

2010

# Job satisfaction of community college adjunct faculty at Midwestern Community College

Jody Kristine Tomanek  
*Iowa State University*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://lib.dr.iastate.edu/etd>

 Part of the [Educational Administration and Supervision Commons](#)

## Recommended Citation

Tomanek, Jody Kristine, "Job satisfaction of community college adjunct faculty at Midwestern Community College" (2010). *Graduate Theses and Dissertations*. 11640.  
<https://lib.dr.iastate.edu/etd/11640>

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Iowa State University Capstones, Theses and Dissertations at Iowa State University Digital Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Graduate Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Iowa State University Digital Repository. For more information, please contact [digirep@iastate.edu](mailto:digirep@iastate.edu).

Job satisfaction of community college adjunct faculty at Midwestern Community College

by

Jody Kristine Tomanek

A dissertation submitted to the graduate faculty

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Major: Education (Educational Leadership)

Program of Study Committee:

Larry Ebbers, Major Professor

Christopher Duree

Linda Serra Hagedorn

Frankie Santos Laanan

Margaret Torrie

Iowa State University

Ames, Iowa

2010

Copyright © Jody Kristine Tomanek, 2010. All rights reserved.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| LIST OF TABLES .....                              | vi  |
| ABSTRACT .....                                    | vii |
| CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION .....                     | 1   |
| Statement of Problem.....                         | 2   |
| Purpose of the Study .....                        | 4   |
| Significance of the Study .....                   | 5   |
| Research Questions .....                          | 6   |
| Theoretical Framework.....                        | 7   |
| Definition of Terms.....                          | 8   |
| Summary .....                                     | 9   |
| CHAPTER 2. LITERATURE REVIEW .....                | 12  |
| History of Adjunct Faculty .....                  | 12  |
| Community College Faculty .....                   | 13  |
| Use of Adjunct Faculty .....                      | 13  |
| Demographics .....                                | 16  |
| Perceptions of Adjunct Faculty.....               | 17  |
| Benefits for Adjunct Faculty.....                 | 19  |
| Support and Development for Adjunct Faculty ..... | 20  |
| Taxonomies of Adjunct Faculty.....                | 24  |
| Theoretical Framework.....                        | 26  |
| Summary .....                                     | 27  |

|  |    |
|--|----|
| CHAPTER 3. METHODS .....   | 29 |
| Overview .....   | 29 |
| Research Design.....   | 30 |
| Methods.....   | 31 |
| Survey Design.....   | 31 |
| Participants.....  | 32 |
| Setting .....  | 32 |
| Instrumentation .....  | 33 |
| Validity .....   | 37 |
| Data Collection .....  | 37 |
| Population .....   | 39 |
| Data Analysis .....  | 40 |
| Ethical Considerations .....   | 43 |
| CHAPTER 4. RESULTS .....   | 44 |
| Demographic Characteristics of Adjunct Faculty at Midwestern Community College .44 |    |
| Adjunct Faculty Support.....   | 53 |
| Job Satisfaction .....   | 58 |
| Motivating and Hygiene Factors.....  | 63 |
| CHAPTER 5. SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION .....  | 70 |
| Summary .....  | 70 |
| Discussion.....  | 71 |
| Limitations and Delimitations.....   | 81 |
| Implications.....  | 82 |

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| Future Research .....   | 88  |
| Final Thoughts and Reflections .....  | 90  |
| REFERENCES .....  | 93  |
| APPENDIX A: SURVEY INSTRUMENT .....   | 100 |
| APPENDIX B: INTRODUCTORY AND DUPLICATE LETTER EMAILED TO PARTICIPANTS ..... | 110 |
| APPENDIX C: FOLLOW-UP LETTER EMAILED TO PARTICIPANTS .....                  | 111 |
| APPENDIX D: FOLLOW-UP LETTER TWO EMAILED TO PARTICIPANTS .....              | 112 |
| APPENDIX E: HUMAN SUBJECTS APPROVAL .....                                   | 113 |
| ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS .....  | 114 |

## LIST OF TABLES

|  |    |
|--|----|
| Table 3.1: Sample and response rate for the community college adjunct faculty job satisfaction survey..... | 40 |
| Table 4.1: Demographics of Midwestern Community College adjunct faculty members .....                      | 46 |
| Table 4.2: Taxonomies of adjunct faculty at Midwestern .....   | 47 |
| Table 4.3: Educational/professional background of adjunct faculty at Midwestern .....                      | 49 |
| Table 4.4: Academic and program teaching areas .....   | 50 |
| Table 4.5: Methods of delivery taught by adjunct faculty .....   | 51 |
| Table 4.6: Employment habits of adjunct faculty at Midwestern.....   | 52 |
| Table 4.7: Institutional resources available to adjunct faculty .....                                      | 54 |
| Table 4.8: Level of satisfaction with institutional support services.....                                  | 55 |
| Table 4.9: Agreement with statements regarding technology support .....                                    | 56 |
| Table 4.10: Correlation matrix for support variables and overall job satisfaction .....                    | 57 |
| Table 4.11: Spearman correlation of technology support.....  | 58 |
| Table 4.12: Job satisfaction.....  | 59 |
| Table 4.13: Overall job satisfaction by demographics.....  | 61 |
| Table 4.14: Summary of factor loading .....  | 64 |
| Table 4.15: Summary of regression analysis for variables predicting overall job satisfaction ..            | 66 |
| Table 4.16: Regression analysis for variables predicting overall job satisfaction.....                     | 68 |

## ABSTRACT

Adjunct faculty constitutes the majority of faculty in higher education. Their large numbers make them a force in community colleges and four-year universities. The role that adjunct faculty play is impressive and their role should not be overlooked. Studying the background of adjunct faculty assists in providing an overview of gender, age, and ethnicity amongst adjunct faculty. College administrators and support professionals can benefit from understanding the levels of support adjunct faculty expect and their satisfaction with support that already exists in community colleges. The overall level of job satisfaction of adjunct faculty also assists college personnel in understanding adjunct faculty. This dissertation reports an in-depth examination of adjunct faculty characteristics as well as faculty thoughts about services and support they receive, and their level of job satisfaction. The data collected and analyzed through this study will add to the literature regarding adjunct faculty and help community college administrators understand the levels of satisfaction adjunct faculty feel related to support and their work.

## CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION

“Over the last decade, we have been observing what has been a silent explosion. They [part-time faculty] have been so long in the shadows of higher education that most colleges know little about them. The majority of part-timers move in and out of our teaching institutions silently and remain, for various reasons, for brief periods; others remain in our company for a much longer time” (p. vii).

The quote comes from the work of Roueche, Roueche, and Milliron (1995) in their book *Strangers in Their Own Land*. While the book was written nearly 15 years ago, the quote is still relevant to the role of adjunct faculty in community colleges today. Community colleges exist in every state in the nation and enroll almost half of the students in higher education today (Cohen & Brawer, 2003). According to the most recent statistics from the American Association of Community Colleges (AACC), community college enrollments for Fall of 2010 are expected to increase by 16.9% compared to the Fall of 2007. This increase would indicate that over 20 million students are expected to attend community colleges in the Fall of 2010. As they enter the doors of community colleges, students—no matter their academic pursuit—quickly encounter faculty willing to help them achieve their academic goals. The faculty they encounter can be a full-time or adjunct faculty member.

Adjunct faculty are being utilized more than ever within higher education and especially within community colleges. According to a report on the AAUP (American Association of University Professors) website, 65% of faculty teaching for Associate Degree granting institutions are considered part-time or adjunct faculty. With continued enrollment increases, budget constraints, and a large number of faculty retirements, community colleges rely on adjunct faculty not only to teach courses but also to help support students in the same way as full-time faculty. The financial accountability of community colleges often depends



on their reliance on adjunct faculty. The use of adjunct faculty is seen as a major difference in public support for full-time students attending community colleges when compared to those attending traditional four-year universities and makes the use of adjunct faculty eminent (Paulsen & Smart, 2001).

This reliance on adjunct faculty, while necessary, raises many issues regarding its viability. Arguments have been made that students receive a lower quality of education when they are taught by an adjunct faculty member versus a full-time faculty member (Jacobs, 1998; Rouche, Rouche, & Milliron, 1995; Schmidt, 2008). This issue continues to be debated in recent literature. In some instances, adjunct faculty are the lone faculty members in particular programs and are expected to fill the role as if they were full-time faculty members. These tasks could include creating assessment tools, revising curriculum, and monitoring course offerings along with the dean of the program, division chair, or other academic administrator. This continued reliance on adjunct faculty makes it imperative for community colleges to assess how adjunct faculty are being used, how adjunct faculty feel about their role within the institution and what motivates them to do the work that they do. The goal of this dissertation was to research those issues and assist in creating more relevant literature surrounding the job satisfaction of adjunct faculty at community colleges.

### Statement of the Problem

Research that has been conducted related to community college faculty is plentiful. Many studies have been done regarding full-time faculty including teaching loads, effects of unions, assessment activities, as well as job satisfaction (Castro, 2000; Hagedorn, 2000; Seybert, 2002). There have been a number of research studies conducted about adjunct faculty as well. Many of these studies of adjunct faculty focus on the use of adjunct faculty

at various higher education institutions, perceptions of full-time faculty of adjuncts, and professional development opportunities (Mangan, 2009; Rossi, 2009; Watts, 2002). A review of the literature found that many of the books written about adjunct faculty are how-to guides or informational works for administrators with tips on how to hire and work with adjuncts. Some literature addresses teaching techniques and strategies for adjunct faculty and what to expect in the classroom while other literature discusses issues administrators might experience such as hiring, recruitment, and orientation (Bianco-Mathis & Chalofsky, 1996; Grieve, 2001; Linehan, 2007; Rouche, Rouche, & Milliron, 1995; Wallin, 2005).

