell me a story about a time where you did not feel loyal to an institution? [This question may only apply to participants who have taught multiple places.]

6.   What does it mean to you to be a loyal adjunct faculty member?

a.   What could increase your loyalty?

b.   What could decrease your loyalty?

7.   Describe the ideal day as an adjunct faculty member. Describe the environment, the students, the staff/administrators.

APPENDIX C – IRB DOCUMENTS

WAYNE STATE UNIVERSITY

IRB Administration Office
87 East Canfield, Second Floor
Detroit, Michigan 48201
Phone: (313) 577-1628
FAX: (313) 993-7122
http://irb.wayne.edu

CONCURRENCE OF EXEMPTION

To: Sara Barnwell
College of Education

For
From: Dr. Deborah Ellis _M. Tancer MD / SC_
Chairperson, Behavioral Institutional Review Board (B3)

Date: August 16, 2018

RE: IRB #: 072718B3X

Protocol Title: Why they care: An exploration of adjunct faculty loyalty

Sponsor:

Protocol #: 1807001611

The above-referenced protocol has been reviewed and found to qualify for Exemption according to paragraph #2 of the Department of Health and Human Services Code of Federal Regulations [45 CFR 46.101(b)].
- Revised Social/Behavioral/Education Exempt Protocol Summary Form (revision received in IRB Office 08/13/2018)
- Revised Research Protocol (revision received in the IRB Office 08/13/2018)
- Medical records are not being accessed therefore HIPAA does not apply
- Research Information Sheet (revision dated 08/06/2018)
- Letter to Participants (2)

This proposal has not been evaluated for scientific merit, except to weigh the risk to the human subjects in relation to the potential benefits.

- Exempt protocols do not require annual review by the IRB.
- All changes or amendments to the above-referenced protocol require review and approval by the IRB BEFORE implementation.
- Adverse Reactions/Unexpected Events (AR/UE) must be submitted on the appropriate form within the timeframe specified in the IRB Administration Office Policy (http://irb.wayne.edu/policies-human-research.php).

NOTE: Forms should be downloaded from the IRB Administration Office website http://irb.wayne.edu at each use.

Notify the IRB of any changes to the funding status of the above-referenced protocol.

www.manaraa.com

Why they care: An exploration of adjunct faculty loyalty

Research Information Sheet
Title of Study: Why they care: An exploration of adjunct faculty loyalty

Principal Investigator (PI): Sara Barnwell
517-795-5557

Purpose:
You are being asked to be in a research study of loyalty in adjunct faculty members because you currently teach as an adjunct faculty member. This study is being conducted using online video conferencing services.

Study Procedures
If you take part in the study, you will be asked to answer questions regarding your educational/employment background, your experiences as an adjunct faculty member, and how you experience loyalty as an adjunct faculty member.

1. You will begin by answering basic demographic, educational, and employment questions.
2. You and the researcher will schedule an online videoconference interview at an agreed-upon time.
3. The semi-structured interview will take approximately 60-90 minutes.
4. You will be asked general, non-identifiable questions regarding your educational and employment background, your experiences as adjunct faculty, and how you experience loyalty as adjunct faculty.
5. You will be asked to not disclose any identifiable information regarding your employment so as to maintain confidentiality.
6. You have the right to not answer some of the questions or end the interview early, if needed.
7. Interviews will be recorded. Interview files will be saved as a password protected file on a password protected computer that can only be accessed by the researcher. Upon completion of the study, interview files will be deleted.
8. Pseudonyms will be created for research documents and no identifiable information will be kept or shared.

Benefits
- As a participant in this research study, there may be no direct benefit for you; however, information from this study may benefit other people now or in the future.

Risks

There are no known risks at this time to participation in this study.

Costs

- There will be no costs to you for participation in this research study.

Submission/Revision Date: August 6, 2018   Page 1 of 2
Protocol Version #: 1

Form Date: 04/2015

Why they care: An exploration of adjunct faculty loyalty

Compensation

o You will not be paid for taking part in this study.