Job satisfaction theories originally created by Herzberg in the early 1960's have led to studies of faculty job satisfaction by other researchers (Boord, 2010; Hagedorn, 2000; Ridenour, 1985; Schulz, 2009). These studies focused on differing factors that lead to job satisfaction amongst full-time and adjunct faculty at both four-year and two-year institutions. What is lacking in these studies and other literary works are more in-depth analyses of the effects that these factors have on the job satisfaction of adjunct faculty. More specifically, what factors lead to adjunct faculty job satisfaction and what factors can lead to their dissatisfaction with their teaching role?

There is currently a lack of literature regarding adjunct faculty demographics and characteristics from large community colleges in the Midwest along with literature regarding the level of support adjunct faculty feel they receive from an institution. Another void in the literature is the point-of-view of adjunct faculty themselves. This dissertation is attempting to add to the literature by researching the adjunct faculty at a large community college in the Midwest. Midwestern Community College, the pseudo name for the college used in this study, has seen an enormous growth in enrollment over the last five years. The increase in

enrollment has been accompanied by an increasing number of adjunct faculty hired within the last five years. During the 2003 academic year, 617 adjunct faculty taught for Midwestern. Compare that to the fall of 2009 when 903 adjunct faculty were employed and teaching. Data from Midwestern indicated that 61.9% of the sections at Midwestern, were taught by adjunct faculty. Those sections identified also included online instruction. In online courses 54% of the online sections were taught by adjunct faculty. Midwestern has seen an overall increase of 46% in adjunct faculty use during that five year time period. The increased reliance on adjunct faculty in such dramatic numbers raises questions regarding the use of adjunct faculty, the role adjuncts play at the institution, and the overall job satisfaction of the college's largest sector of employees.

Research is limited when it comes to studying the role of the adjunct faculty and how the adjunct faculty feel about the role that they play at a community college. Exploring how adjunct faculty view the institution, how they view the role they play, and how they feel about the overall contribution they make to an institution is key for any institution that relies heavily on adjunct faculty. Community colleges may see the use of adjunct faculty as a way to save money, but adjunct faculty should be integrated into the culture of the community college they serve (Burnstad, 2002; Gappa & Leslie, 1993). As presented thus far and as demonstrated in the literature review, little research has been conducted on adjunct faculty job satisfaction exclusively.

#### Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the study is to gain an understanding of adjunct faculty job satisfaction at a large community college in the Midwest. The research includes identifying demographic and background information of adjunct faculty, levels of support provided for

adjunct faculty, and the overall job satisfaction of community college adjunct faculty. Initially, the study will identify demographic characteristics of adjunct faculty such as gender, race/ethnicity, educational background, academic discipline, marital status, primary language and teaching method. The value of this demographic research is to gain a sense of the participants in the study as well as reveal the academic discipline that are primarily taught by adjunct faculty.

Support for adjunct faculty is also a critical issue to be addressed in this study. This study will attempt to identify the relationship between:

- institutional support
- technical support, and
- classroom support

The support areas made available to adjunct faculty will be compared to adjunct faculty's perceived level of job satisfaction to determine if there is any relationship between the two variables. To address the job satisfaction portion of the study, Herzberg's (1968) Motivation/Hygiene theory will be utilized. Specifically, the theory will be employed to identify the motivators that lead to adjunct faculty job satisfaction and the factors that lead to dissatisfaction of adjunct faculty in their teaching roles.

#### Significance of the Study

The increased use of adjunct faculty derives from tight budgets experienced by community colleges and large enrollment growths that need to be addressed. Research that has been conducted until now focuses on the use of adjunct faculty and handbooks for adjunct faculty. Little research has been conducted that relates specifically to adjunct faculty and job satisfaction. The literature lacks when it comes to how adjunct faculty at a large

Midwestern community college feel about the role they play, how satisfied they are with their teaching positions within a community college, and what exactly motivates them to pursue and retain adjunct teaching positions.

This dissertation research will be significant in providing a better understanding adjunct faculty and also understanding what motivates or what hinders the satisfaction adjunct faculty feel related to their teaching positions. The research presented will contribute to the literature on adjunct faculty and identify some practical ways for creating additional support systems that can increase job satisfaction amongst community college adjunct faculty.

### Research Questions

The following research questions have guided this dissertation.

1. What are the demographics of adjunct faculty at Midwestern Community College? Specifically, how do adjunct faculty differ by age, gender, race/ethnicity, educational background, academic discipline, and teaching method?
2. How do community college adjunct faculty rate the level of institutional support, classroom support, and technology support at the college? To what extent is there a relationship between faculty job satisfaction and perceived level of institutional, classroom, and technology support?
3. How do adjunct faculty rate their overall level of job satisfaction at the community college? To what extent does job satisfaction differ by background characteristics (e.g., gender, race/ethnicity), academic discipline, and teaching method?
4. How do adjunct faculty rate their satisfaction/dissatisfaction as it relates to Herzberg's Motivation/Hygiene theory?

5. To what extent do relationships, benefits, teaching and institutional support predict overall job satisfaction?

### Theoretical Framework

Job satisfaction can have many meanings for researchers and those involved in business. There are many theories about how to measure job satisfaction. In the 1950s, Frederick Herzberg researched the lives and events of engineers and accountants to find what motivated them to do well in their jobs and be successful. According to Herzberg (1968), “the findings of these studies, along with corroboration from many other investigations using different procedures, suggest that the factors involved in producing job satisfaction (and motivation) are separate and distinct from the factors that lead to job dissatisfaction” (p. 56).

What followed was the creation of Herzberg’s Motivation/Hygiene theory that can still be applied today. In Herzberg’s article, he presents the factors that lead to both job satisfaction (motivators) and those that lead to job dissatisfaction (hygienes).

Motivators – factors that lead to job satisfaction include:

- Achievement
- Recognition
- Work itself
- Responsibility
- Advancement

Hygienes – factors that prevent job satisfaction include:

- Company and policy administration
- Working conditions
- Supervision

- Interpersonal relations
- Money
- Status
- Security

Herzberg's theory focuses on individuals in the general business sector but has been used in academic arenas with faculty research as well (Boord, 2010; Hagedorn, 2000; Schulz, 2009). Herzberg's Motivation/Hygiene theory helps define the scope of this study. Using the variables presented in chapter three, the following statements represents the basis for designing and conducting this study. If adjunct faculty agree that achievement, recognition, work itself, responsibility, and advancement are motivators, then their level of job satisfaction increases. And if adjunct faculty agree that college and policy administration, working conditions, supervision, interpersonal relations, money, status, and security are hygienes, then their level of job satisfaction decreases.

#### Definition of Terms

Listed below are key terms that are used throughout this dissertation. Definitions are provided to inform the reader.

Adjunct Faculty - faculty teaching at Midwestern Community College in a part-time capacity and not covered by a faculty union agreement.

Benefits - insurance, retirement, paid vacation or sick time, faculty unions, professional development opportunities, or any other enticement given to an adjunct faculty member beyond a wage or salary.

Classroom support – support provided to adjunct faculty to supplement their classroom instruction. This includes textbook materials, teaching aides, supplies, classroom management training.

Hygienes – factors that prevent job satisfaction including: company and policy administration, working conditions, supervision, interpersonal relations, money, status, and security.

Institutional support – support provided to adjunct faculty related to college specific resources that include, but are not limited to: communication pieces (website, handbook newsletter), parking, access to office space.

Job Satisfaction - the feeling that one has in regards to his or her job based on motivating and hygiene factors.

Motivators – factors that lead to job satisfaction including: achievement, recognition, work itself, responsibility, and advancement.

Teaching Methods – avenues in which classroom instruction is provided to students that include face-to-face/classroom instruction, online course delivery, hybrid delivery (portion in the classroom and portion online).

Technology support – support provided to adjunct faculty related to technology that includes but is not limited to: access to computers, projectors or any other technology device used to assist classroom instruction, assistance and troubleshooting with computers, projectors and presentation devices; assistance with logging into college computers.

### Summary

This study attempts to build on the existing research on community college faculty job satisfaction by specifically examining satisfaction among adjunct faculty. The lack of



literature in this area will make this particular research valuable to the academic community. Chapter one describes the purpose and significance of the research study which is to gain an understanding of adjunct faculty job satisfaction at community colleges. Chapter one introduces the research questions that will lead this study and outlines the theoretical framework used to define the scope of the study.

Chapter Two provides an outline of related research focused on community colleges, adjunct faculty, and job satisfaction. Research presented includes, history of adjunct faculty, community college faculty, use of adjunct faculty (including demographics), perceptions of adjunct faculty, benefits for adjunct faculty, support and development of adjunct faculty, the theory of job satisfaction and other literature related to the factors that can affect adjunct faculty job satisfaction. Other areas of literature are presented that include the institutional support of adjunct faculty.

Chapter Three presents the methods and research design for this research study. It discusses the survey design and participant selection and explains the survey instrument. Specific information is provided in chapter three regarding the data analysis procedures and variables that will be used to answer each research question.

Chapter Four presents the results of the survey data collection related to each research question. The chapter covers demographic responses, adjunct faculty ratings of the support they receive, and results of overall job satisfaction. Data are presented in both text and tables and shows the statistical methods used.

The final chapter includes a summary of the data followed with a discussion on what the data indicates to the researcher. Chapter Five also presents the researcher's thoughts

regarding local and national implications, suggestions for future research in the area of adjunct faculty and concludes with final thoughts of the researcher.

## CHAPTER 2. LITERATURE REVIEW

### History of Adjunct Faculty

Increasingly, higher education, especially community colleges, uses and relies on adjunct faculty (Hoyt, Howell, et. al, 2008, Landrum 2009, Nutting 2003, Rossi 2009). As they become the first choice among traditional-aged college students, community colleges are experiencing tremendous enrollment growth. Given continued enrollment increases and budget constraints, adjunct faculty are relied upon to not only teach courses but also help support students the way full-time faculty do. In some instances, adjunct faculty are the lone faculty members in a particular program and are expected to develop curriculum (Burnstad, 2002).

This continued reliance on adjunct faculty makes it incumbent on institutions to identify how adjunct faculty are being used and how adjunct faculty feel about their role within the institution. Institutions should consider researching:

- the adjunct faculty perception of the institution
- how adjunct faculty see themselves fitting into the institution
- perceptions of adjuncts from full-time faculty and administrators
- support offered to adjunct faculty

Researching those areas are important for any institution that relies heavily on adjunct faculty.

This literature review will address topics surrounding the history, use, and demographics of adjunct faculty, faculty support, job satisfaction related to adjunct faculty and their roles within institutions of higher education. Job satisfaction will present the works

of Herzberg (1968) and the theories he identified that lead to job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction.

### Community College Faculty

Community college faculty have been studied for nearly four decades. Early studies focused on identifying the faculty, their backgrounds, relationships with students, and roles in the world of higher education (Cohen 1975, Cohen & Brawer 1977). But as the community college started to change in the early 1970's so too did the research being done on community college faculty. Research began to include in-depth studies on the role and demographics of community college faculty and the differences between community college and traditional four-year university faculty.

Studies in early 2000 grew exponentially and research on community college faculty was conducted in various areas. One of the largest areas was the ever-changing role and mission of the community college and how that affected faculty members. Focuses on the type of students community colleges were enrolling including transfer students, developmental students, and English-as-a-Second Language students contributed to even more changes for faculty. Increased attention was being given to the shortage of qualified faculty, student-learning focused missions, and the influence of technology in everyday life (Gibson-Harman, Rodriguez, & Haworth, 2002). Adjunct faculty began to be studied in more frequency in the last decade as their use in community colleges escalated.

### Use of Adjunct Faculty

The use of adjunct faculty in higher education is not a new phenomenon. From the beginning of higher education in the United States, faculty other than full-time or tenure-

track faculty have been used. Early colleges and universities used this term to designate the ministers and scholars that visited from other institutions (Jacobs, 1998).

While the practice of employing visiting faculty is well established, the purpose behind the repetition of adjunct faculty has changed throughout history. According to Jacobs (1998), “the rationale for part-time faculty appointments has shifted dramatically from the need for specialists to the expedient need for temporary instructional assistance.” He goes on to say “the need for temporary assistance emerges both from internal and external factors” (p.11). Examples of those factors can include increased enrollments, budgetary constraints, need for specialized faculty, and lately, the large number of retirements of full-time faculty. Adjunct faculty use is substantial in the academic world. They do incredible work for institutions and will continue to do so long into the future (Gappa & Leslie, 1993). Much of the older literature surrounding the use of adjunct faculty does focus on the use of temporary or adjunct faculty within the four-year university setting. Recent literature however has started to recognize that the largest percentage of adjunct faculty use is at the community colleges (Gappa & Leslie, 1993).

Community colleges have historically not had a choice in whether or not they hire adjunct faculty due to the large enrollment increases they have experienced. Some institutions may have rules or regulations regarding the hiring of adjunct faculty or the number that they can hire, but many community colleges have no formal policy about the use of adjunct faculty (Gappa & Leslie, 1993). This trend of hiring large numbers of adjunct faculty is not expected to recede anytime soon. According to Howell and Hoyt (2007), “not only will decreasing subsidies from state and federal governments contribute to this ongoing trend of hiring more part-time and fewer full-time faculty, but so will the planned growth

among the population in general, and with more college-age students enrolling in higher education” (p. 1). Community colleges have increased the employment of adjunct faculty for many years and face the reality that two out of every three faculty members are adjunct instructors. These instructors are found to be without benefits, offices, or any form of job security (Mangan, 2009).

Deans and department chairs are often faced with the scenario of having to hire adjunct faculty on relatively short notice (Linehan, 2007). These short notice hires come from sudden surges in enrollment or the unexpected exit of a full-time faculty member. Hiring adjunct faculty helps the institution save money on salary and benefits and does not require a long term commitment on the part of the institutions (Rossi, 2009). Schmidt (2008), interviewed a member of the AAUP (American Association of University Professors) who argued that along with not being adequately compensated for time spent with students outside the classroom, many part-time faculty members are recruited by colleges at the last minute and are hired with little scrutiny.

Roueche, Roueche, and Milliron (1995) note that “warnings about the overuse of part-time faculty in community colleges are common and widespread, and while they have changed little over the past fifteen years or more, they appear to resurface with different faces as the debate continues.” The authors continue by noting that “there is a curious absence of any evidence to support any policy for appropriate ratios of part-time to full-time faculty” (pp. 17-18). Since the publication of *Strangers in Their own Land*, some states like California have taken steps to off-set the over use of adjunct faculty by setting limits on the ratio of full-time to part-time faculty. California originally required community colleges to maintain a 75-25 percent ratio on full-time to part-time faculty (Gibson-Harmon, Rodriquez,

& Haworth, 2002). However, with increasing enrollments and tight budgets in 2008, California raised the cap for adjunct faculty and allowed them to teach 67% of a full-time teaching load versus the original 60% rule (Jaschik, 2008).

While institutions argue whether the use of adjunct faculty is a good strategy, institutions cannot deny the importance of the role they play. Adjunct faculty make a number of contributions to the teaching and learning environment and should be recognized within the academic community (Roueche, Roueche, & Milliron, 1995). The role of an adjunct faculty member may vary by institution, but the reliance on adjunct faculty is a constant.

### *Demographics*

One of the research questions that will be addressed in this study is the overall demographics of adjunct faculty at community colleges. Some demographic data can be retrieved from databases that record information related to adjunct faculty, but little has been written in specific regard to adjunct faculty demographics (Leslie & Gappa, 2002). Townsend and Twombly (2007), note that almost 50 percent of part-time faculty members were female in 2003. Leslie and Gappa (2002) found that there is no major gender difference when it comes to part-time faculty. Their findings also suggest there is no difference in educational background or the time spent on professional development activities. Research conducted by Tack and Patitu (1992) indicated that “it is painfully clear that the representation of women on college and university faculties is, and always has been relatively small” (p. 33).

Women have been present within higher education for decades, but are underrepresented, “women typically represent a small percentage of the faculty cohort, hold the lower professional ranks, work in part-time rather than full-time positions, represent

disciplines typically considered reserved for females, work in less prestigious institutions, and are not tenured” (Tack & Patitu, 1992, p. 33). Women have seemed to find a home in community colleges, which were more willing to accept them into the teaching ranks. (Hagedorn & Laden, 2002).

Studies have shown that race/ethnicity within community college adjunct faculty is lower than those of community college full-time faculty (Roueche, Roueche, & Milliron, 1995; Townsend & Twombly, 2007) and percentages of minorities in the faculty ranks are not represented in the same proportion to the percentage of minority students in community colleges (Townsend & Twombly, 2007). Tack and Patitu (1992) note that “minority faculty members are crucial to the personal and academic success of minority students” (p. 55). Tack and Patitu (1992) also mention that minority faculty can be hard to retain if they feel isolated and are unable to achieve success in a predominantly white environment.

Adjunct faculty in community colleges have been found to be younger than their full-time faculty counterparts (Townsend & Twombly, 2007). Gappa and Leslie (2002) noted that part-timers are more likely to be both older and younger than full-time faculty with a mean age of 45.8, with twice as many over the age of 65 and twice as many in the 25 – 34 age bracket.

#### Perceptions of Adjunct Faculty

Adjunct faculty bring a different perspective to the classroom that full-time faculty cannot always bring with them (Cohen & Brawer, 2003; Gappa & Leslie, 1993; Jacobs, 1998; Mangan, 2009). The use of adjuncts in community colleges present opinions related to not only their use, but also their overall teaching abilities. Administrators and full-time



faculty do have strong feelings about how they view adjunct faculty. Roueche, Roueche, and Milliron (1995) note:

there is the generalized concern that part-time faculty, no matter how qualified, competent, or conscientious in performing their duties, lack the permanent commitment required for sustained teaching effectiveness. The concerns over instructional quality generate the most intense discussions among full-time faculty and college administrators regarding the use of part-time faculty (p. 9).