Confidentiality:

o You will be identified in the research records by a code name or number. There will be no list that links your identity with this code.

Voluntary Participation /Withdrawal:

Taking part in this study is voluntary. You are free to not answer any questions or withdraw at any time. Your decision will not change any present or future relationships with Wayne State University or its affiliates.

Questions

If you have any questions about this study now or in the future, you may contact Sara Barnwell at the following phone number: 517-795-5557. If you have questions or concerns about your rights as a research participant, the Chair of the Institutional Review Board can be contacted at (313) 577-1628. If you are unable to contact the research staff, or if you want to talk to someone other than the research staff, you may also call the Wayne State Research Subject Advocate at (313) 577-1628 to discuss problems, obtain information, or offer input.

Participation

By completing the interview, you are agreeing to participate in this study.

APPROVED

AUG 1 6 2018

**WAYNE STATE UNIVERSITY
INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD**

Submission/Revision Date: August 6, 2018   Page 2 of 2
Protocol Version #: 1

Form Date: 04/2015

Subject: Request for Participants in Research Study – Adjunct Faculty Loyalty

Hello!

My name is Sara Barnwell and I am a PhD Candidate at Wayne State University. I am conducting a research study about adjunct faculty loyalty.

I am emailing to ask if you are interested in being a participant in my research study. If you are interested, I will send you an information sheet to obtain your consent to participant. I will then ask you a few basic demographic questions and schedule a time for an online videoconferencing interview. The interview will take approximately 60-90 minutes. Your participation is completely voluntary and all responses will be anonymous.

If you are interested or if you have any questions, please contact me (Sara Barnwell – fq9488@wayne.edu).

Thank you for your time!

Sara Barnwell
PhD Candidate
Wayne State University

APPROVED

AUG 1 6 2018

WAYNE STATE UNIVERSITY
INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD

Subject: Request for Participants in Research Study – Adjunct Faculty Loyalty

Hello!

My name is Sara Barnwell and I am a PhD Candidate at Wayne State University. I am conducting a research study about adjunct faculty loyalty.

I am emailing to ask if your employees or colleagues may be interested in being a participant in my research study. If you think they may be, please share this email with anyone who may be interested.

If they are interested, I will send them an information sheet to obtain consent to participant. I will then ask them a few basic demographic questions and schedule a time for an online videoconferencing interview. The interview will take approximately 60-90 minutes. Their participation is completely voluntary and all responses will be anonymous.

If they are interested or if anyone has any questions, please contact me (Sara Barnwell – fq9488@wayne.edu).

Thank you for your time!

Sara Barnwell
PhD Candidate
Wayne State University

APPROVED

AUG 1 6 2018

WAYNE STATE UNIVERSITY
INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD

REFERENCES

Adams, E. (2010). The joys and challenges of semi-structured interviewing. *Community Practitioner*, *83*(7), 18-21.

AFT Higher Education. (2010). American academic: A national survey of part-time/adjunct faculty. *American Federation of Teachers*, *2*. Retrieved from https://www.aft.org/sites/default/files/aa_partimefaculty0310.pdf

Allen, N. J., & Meyer, J. P. (1990). Organizational socialization tactics: A longitudinal analysis of links to newcomers' commitment and role orientation. *Academy of Management Journal*, *33*(4), 847-858.

Anderson, R. (2000). Intuitive inquiry: Interpreting objective and subjective data. *Revision*, *22*(4).

Anderson, R. (2004). Intuitive inquiry: An epistemology of the heart for scientific inquiry. *The Humanistic Psychologist*, *32*(4), 307-341.

Borzaga, C., & Tortia, E. (2006). Worker motivations, job satisfaction, and loyalty in public and nonprofit social services. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, *35*(2), 225-248.