Roueche, Roueche, and Milliron (1995) also indicate that “over the last twenty to thirty years, even as the number of part-timers have been escalating, there has been an underlying assumption among full-time faculty, administrators, and professional and legislative entities that once the extraordinarily heavy demands on our colleges dissipated, when budgets began increasing again, the need for significant numbers of part-time faculty would be reduced” (p. 19).

While full-time faculty and administrators might have negative perceptions or strong feelings about the use of adjunct faculty, using adjunct faculty does have positive results. Gappa and Leslie (1993), assert that adjunct faculty can bring a wide array of experience and real world issues to the classroom. This added value in instructional programs is enhanced by the type of academic background an adjunct faculty may possess. Many have achieved graduate degrees in their field and are respected members of their profession outside the classroom. Adjuncts who are working in their teaching field bring with them the latest concepts, understand the most current techniques of tools available in the field, and can provide more up-to-date information than texts that are used in classes.

There are perceptions that adjunct faculty are not as accessible to students and that students who take a class from an adjunct faculty member receive a different experience than those students who take a course from a full-time faculty member. According to Jacobs

(1998), “typically, full-time faculty are more accessible to students, have offices and office hours, and are familiar with the institutional services available to students.” He goes on to note that “students can have significantly different educational experiences, particularly in regard to their access to faculty members. This puts some students at a disadvantage and creates inconsistency of standards for all students” (p. 13-14). Community college students are also perceived to need more help or attention due to academic ability or financial situations. Lack of attention by adjunct faculty can alter their success.

Indications are that students who enroll in classes taught by part-time faculty are missing out on guest lectures, lab experiments, media, or technology, which can result in the lack of services that students may need (Schmidt, 2008; Schuetz, 2002). The counter argument has been that adjunct faculty are just as effective as full-time faculty in the classroom. Research of adjunct faculty by both Wyles (1998) and Kozeracki (2002) found that adjunct faculty are just as effective in the classroom as full-time faculty and have student outcomes that are just as good as those of full-time faculty. Kozeracki (2002) also found that adjunct faculty find their work and interactions with students to be more positive than those of full-time faculty.

#### Benefits for Adjunct Faculty

Research regarding the benefits (insurance, retirement, paid vacation or sick time, faculty unions, professional development opportunities, etc.) provided to adjunct faculty is quite slim, mainly because adjunct faculty are typically not provided with benefits. However, benefits for adjunct faculty are required by certain state laws. Some of these benefits include worker’s compensation, unemployment compensation, and retirement

(Gappa & Leslie, 1993). Many institutions have faculty unions to represent their full-time faculty when it comes to negotiating their contracts and other legally binding agreements.

While not as common, adjunct faculty at some community colleges belong to their own collective bargaining units (Townsend & Twombly, 2007; Castro, 2000) According to research done by Gappa and Leslie (1993), “sometimes a labor board decides that all part-time faculty should be included in a bargaining unit with full-time faculty. Alternatively, a bargaining unit that includes full-time faculty may exclude some or all part-time faculty.” They go on to note that “in a number of cases, labor boards have decided that part-time faculty should be eligible to form their own bargaining units and elect their own representatives separately from the full-time faculty.” (p. 79-80). Castro (2000, p. 47) also found that faculty unions come into existence when either full-time or adjunct faculty become dissatisfied with job security, compensation, and governance issues.

Tangible benefits such as health coverage, retirement, and tuition remission are provided at some institutions. Gappa and Leslie (1993, p. 162) found that benefits for adjunct faculty tend to be hot topics on campuses. They also note that for those institutions that do not provide health coverage or retirement, those are some of the most discussed issues amongst adjunct faculty and administrators.

#### Support and Development for Adjunct Faculty

In an attempt to provide some type of benefits to adjunct faculty, colleges can consider offering support and professional development opportunities. Once adjunct faculty are hired within an institution, the institution should make an effort to ensure that faculty are supported in the right ways and continue to help develop their teaching strategies (Burnstad, 2002). As Marits (1996) notes, “it clearly benefits a university to provide professional

development options” (p. 220). Making sure that adjunct faculty have adequate support and taking the time to help them become better teachers can help increase the satisfaction that adjunct faculty feel.

In their book *Strangers in Their Own Land*, Roueche, Roueche, and Milliron (1995) completed a survey of 88 community colleges to better understand the role that adjunct faculty play within an institution. Among their many findings, they were able to identify some of the important issues related to adjunct faculty as noted by these institutions. The following were identified as crucial to the development of adjunct faculty:

- Recruitment of part-time faculty
- Selection/hiring of part-time faculty
- Orientation of part-time faculty
- Involvement of part-time faculty in college life
- Staff development of part-time faculty
- Evaluation of part-time faculty
- Retention of part-time faculty

Other researchers have noted areas for development as well when it comes to adjunct faculty that seem to align with those of Roueche, Roueche, and Milliron. Wyles (1998 p. 92-93) notes that to include adjunct faculty in the culture of the institution, assumptions about how faculty are examined need to be addressed. Those include:

- Practices by which institutions recruit, select, and hire
- Provisions for appointment and reappointment
- Establishment of appropriate working conditions

- Orientation to the institutional culture as well as orientation to policies and practices
- Integration into collegial campus and departmental processes
- Provision of professional development opportunities
- Evaluation of work consistent with responsibilities
- Establishment of equitable pay

It is important to note that while the professional development and support activities mentioned in this session are beneficial, institutions must remember that professional development for adjunct faculty is voluntary because it generally requires additional work that may not be compensated (Marits, 1996). To combat this issue, some institutions may decide to compensate adjunct faculty for their time attending approved professional development activities through either an hourly rate or flat stipend.

Jacobs (1995, p. 13) also identifies three strategies to improve working conditions for adjunct faculty that seem to align with those of Roueche, Roueche, and Milliron and Wyles. Jacobs' strategies include:

- Improving appointment, evaluation, and retention procedures
- Disaggregating the roles and circumstances for which part-time faculty are used,
- Creating opportunities to enable part-time faculty to become engaged with the institutional values and culture.

Part of the recruitment process ensures that potential adjunct faculty meet criteria that are specified by the institution or faculty bargaining units. The most common degree

requirements are a master's degree with a specified number of graduate hours in a specific discipline (Gappa & Leslie, 1993).

Other than providing benefits, an institution can show support for its adjunct faculty in other ways. Gappa and Leslie's research found that some institutions provide dedicated office space, general office support with mailboxes, copy services, telephones, and extended office hours for those departments that help support adjunct faculty. Landrum (2009) found in his research that part-time faculty accomplish so much with the amount of reduced resources available to them. Landrum (2009) goes on to note that "it is not that adjunct faculty do more with less, but it appears that they are do the same with less" (p. 25).

Helping to make adjunct faculty feel more involved in the institution can improve their job satisfaction as well. Adjunct faculty job satisfaction can be improved by ensuring adjuncts become a part of the culture that exists at the institution along with understanding the values and mission of the institution (Jacobs, 1998). Making adjunct faculty feel that they are part of the institution can lead to increased job satisfaction. To address some of the issues noted above, Wyles (1998) listed some ways that her institution was helping to make adjunct faculty feel like a part of the institution. Items that the college implemented included:

- Orientation sessions on evenings and weekends when adjunct faculty are more available to attend.
- Orientations regarding institutional policies and practices along with divisional orientations.
- End-of-year recognition for outstanding adjunct faculty.
- Adjunct representation on campus council.
- Adjunct participating in grants.

- The establishment of “permanent part-time” faculty.
- A handbook entitled “Adjunct Faculty Handbook”.

Mangan (2009) addressed some of the ideas listed above when she revealed what one institution was doing for adjunct faculty. She found that while there are concerns surrounding the overwhelming use of adjunct faculty, institutions like Lone Star are implementing programs to help support and develop adjunct faculty including the development of adjunct certification programs.

The interactions that adjunct faculty have with members of an institution can also show how connected adjunct faculty feel to the institution. Wilson (2009), who researched adjunct faculty perceptions, found that at one community college interactions played a large role in satisfaction. She found that adjunct faculties’ lack of connection to full-time faculty and administrators makes them feel as though they don’t belong. Wilson’s (2009) research also suggests that if that statement is true of most community college adjunct faculty, who now make up around half of the college teaching profession, half of the nation’s teachers do not feel connected to their institution.

#### Taxonomies of Adjunct Faculty

In reviewing the literature surrounding adjunct faculty, researchers have attempted to classify, or group, adjunct faculty by their level of involvement within the department and institution. Tucker, as presented in Roueche, Roueche, and Milliron (1995) categorized them as the following:

*Fullmooners* – persons who, in addition to their full-time jobs, hold full-time positions elsewhere of at least thirty-five hours per week for eighteen weeks of the year.

*Students* – persons employed in departments other than those in which they are seeking degrees.

*Hopeful full-timers* – persons holding part-time positions because they are unable to find full-time employment.

*Part-mooners* – persons who simultaneously hold two or more part-time jobs of less than thirty-five hours per week for more than one week.

*Homeworkers* – persons who do not want full-time employment because they are taking care of a relative or child at home.

*Semiretireds* – persons who seek activities to fill time made available by retirement.

*Part-unknowns* – persons who do not fall into one of the other categories (p. 7).

As an expansion on the categories listed above, Roueche, Roueche, and Milliron (1995), also note four other classifiers based on adjunct faculty employment within an institution.