Brinkmann, S., & Kvale, S. (2015). *Interviews: Learning the craft of qualitative research interviewing* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Center for Community College Student Engagement. (2014). *Contingent commitments: Bringing part-time faculty into focus*. Retrieved November 8, 2017, from Center for Community College Student Engagement website: http://www.ccsse.org/docs/PTF_Special_Report.pdf

Charlier, H. D., & Williams, M. R. (2011). The reliance on and demand for adjunct faculty members in America's rural, suburban, and urban community colleges. *Community College Review*, *39*(2), 160-180.

Coalition on the Academic Workforce. (2012, June). *A portrait of part-time faculty members: A summary of findings on part-time faculty respondents to the coalition on the academic workforce survey of contingent faculty members and instructors*. Retrieved from http://www.academicworkforce.org/CAW_portrait_2012.pdf

Colwell, J. R. (2011). *Importance of institutional support factors provided to part-time community college faculty* (Doctoral dissertation).

Cook, J., & Wall, T. (1980). New work attitude measures of trust, organizational commitment and personal need non-fulfilment. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, *53*, 39-52.

Couch, J. J. (2014). *An examination of adjunct faculty job satisfaction and loyalty in Christian higher education* (Doctoral dissertation).

Coughlan, R. (2005). Employee loyalty as adherence to shared moral values. *Journal of Managerial Issues*, *17*(1), 43-57.

Creswell, J. W. (2013). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches* (3rd ed.). Los Angeles, CA: Sage.

Curtis, J. W. (2014, April). *The employment status of instructional staff members in higher education, Fall 2011*. Retrieved October 29, 2017, from https://www.aaup.org/sites/default/files/Academic_Labor_Force_Trends_1975-2015_0.pdf

Cusack, G. P. (2009). Willingness: A reflection on commitment, organizational citizenship and engagement from the perspective of Albert O. Hirschman's concept of exit, voice, and loyalty. *Review of Business*, *29*(2), 19-29.

Dolan, D. M., Hall, M. S., Karlsson, C. R., & Martinak, M. L. (2013). Five years later: Maryland adjuncts tell us (again) who they are and what they want. *The Journal of Continuing Higher Education*, *61*, 35-45.

Eskildsen, J. K., & Nussler, M. L. (2000). The managerial drivers of employee satisfaction and loyalty. *Total Quality Management*, *11*(4-6), 581-588.

Fiorito, J., Bozeman, D. P., Young, A., & Meurs, J. A. (2007). Organizational commitment, human resource practices, and organizational characteristics. *Journal of Managerial Issues*, *19*(2), 186-207.

Gelhaus, P. (2012). The desired moral attitude of the physician: (I) empathy. *Medicine, Health Care, and Philosophy*, *15*(2), 103-113.

Grant, A. (2013). *Give and take: Why helping others drives our success*. New York, NY: Penguin.

Guillon, O., & Cezanne, C. (2014). Employee loyalty and organizational performance: A critcal survey. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, *27*(5), 839-850.

Hensley, E. T. (2015). *Adjunct online faculty job satisfaction: A phenomenological study* (Doctoral dissertation).

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

Himmelberg, L. (2011). *Perceptions of novice clinical adjunct nursing faculty* (Doctoral dissertation).

Hirschman, A. O. (2007). *Exit, voice, and loyalty: Responses to decline in firms, organizations, and states* (Reprint ed.). Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Univ. Press.

Hoffman, E. A. (2006). Exit and voice: Organizational loyalty and dispute resolution strategies. *Social Forces*, *84*(4), 2313-2330.

Hoyt, J. E. (2012). Predicting the satisfaction and loyalty of adjunct faculty. *The Journal of Continuing Higher Education*, *60*, 132-142.

IDEO.org. (2015). *The field guide to human-centered design*. Retrieved from http://d1r3w4d5z5a88i.cloudfront.net/assets/guide/Field%20Guide%20to%20Human-Centered%20Design_IDEOorg_English-ee47a1ed4b91f3252115b83152828d7e.pdf

Jacobsen, D. I. (2000). Managing increased part-time: Does part-time work imply part-time commitment? *Managing Service Quality*, *10*(3), 187-200.