*Moonlighters* – persons who are employed in another job but who teach one course.

*Twilighters* – persons who are not otherwise employed, but to whom the institution chooses not to give a regular part-time faculty position.

*Sunlighters* – persons who hold a regular faculty appointment who are like regular full-time faculty in every way except the amount of time they work.

*Persons on occasional part-time leave* – those whose regular full-time faculty appointment is retained and whose probationary period is extended proportionately (p. 8).

The taxonomies presented above are not a comprehensive list, but an attempt to classify adjunct faculty based on the lives that they lead.



### Theoretical Framework

As noted in Chapter one, Herzberg's (1968) Motivation/Hygiene theory of job satisfaction is being utilized in this study as the theoretical framework. There are studies that exist when it comes to job satisfaction amongst full-time faculty, but few look at the Motivation/Hygiene theory as it relates to adjunct faculty in community colleges. Job satisfaction studies have been conducted at length in business and have been written about in numerous journals, magazines, and books but did not hit the academic world until much later.

Job satisfaction studies related to faculty can be traced back to the mid-70's. Cohen wrote about and discussed job satisfaction in his 1975 book *College Responses to Community Demands*. Cohen noted that job satisfaction in 1975 had not been studied in the world of academia because faculty did not consider themselves workers and therefore job satisfaction was not used to discuss how faculty felt about their teaching positions. Cohen suggests that the changing role of the faculty at that time, with the addition of contracts, collective bargaining, and rethinking the definition of working conditions to relate to the teaching profession, could now lend itself to study job satisfaction (Cohen, 1975). Few job satisfaction theories have solely been applied to the world of academe. However, one researcher was able to use Herzberg's findings to create a conceptual framework for the academic world.

A framework of Community College Faculty Job Satisfaction was constructed by Hagedorn. According to Hagedorn (2000), "I offer [this framework], as a strategy to sort and categorize the factors that compose and contribute to job satisfaction. Basically, the model

hypothesizes two types of constructs that interact and affect job satisfaction – triggers and mediators” (p. 6).

Hagedorn defines a trigger as a significant life event that is either related or unrelated to a person’s job (Hagedorn, 2000). Six triggers within the model:

- Change in life stage
- Change in family-related or personal circumstances (birth, divorce, illness, etc.)
- Change in rank or tenure
- Transfer to a new institution
- Change in perceived justice
- Change in mood or emotional state

A mediator is defined as a variable or situation that influences the relationships between other variables or situations producing an interaction (Hagedorn, 2000). The three mediators include:

- Motivators and hygienes
- Demographics
- Environmental conditions

Taken together, the triggers and mediators are able to provide a model for measuring and examining job satisfaction among adjunct faculty.

#### Summary

The increased use of adjunct faculty is going to be an issue for years to come. In the book *Teaching Without Tenure*, Baldwin and Chronister (2001) note that:

the academic profession is in the midst of a dramatic transformation. Changes have been necessary to accommodate a more pluralistic society, new technologies, a changing economy, and greatly increased demands for education. As we move into a new era in higher education, academic personnel policies must be revised and rewritten if they are to shape a work environment that facilitates the effective performance of all persons who fill faculty roles – nontraditional as well as conventional (p. 146).

While the authors were discussing the role of more traditional four-year university faculty, the passage sums up the use of non-tenure track faculty in a way that is reflective of community college adjunct faculty as well.

The review of the literature demonstrates there are issues when it comes to adjunct faculty. Little research has been conducted in regard to adjunct faculty job satisfaction and this dissertation will add to the literature and provide insight into community college adjunct faculty. Basic demographics of community college adjunct faculty are researched and presented. Adjunct faculty feelings regarding support provided by community colleges and taking an in-depth look at what motivates or hinders the job satisfaction of community college adjunct faculty will also be presented and analyzed.

## CHAPTER 3. METHODS

### Overview

The purpose of this study was to gain an understanding of adjunct faculty job satisfaction at community colleges. This study began by researching the basic characteristics of adjunct faculty teaching at a large Midwestern community college. These include demographic characteristics of adjunct faculty such as gender, race/ethnicity, educational background, academic discipline, marital status, primary language and teaching method. The value of this demographic research is to gain a sense of the participants in the study as well as reveal the subject areas that are primarily taught by adjunct faculty. This study also seeks to identify the support systems made available to adjunct faculty as well as community college adjunct faculty job satisfaction.

To address the job satisfaction portion of the study, Herzberg's Motivation/Hygiene theory was utilized. Specifically, the theory was used to identify the motivators that lead to adjunct faculty job satisfaction and the factors that lead to dissatisfaction of adjunct faculty in their teaching roles. Support for adjunct faculty is also a critical issue addressed in this study. This study attempted to identify the relationship between institutional, technical, and classroom support made available to adjunct faculty and their level of job satisfaction to determine if there is any relationship between the two variables.

The following research questions guided the study:

1. What are the demographics of adjunct faculty at Midwestern Community College? Specifically, how do adjunct faculty differ by age, gender, race, educational background, academic discipline, and teaching method?

2. How do community college adjunct faculty rate the level of institutional support, classroom support, and technology support at the college? To what extent is there a relationship between faculty job satisfaction and perceived level of institutional, classroom, and technology support?
3. How do adjunct faculty rate their overall level of job satisfaction at the community college? To what extent does job satisfaction differ by background characteristics (e.g., gender, race/ethnicity), academic discipline, and teaching method?
4. How do adjunct faculty rate their satisfaction/dissatisfaction as it relates to Herzberg's Motivation/Hygiene theory?
5. To what extent do relationships, benefits, teaching and institutional support predict overall job satisfaction?

### Research Design

The methodology for this study was quantitative with open-ended survey questions to provide some qualitative data. The study used a survey research design to collect data on the job satisfaction of community college adjunct faculty. The survey for this particular study was originally created by Boord (2010) and Schulz (2009) in the spring of 2009. The Boord and Schulz survey was used to collect data from adjunct faculty in the state of Iowa during summer 2009. The researchers of that particular study were interested in a number of different aspects related to adjunct faculty ranging from job satisfaction to professional development. A modified version of the Boord and Schulz survey served as the basis for this study. Modifications included restructuring of questions to better fit the culture of Midwestern Community College, the addition of questions regarding adjunct faculty support, and the addition of taxonomies used to identify adjunct faculty. The survey included

questions related to demographic characteristics of adjunct faculty, support for adjuncts, and professional development opportunities. For the purpose of this study, specific questions regarding job satisfaction and taxonomies were added to the original survey. The additional job satisfaction questions were based on research derived from previous surveys of full-time faculty in the area of job satisfaction and were developed based on the job satisfaction theories of Herzberg (1968) and Hagedorn (2000); the questions related to differing taxonomies of adjunct faculty were based on the work of Roueche, Roueche, and Milliron (1995). A copy of the final survey used for this research study is included as appendix A.

## Methods

### *Survey Design*

The purpose of using survey research is to generalize from a sample to a population so that inferences can be made about some characteristic, attitude, or behavior of this population (Babbie, 1990). This research project utilized a survey since little data exists related to adjunct faculty in community colleges. Many times, research studies can build on a national data set that was previously collected and find a new twist for research without having to re-collect data. Unfortunately, this type of national database does not exist when it comes to adjunct faculty at community colleges. The data collected from this survey has allowed the researcher to analyze data from a large Midwestern community college and generalize the demographics and levels of job satisfaction among community college adjunct faculty compared to national data. A wide range of data was collected for this study and not all of the data will be used to answer the research questions presented. The data collected can now serve as a baseline of adjunct faculty demographics and attitudes for further use in additional research topics or studies related to adjunct faculty.

The data itself were a cross-sectional collection as it was collected at one point in time (Creswell, 2009). The method for collecting the data utilized the World Wide Web and the survey was administered online using Qualtrics Survey Software through the Office of Community College Research and Policy (OCCRP) at Iowa State University. This collection method allowed the researcher to distribute the survey efficiently to email addresses and the participants to complete the survey in a timely and convenient manner. Paper surveys were available upon request of a participant.

### *Participants*

Participants in this study were identified as adjunct faculty members at a large Midwestern community college. To be eligible for the study, adjunct faculty had to have access to an active email account through the community college email directory. Adjunct faculty at this community college were defined as faculty not covered by the full-time faculty union agreement. The initial population consisted of 800 adjunct faculty with corresponding email addresses from the institution. Bad email addresses from 100 potential participants were identified by the researcher and removed from the population, resulting in a final population of 700 adjunct faculty. The sample was representative of all academic areas, teaching methodologies, all campus locations as well as reflecting gender and varying ethnic backgrounds.

### *Setting*

The site for this research was a large, urban community college located in a heavily populated metropolitan area. This institution was founded in the mid-1970's and has served the community for nearly 35 years. In its early days, this institution served mainly as a technical community college and enrolled slightly more than 1,000 students in 20 different

vocational programs. The institution was housed in a small warehouse on what was then the far west side of the city. In the early 80's, the institution had grown and moved out of the warehouse setting and served students out of three main campuses throughout the city. During the 80's, the college, along with other community colleges across the state, asked the state legislature to remove the technical portion of its name so that the community colleges across the state could allow students to start their liberal arts education at a community college and later transfer to a four-year college or university.