Karpf, J. (2015). What adjuncts need. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved from https://www.chronicle.com/article/What-Adjuncts-Need/228139/?key=I4Knq6bsDwQogItu-_PrsnjNiuj5Ob2VsSSsKsb-N6n5bxrfauQw7wKkCl4DjntjcXNub0ZfU0ZNUGNtbHRoOFR6eE9NNzRFSjZ2NWxESDdZbFVySXRxNnNNTRQ#.WhhMXZnA4ck.email

Keeley, M., & Graham, J. W. (1991). Exit, voice, and ethics. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *10*(5), 349-355.

Kezar, A. & Maxey, D (2016). *Envisioning the faculty for the 21st century: Moving to a mission-oriented and learner-centered model.* New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Kolawole, E. (2016, February 9). *Empathy - IDEO.org* [Video file]. Retrieved from https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=l0iJ7P2OtkU&feature=youtu.be

Linz, S., Good, L. K., & Busch, M. (2015). Promoting worker loyalty: An empirical analysis. *International Journal of Management*, *36*(2), 169-191.

Lyons, R. E. (Ed.). (2007). *Best practices for supporting adjunct faculty*. Bolton, MA: Anker Publishing Company, Inc.

Martin, J., & Samels, J. E. (2015). *The provost's handbook: The role of the chief academic officer*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Maxwell, J. A. (2013). *Qualitative research design: An interactive approach* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Merriam, S. B. (2009). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. J. (1991). A three-component conceptualization of organizational commitment. *Human Resource Management Review*, *1*(1), 61-89.

Niehoff, B. P., Moorman, R. H., Blakely, G., & Fuller, J. (2001). The influence of empowerment and job enrichment on employee loyalty in a downsizing environment. *Group & Organization Management*, *26*(1), 93-113.

1998 amendments to the Higher Education Act of 1965. (2003, September 23). Retrieved January 28, 2018, from U.S. Department of Education website: https://www2.ed.gov/policy/highered/leg/hea98/sec101.html

O'Connor, D., & Yballe, L. (2007). Maslow revised: Constructing a road map of human nature. *Journal of Management Education*, *31*(6), 738-756.

Othman, N., Mokhtar, S. S. M., & Asaad, M. N. M. (2017). Quality management system, employee satisfaction and employee performance in private higher education institutions: A proposed framework. *International Journal of Management Research & Review*, *7*(6), 681-686.

Pershing, J. A. (Ed.). (2006). *Handbook of human performance technology* (3rd ed.). San Francisco, CA: Pfeiffer.

Psychology Today. (n.d.). Empathy. Retrieved April 15, 2018, from Psychology Today website: https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/basics/empathy

Pyram, M. J. (2016). *For-profit career college adjunct faculty and their affiliation needs and experiences* (Doctoral dissertation).

Reichheld, F. F. (1996). *The loyalty effect: The hidden force behind growth, profits, and lasting value*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.

Reichheld, F. F. (2001). *Loyalty rules: How today's leaders build lasting relationships*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.

Richey, R. C., Klein, J. D., & Tracey, M. W. (2011). *The instructional design knowledge base: Theory, research, and practice*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Rousseau, D. M. (1995). *Psychological contracts in organizations: Understanding written and unwritten agreements*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Sachau, D. A. (2007). Resurrecting the motivation-hygiene theory: Herzberg and the positive psychology movement. *Human Resource Development Review*, *6*(4), 377-393.

Saldana, J. (2016). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers* (3rd ed.). Los Angeles, CA: Sage.

Shannon, P. A. (2011). *An exploration of factors that influence online adjunct nursing faculty loyalty to a university: A phenomenological approach* (Doctoral dissertation).

Stum, D. L. (2001). Maslow revisited: Building the employee commitment pyramid. *Strategy & Leadership*, *29*(4), 4-9.