Today, the college employs nearly 750 full-time employees and offers courses at its three campuses and four centers, varying other locations throughout its service area in the state as well as nationally through its online presence. Enrollment at Midwestern has grown to nearly 14,000 students majoring in 120 different degree, certificate, and diploma programs. The college supports 220 full-time faculty and over 900 adjunct faculty throughout the academic year.

### *Instrumentation*

The survey instrument used for this study was a modified survey based on the Boord (2010) and Schulz (2009) survey that was created and administered in the spring and summer of 2009. Questions were added and/or removed from the original survey to better fit this particular research study and the culture of the community college participating in the study. Questions added allowed for a larger focus on teaching methodology, for the participation of adjunct faculty in online courses, and to generate a clear understanding of the type of adjuncts being utilized at this community college. Questions were also added after consulting with the dissertation committee during the proposal stage. The reliability of the survey was tested by using a test-retest format. A copy of the survey was sent to a pilot



group of 13 people that included faculty, academic deans of the institution, and college administrators from outside the institution. This allowed faculty and administrators to suggest any changes needed to be made in the design of questions, helped in identify any issues with completing the survey online, and allowed the academic deans to understand the questions that were being asked of the adjunct faculty. The feedback resulted in wording changes for a clear understanding of the question, cosmetic and technical changes. Once changes were made, the survey was resent to the pilot group for additional comments. No additional comments were received.

The adjunct faculty survey (Appendix A) consisted of 36 questions and was organized into nine sections: (1) background characteristics; (2) academic/professional background; (3) instructional responsibilities and workload; (4) current employment; (5) institutional resources; (6) activities; (7) job satisfaction; (8) opinions of activities from adjunct faculty; (9) open-ended questions regarding Midwestern Community College. Descriptions of each section are outlined below.

*Background Characteristics.* The purpose of this section was to collect demographic data from adjunct faculty to allow for comparative statistical analysis and frequency distributions. This section includes questions about gender, age, racial/ethnic background, primary language, marital status, and citizenship.

*Academic/Professional Background.* Adjunct faculty are a diverse group of faculty with varying educational backgrounds and teaching experiences. This section asked questions related to degrees they have obtained, the field their education is in, and longevity of overall teaching in a variety of education settings. This helps identify adjunct faculty who

have continuously taught in postsecondary or secondary settings and the degrees adjunct faculty possess.

*Instructional Responsibilities and Workload.* This section collected data related to the field that adjuncts are currently teaching in and the methods of delivery (face-to-face, online, hybrid, etc.) adjunct faculty are utilizing. This section helps the researcher to determine if there are any correlations between age, gender, race/ethnicity, and teaching method..

*Current Employment.* Adjunct faculty are busy individuals who typically hold either full-time or part-time jobs in their fields along with teaching. This section allowed the researcher to collect data regarding current work practices of adjunct faculty. Questions in this section addressed other jobs, including teaching, held by adjunct faculty, the career area they are currently working in, their desire to be a full-time instructor, and the reasons they choose to teach.

*Institutional Resources.* One research question focuses on community college adjunct faculty rate the level of support they receive. This section asked questions related to that support. Adjuncts were asked to identify the resources available to them that assists in answering research question number two.

*Activities.* This section of questions asked faculty to indicate how many hours per week they spend on activities both inside and outside of the classroom. A scale of hours was provided with ranges consisting of 0, 1-4, 5-8, 9-12, 13-16, 17-20, 21-34, and 35-45 hours per week and adjunct faculty were asked to identify how many hours they spend a week on activities such as teaching, advising, committee work for the college, researching,

commuting, etc. The data collected in this question could be used to determine where adjunct faculty are spending their time and if it affects their job satisfaction.

*Job Satisfaction.* This section consisted of questions directed at job satisfaction of community college adjunct faculty. A number of items were listed for adjunct faculty to respond to indicating their level of satisfaction. The possible choices included very satisfied, satisfied, marginally satisfied, and not satisfied. The items are reflective of both motivators and hygienes as defined by Herzberg's Motivation/Hygiene Theory (1968). The data collected through this specific section are imperative to the study and allowed the researcher to use this data in conjunction with demographic data to determine if differences exist with job satisfaction and age, gender, race/ethnicity, marital status, academic discipline, and teaching method.

*Opinion's of activities from adjunct faculty.* Data from this section, in conjunction with other data from the survey, were used to determine the job satisfaction of adjunct faculty. The list of statements outlined in this area assisted in identifying motivators and hygienes for this study. Participants were able to determine if they agree strongly, somewhat agree, somewhat disagree, strongly disagree or don't know how they feel about the statements provided in the question. This section also contained a taxonomy of the types of adjuncts as identified by Rouche, Rouche, and Milliron (1995) along with two new taxonomies created by the principal investigator. The two new taxonomies include Full-time Part-timer (currently holding two or more adjunct teaching positions at two or more post-secondary institutions) and Onliner (currently teaching strictly online courses at a post-secondary institution). Adjunct faculty were asked to self-identify on this question and were allowed to mark more than one.

*Open ended questions regarding Midwestern Community College:* Employees enjoyed the opportunity to voice their opinions, ideas, and concerns. The questions represented in this section allowed adjunct faculty to provide their advice, concerns, and recommended areas of improvement for the college in general from the perspective of adjunct faculty. Data collected in this section were valuable for the researcher and will be valuable to administrators in community colleges across the nation.

### *Validity*

Validity for this dissertation research developed as the survey instrument was used and data were analyzed. Creswell (2008) defines validity as ensuring that individual scores from a survey make sense and are meaningful to the researcher and allows good conclusions to be drawn. Once the data were collected, construct validity was used to determine if the scores from the survey are significant, meaningful, and useful. Scores from the survey were reviewed for validity by determining if the scores were useful and had positive consequences. The data proved to be reliable and predicted what the researcher hoped to discover.

### *Data Collection*

The survey used in this research study was created and distributed using Qualtrics Survey Software. Qualtrics was also utilized to assist with collecting and aggregating the data collected. The final version of the survey was e-mailed to adjunct faculty members along with a cover letter from the principal investigator (Appendix B) on December 14, 2009. Adjunct faculty at Midwestern teach on a quarter schedule. The date chosen to send the survey was two weeks following the start of the quarter and a week prior to the holiday break. Adjunct faculty members were given a deadline of January 3, 2010 to complete the survey which allowed adjunct faculty to complete the survey during their holiday break. The

e-mail also provided adjunct faculty with information regarding the research study and contact information for the principal investigator, major professor Larry Ebbers, Ph.D. and Iowa State University Institutional Review Board.

Following the initial mailing, the principal investigator realized that e-mails were not successfully delivered to all adjunct faculty originally listed in the database of e-mail addresses. Upon further investigation, 100 bad e-mail addresses were identified and an attempt was made to correct the addresses. A duplicate e-mail (Appendix B) was sent to all participants on December 18, 2009 as a back-up to ensure that all potential participants received the original invitation to participate. Further investigation found that 100 emails never reached potential participants.

Additional e-mail reminders were sent to adjunct faculty who had not completed the survey. The first reminder was sent immediately upon the return of adjunct faculty from the holiday break (Appendix C), with a final reminder (Appendix D) three weeks later. E-mail reminders encouraged faculty to complete the survey by the specified dates and numerous deadlines were given to ensure a robust response rate. A summary of communications and corresponding dates are included below:

|                   |   |
|-------------------|---|
| December 14, 2009 | Original Survey E-mailed                        |
| December 18, 2009 | Duplicate e-mail sent for bad address follow-up |
| January 11, 2010  | E-mail reminder 2                               |
| February 8, 2010  | E-mail reminder 3 (Final)                       |

Surveys were completed from December 14, 2009 through February 19, 2010. There were 213 surveys started and 203 completed for a response rate of 29.0%. One participant requested a hard copy of the survey. The survey was mailed to the requestor and not returned

to the investigator. Survey data collected were then exported from Qualtrics Survey Software to Excel and also to Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) software.

### *Population*

Discussions were held with Midwestern Community College's Management Information Systems (MIS) department regarding the requested sampling for this research study. The original request was for a listing of names, primary e-mail address, gender, ethnicity, and teaching area for all adjunct faculty who had taught in the fall and winter terms of 2009. That request resulted in a listing of 800 adjunct faculty. Names were removed for those individuals who were found to have bad e-mail addresses resulting in a final population of 700. Once the deadline for survey completion has passed, 203 participants had completed and submitted their survey resulting in a response rate of 29.0%. While a high response rate such as 50% or more is typically mentioned in education journals, response rates will vary depending on the number of notifications received by participants or the interest of the participants in the research topic (Creswell, 2008). Table 3.1 illustrates the collection numbers and response rate.

Table 3.1 *Sample and response rate for the community college adjunct faculty job satisfaction survey*

|                           | <i>Cases</i> |
|---------------------------|--------------|
| Original Database Request | 800          |
| Bad addresses removed     | 100          |
| <i>Eligible Sample</i>    | 700          |
| Started the survey        | 213          |
| Final Respondent Size     | 203          |
| <i>Response Rate</i>      | 29.0         |

#### Data Analysis

Descriptive and comparative analyses were used to analyze the level of job satisfaction of community college adjunct faculty. The analyses focused on job satisfaction based on demographic information, perceived levels of support, and motivating and hygiene factors described by Herzberg. The Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) for Windows software was used to execute the statistical analysis for this study. SPSS is a comprehensive software system for analyzing data and provides information on trends, descriptive statistics, and complex statistical analyses. Not all data collected during the online survey process was used in the analysis. The survey instrument used collected data on many areas, but not all the data was needed to answer the research questions that are addressed in this study. Only the most relevant data were used during the analysis.

Research Question 1

*What are the demographics of adjunct faculty at Midwestern Community College? Specifically, how do adjunct faculty differ by age, gender, race, educational background, academic discipline, and teaching method?*

This question was addressed by using descriptive statistics. In particular, a frequency distribution was used to identify the mean age, gender and race distribution, educational background, academic discipline and percentage of adjunct faculty teaching on-line versus on-campus sections. The purpose of this analysis was to gain a better understanding of the demographics of community college adjunct faculty.

Research Question 2

*How do community college adjunct faculty rate the level of institutional support, classroom support, and technology support at the college? To what extent is there a relationship between faculty job satisfaction and perceived level of institutional, classroom, and technology support?*

This question was addressed by using a Spearman correlation model to determine if there is a positive or negative correlation between the perceived level and type of support provided to adjunct faculty and the level of job satisfaction. The null hypothesis for this particular research question is that there is no correlation between the perceived level of support and job satisfaction.

Research Question 3

*How do adjunct faculty rate their overall level of job satisfaction at the community college? To what extent does job satisfaction differ by background characteristics (e.g., gender, race/ethnicity), academic discipline, and teaching method?*



To address this research question, differences in levels of job satisfaction were compared by background characteristics (age, gender, race), academic discipline, and teaching method. To accomplish this, a frequency distribution and cross-tabulation were used to determine satisfaction levels by background characteristics. The cross-tabulation allowed the researcher to see how adjunct faculty answered the job satisfaction questions by gender, age, race/ethnicity, academic background, and teaching method.

#### Research Question 4

*How do adjunct faculty rate their overall satisfaction/dissatisfaction as it relates to Herzberg's Motivation/Hygiene theory?*

To address this research question, an exploratory factor analysis was used on 23 items identified in the Adjunct Faculty Survey that address job satisfaction. The exploratory factor analysis allowed the researcher to determine if any potential constructs exist in the data. The goal of this research question is to determine if the motivating factors that lead to job satisfaction, as presented by Herzberg, are the same motivating factors for job satisfaction among community college adjunct faculty.

#### Research Question 5

*To what extent do relationships, benefits, teaching and institutional support predict overall job satisfaction?*

To address this research question, a standard multiple regression model was used as in research question four. The standard regression was used to assess the relationships among the job satisfaction variables and constructs that could affect job satisfaction (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). The goal of this research question is to determine if the

motivating and hygiene factors that lead to job satisfaction/dissatisfaction, as presented by Herzberg, can be used to predict overall job satisfaction.

#### Ethical Considerations

Ethical considerations for this research study were addressed in a number of ways to ensure the ethical treatment of research participants and to ensure the overall ethics of the research study. The purpose of this research study was conveyed to the participants through a cover letter in the original e-mail as well as a statement in the survey consenting to participate in the survey. The consent statement was added based on feedback from the Iowa State University Institutional Review Board. This also assisted in ensuring that the participants were clear about the research being conducted. The cover letter also indicated that participation in this survey was voluntary and any questions participants were not comfortable answering could be skipped.

During the data collection process, participants who completed the web-based survey were not asked to provide names or identification numbers. The raw data collected were stored on an Iowa State University data server that is password protected. In addition, human subjects' approval was sent to the Iowa State University Institutional Review Board and approval was received on November 25, 2009 (Appendix E).

## CHAPTER 4: RESULTS

This chapter provides a comprehensive overview of the survey results as they relate to the research questions presented. It should be noted that survey participants were informed that they did not have to answer questions they felt uncomfortable with; therefore sample sizes can differ on certain variables within the results.

### Demographic Characteristics of Adjunct Faculty at a Midwestern Community College

This section addresses Research Question 1: *What are the demographics of adjunct faculty at Midwestern Community College? Specifically, how do the adjunct faculty differ by age, gender, race, educational background, academic discipline, and teaching method?* Frequency analyses were conducted to determine the demographics of the 203 adjunct faculty who completed the survey.

Participants were asked to provide information related to personal demographic characteristics including their age, gender, race, educational background, academic discipline, and teaching method. Information regarding language, marital status, and citizenship are also presented. The data show that by gender, a majority of community college adjunct faculty at Midwestern were female, 55.4% (n=112), while men represented 44.6% (n=90) of the sample population. The majority of adjunct faculty (31.9%) were in the 50 – 59 age bracket with the mean age of all respondents being 48.8 years of age.

The racial/ethnic background was predominately white, non-Hispanic with 87.1% (n=182) of the total. Black or African American 5.3% (n=11); Latino, Hispanic 2.9% (n=6); Asian and other 2.4% (n=5) were also represented in the responses. The primary language of adjunct faculty at Midwestern was English, 94.7% (n=196) with Other, 2.9% (n=6) and Spanish, 2.4% (n=5) following respectively.

Adjunct faculty at Midwestern indicated that their primary marital status was Married/Living with partner or significant other 74.5% (n=155), Single 14.4% (n=14.4), and Separated, Divorced or Widowed 11.1% (n=23). The majority of participants responded they were U.S. Citizens with 97.1% (n=204) indicating their citizenship, leaving 2.9% (n=6) as non-U.S. Citizens. Detailed descriptions of the personal demographic information are presented in Table 4.1.

The demographic characteristics of Midwestern adjunct faculty aligned with the demographics of Midwestern students. Female students represent 57.3% of the enrollment at Midwestern with 42.7% of the students being male. The majority of students at Midwestern (76.3%) are white, non-Hispanic and 23.7% of students are classified as a minority. The data indicate that adjunct faculty at Midwestern are representative of the student body who are taking classes. Data for non-respondents to the survey show that 53.3% were male and 46.7% female. The data indicate that of non-responders 80.4% were white, non-Hispanic; 8.9% no race indicated; 5.6% Black or African American; 2.6% Asian; and 2.2% Hispanic.

Table 4.1. *Demographics of Midwestern Community College adjunct faculty members*

| Variable   | N   | Percent |
|--|-----|---------|
| <i>Gender</i>                                    |     |         |
| <i>N = 202</i>                                   |     |         |
| Female   | 112 | 55.4    |
| Male   | 90  | 44.6    |
| <i>Age</i>                                       |     |         |
| <i>N = 182</i>                                   |     |         |
| 50-59  | 58  | 31.9    |
| 40-49  | 41  | 22.5    |
| 60 and Older                                     | 37  | 20.3    |
| 30-39  | 28  | 15.4    |
| 22-29  | 18  | 9.9     |
| Mean Age   |     | 48.8    |
| <i>Racial/Ethnic Background</i>                  |     |         |
| <i>N = 209</i>                                   |     |         |
| White, Non Hispanic                              | 182 | 87.1    |
| Black or African American                        | 11  | 5.3     |
| Latino, Hispanic                                 | 6   | 2.9     |
| Asian  | 5   | 2.4     |
| Other  | 5   | 2.4     |
| Alaska Native                                    | 0   | 0.0     |
| Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander        | 0   | 0.0     |
| <i>Primary Language</i>                          |     |         |
| <i>N = 207</i>                                   |     |         |
| English  | 196 | 94.7    |
| Spanish  | 5   | 2.4     |
| Other  | 6   | 2.9     |
| <i>Marital Status</i>                            |     |         |
| <i>N = 208</i>                                   |     |         |
| Married/Living with partner or significant other | 155 | 74.5    |
| Single   | 30  | 14.4    |
| Separated, Divorced or Widowed                   | 23  | 11.1    |
| <i>U.S. Citizenship</i>                          |     |         |
| <i>N = 210</i>                                   |     |         |
| Yes  | 204 | 97.1    |
| No   | 6   | 2.9     |

Based on the work of Roueche, Roueche, and Milliron (1995), this study attempted to categorize adjunct faculty using a taxonomy that was originally created and used by Roueche, Roueche, and Milliron with some new taxonomies added. The original taxonomies included semi-retired, student, hopeful full-timer, full-mooner, part-mooner, and homemaker. The researcher added two new taxonomies including “full-time part-timer”, representing those adjunct faculty who are currently holding two or more adjunct teaching positions at two or more institutions, and “onliner” representing those adjunct faculty who are currently teaching strictly online courses. The results of the taxonomy are included in table 4.2.

Table 4.2 *Taxonomies of adjunct faculty at Midwestern (N = 198)*

| Variable   | N  | Percent |
|--|----|---------|
| Full-mooner (currently working 35 or more hours per week elsewhere)  | 88 | 44.4    |
| Hopeful Full-timer (currently would like to secure a full-time college teaching position)                                  | 75 | 37.8    |
| Semi-Retired   | 40 | 20.2    |
| Part-mooner (currently holding two or more part-time jobs of less than 35 hours per week)                                  | 33 | 16.6    |
| Full-time Part-timer (currently holding two or more adjunct teaching positions at two or more post-secondary institutions) | 31 | 15.6    |
| Onliner (currently teaching strictly online courses at a post-secondary institution)                                       | 23 | 11.6    |
| Homemaker (teaching part-time to allow time to care for children and/or other relatives)                                   | 19 | 9.5     |
| Student (currently teaching part-time while pursuing further education)  | 17 | 8.5     |

Taxonomy data indicate that the majority of adjunct faculty at Midwestern (44.4%) are self-identified as full-mooners (currently working 35 or more hours per week elsewhere), followed by 37.8% who indicated they were hopeful full-timers (currently would like to secure a full-time college teaching position), and 20.2% self-identified as semi-retired.