Tansky, J. W., Gallagher, D. G., & Wetzel, K. W. (1997). The effect of demographics, work status, and relative equity on organizational commitment: Looking among part-time workers. *Revue Canadienne des Sciences de l'Administration*, *14*(3), 315-326.

Wallin, D. L. (Ed.). (2005). *Adjunct faculty in community colleges*. Bolton, MA: Anker Publishing Company, Inc.

Watson, G. W., & Shepard, J. (2000). Disaffected loyalties in a changing contractual environment. *International Journal of Value-Based Management*, *13*(2), 123-140.

Watson, J. C., Steckley, P. L., & McMullen, E. J. (2014). The role of empathy in promoting change. *Psychotherapy Research*, *24*(3), 286-298.

Wertz, F. J., Charmaz, K., McMullen, L. M., Josselson, R., Anderson, R., & McSpadden, E. (2011). *Five ways of doing qualitative analysis: Phenomenological psychology, grounded theory, discourse analysis, narrative research, and intuitive inquiry*. New York, NY: The Guilford Press.

ABSTRACT

WHY THEY CARE: AN EXPLORATION OF ADJUNCT FACULTY LOYALTY

by

SARA ELIZABETH BARNWELL

May 2020

Advisor: Dr. Ingrid Guerra-Lopez

Major: Learning Design and Technology

Degree: Doctor of Philosophy

Higher education is always evolving and striving to be more effective and efficient. Over time, the use of part-time or adjunct faculty members has increased in an effort to achieve that goal. In this dissertation, the concept of adjunct faculty loyalty is explored using Intuitive Empathic Exploration which is a newly constructed qualitative methodology. Intuitive Empathic Exploration was created for this research study with the hope that it can be used in future research. It draws primarily from the concepts of phenomenology, empathy, intuitive inquiry, and in-depth interviewing. The focus of the research is to consider how adjunct faculty members experience loyalty to their institutions and to identify any common themes with adjunct faculty members who experience either being loyal or disloyal to their institutions.

Fourteen adjunct faculty members from across the United States were interviewed in this study. The participants had all worked as adjunct faculty members at one or more institutions, and their only affiliation with their institution was as an adjunct faculty member (graduate students and full-time employees who also teach for the same institution were excluded). Throughout these interviews, it was found that adjunct faculty consistently feel that loyalty should exist as a two-way commitment between them and their institution(s) and supervisors. While some of the

participants identified as loyal or having been loyal in the past, some shared that they were satisfied and committed with their work as an adjunct faculty member but did not experience being either loyal or disloyal. Other findings include that the participants appreciate connections and a sense of belonging at their institutions and that they feel a deep sense of loyalty and caring for their students. Some participants also shared that they experienced a strong loyalty to their discipline or to their profession, which was a strong motivator for teaching.

AUTOBIOGRAPHICAL STATEMENT

Sara Barnwell is the Associate Dean of Academic Operations at Cleary University. Barnwell is a careful, detail-oriented leader who thrives in an environment full of numbers, fine print, and cautious precision. As "the General," a nickname coined by her colleagues, Barnwell works across academics, athletics, admissions, finance, technology, and human resources to ensure everything "behind the scenes" has met her high standards of quality. While she strives for precision, her motivation is not to achieve perfection, but rather to set the stage for a successful experience for all faculty, staff, and students.

Barnwell is deeply committed to service within her community and plays an active role in community organizations, including Livingston Sunrise Rotary Club, The Torch, Big Brothers/Big Sisters, and Livingston County Literacy Coalition. She is also a friend to many and regularly volunteers to "pitch-in" to support all departments. Barnwell enjoys seeing the bird's-eye view to target problem areas and form multi-layer strategies. Her colleagues often promote her ability to solve the unsolvable problems and to find the solution that optimizes overall outcomes.

Barnwell has achieved a Bachelor of Arts in Education from Michigan State University, a Master of Business Administration from Cleary University, an Education Specialist certificate from Wayne State University, and is completing a Doctor of Philosophy from Wayne State University.