Those adjunct faculty who are teaching part-time at two or more post-secondary institutions

represented 15.6% (N=31), and 11.6% (n=23) are online (currently teaching strictly online at a post-secondary institution).

Participants were asked to provide information related to their educational backgrounds and degree attainment. Table 4.3 details the professional background information. Respondents were asked if they had ever enrolled in community college as a student. Adjunct faculty were divided in their responses with 50.2% (n=104) indicating they had never attended and 49.8% (n=103) indicated that they had attended a community college as a student. Of the respondents who indicated that they had attended a community college 40.0% (n=26) obtained an Associate of Applied Science (AAS) degree, 23.0% (n=15) obtained some other credential or no credential and 21.5% (n=14) obtained an Associate of Arts (AA) and Associate of Science (AS) respectively.

Table 4.3 also reveals that of the 209 adjunct faculty who completed the question regarding highest degree completed, 73.2% (n=153) had completed a Masters degree or higher. Respondents indicated that 13.9% (n=29) had completed a bachelors degree, 8.1% (n=17) completed an associates degree and the remaining 4.8% (n=10) completed a certificate, high school diploma/GED, or other to fulfill their educational preparation.

Table 4.3. *Educational/professional background of adjunct faculty at Midwestern*

| Variable   | N   | Percent |
|--|-----|---------|
| <i>Ever Enrolled in Community College as a Student</i> |     |         |
| <i>N = 207</i>   |     |         |
| No   | 104 | 50.2    |
| Yes  | 103 | 49.8    |
| <i>Degree Earned</i>                                   |     |         |
| <i>N = 65</i>  |     |         |
| Associate of Applied Science                           | 26  | 40.0    |
| Other  | 15  | 23.0    |
| Associate of Arts                                      | 14  | 21.5    |
| Associate of Science                                   | 14  | 21.5    |
| <i>Highest Degree Completed</i>                        |     |         |
| <i>N = 209</i>   |     |         |
| Master's Degree  | 132 | 63.2    |
| Bachelor's Degree                                      | 29  | 13.9    |
| Associate's Degree                                     | 17  | 8.1     |
| Doctorate (Ph.D., M.D., Ed.D., J.D. etc.)              | 16  | 7.7     |
| Education Specialist                                   | 5   | 2.4     |
| Other  | 5   | 2.4     |
| High School Diploma/GED                                | 3   | 1.4     |
| Certificate  | 2   | 1.0     |
| Diploma  | 0   | 0.0     |
| Less than High School Diploma/GED                      | 0   | 0.0     |
| Not applicable   | 0   | 0.0     |

To allow a better understanding of adjunct faculty at Midwestern Community College, survey respondents were asked to indicate how many years they had been teaching at this institution. Respondents' answers ranged from one month of service to 35 years of service with an average of 4.76 years of teaching at Midwestern. Further analysis found that 53.2% (n=107) of the respondents had taught four or less years, 21.9% (n=44) had taught five to eight years, and 24.9% (n=50) had taught nine or more years at Midwestern Community College.



Respondents were also asked to identify their primary teaching discipline at Midwestern. The findings were broken down in two different manners. Those include teaching area (general education, vocational, developmental/remedial) and program area. Table 4.4 represents the findings of both. Results show 53% (n=96) taught in general education areas, 42.5% (n=77) taught in vocational/technical areas and 4.4% (n=8) taught in a developmental/remedial area.

Table 4.4. *Academic and program teaching areas*

| Variable                    | N  | Percent |
|-----------------------------|----|---------|
| <i>Teaching Area</i>        |    |         |
| <i>N = 181</i>              |    |         |
| General Education           | 96 | 53.0    |
| Vocational                  | 77 | 42.5    |
| Developmental/Remedial      | 8  | 4.4     |
| <i>Program area</i>         |    |         |
| <i>N = 181</i>              |    |         |
| Social Sciences             | 37 | 20.4    |
| Math and Science            | 29 | 16.0    |
| Communications & Humanities | 28 | 15.5    |
| Information Technology      | 25 | 13.8    |
| Languages & Visual Arts     | 16 | 8.8     |
| Business                    | 14 | 7.7     |
| Culinary/Horticulture       | 8  | 4.4     |
| Health and Public Services  | 8  | 4.4     |
| Learning Support            | 8  | 4.4     |
| Applied Technology          | 7  | 3.9     |

Categorizing by program area at the institution was used to provide an accurate reflection of the institution and the responses of adjunct faculty based on the structure of the institution. Results indicated that 20.4% (n=37) taught in the Social Sciences area, 16% (n=29) in the Math and Science area, 15.5% (n=28) in the Communications and Humanities

area, 13.8% (n=25) in the Information Technology area, 8.8% (n=16) in the Language and Visual Arts area, 7.7% (n=14) in the Business area and 4.4% (n=8) in the areas of Culinary Arts & Horticulture, Learning Support, and Health and Public Services areas. The remaining 3.9% (n=7) were in the Applied Technology area.

Research added to this study included the amount of teaching being done on-line versus in the classroom. Respondents to the survey were asked to identify which methods of delivery they taught in used during the 2009-10 academic year. Results are detailed in Table 4.5. Respondents indicated that the majority, 79.2% (n=164) are teaching Face-to-Face/In Classroom. Online represented 27.5% (n=57), Course Conferencing 2.9% (n=6), Hybrid 3.4% (n=7), and the remaining either taught in another format or did not teach during the fall or winter terms. It is important to note that respondents were asked to mark all teaching methods that applied to them, so some adjunct faculty could have responded that they teach in more than one delivery mode.

Table 4.5 *Methods of delivery taught by adjunct faculty*

| Variable                          | N   | Percent |
|-----------------------------------|-----|---------|
| <i>Teaching methods taught in</i> |     |         |
| <i>N = 207</i>                    |     |         |
| Face-to-face/In Classroom         | 164 | 79.2    |
| Online                            | 57  | 27.5    |
| Did not teach in winter           | 13  | 6.3     |
| Did not teach in fall             | 8   | 3.9     |
| Hybrid                            | 7   | 3.4     |
| Course Conferencing               | 6   | 2.9     |
| Other                             | 3   | 1.4     |

Those adjunct faculty who were teaching in two or more delivery methods were asked to indicate the percentage of their teaching load devoted to each of the delivery

methods. The data indicate that 14.1% (n = 30) are teaching in two or more methods of delivery.

To gain a better understanding of the reasons adjunct faculty choose to work at Midwestern, respondents were asked to identify the reasons they chose to teach at Midwestern. The majority of the responses, 81.1% (n=167), indicated that these adjunct faculty enjoy the experience of teaching. Enjoyment of the students followed with 70.4% (n=145) and the need for extra money 61.2% (n=126). The plan to use the experience as a career ladder received 31.6% (n=65) with other representing 21.8% (n=45) (See Table 4.6). Other reasons adjunct faculty at Midwestern choose to teach include passing on their experiences, interpersonal contact with staff and faculty at Midwestern, the love of teaching, and a way to earn money in a tough economy.

Table 4.6 also show data pertaining to adjunct faculty and their current employment habits while teaching at Midwestern. Of the 201 respondents who answered the question, just under half of the respondents 49.8% (n=100) indicated that they would have preferred a full-time teaching position. Adjunct faculty indicating that they did not desire a full-time teaching position at Midwestern during the 2009-10 academic year was 50.2% (n=101).

Table 4.6 *Employment habits of adjunct faculty at Midwestern*

| Variable  | N   | Percent |
|---|-----|---------|
| <i>Number of jobs held while teaching at Midwestern</i> |     |         |
| <i>N=206</i>  |     |         |
| 1   | 104 | 50.5    |
| 2   | 47  | 22.8    |
| 0   | 37  | 18.0    |
| 3   | 13  | 6.3     |
| 5 or more   | 4   | 1.9     |
| 4   | 1   | 0.5     |

Table 4.6 (continued)

| Variable   | N   | Percent |
|--|-----|---------|
| <i>Number of adjunct faculty employed full-time at another job</i>                                       |     |         |
| <i>N=177</i>   |     |         |
| No   | 102 | 57.6    |
| Yes  | 75  | 42.4    |
| <i>Number of adjunct faculty holding jobs involving instruction at another postsecondary institution</i> |     |         |
| <i>N=195</i>   |     |         |
| 0  | 133 | 68.2    |
| 1  | 41  | 21.0    |
| 2  | 14  | 7.2     |
| 3  | 5   | 2.6     |
| 4  | 1   | 0.5     |
| 5 or more  | 1   | 0.5     |
| <i>Number of adjunct faculty holding jobs involving instruction at another community college</i>         |     |         |
| <i>N=203</i>   |     |         |
| No   | 179 | 88.2    |
| Yes  | 24  | 11.8    |
| <i>Number of adjunct faculty who would have preferred Full-time teaching position</i>                    |     |         |
| <i>N=201</i>   |     |         |
| No   | 101 | 50.2    |
| Yes  | 100 | 49.8    |
| <i>Primary reason for teaching as an adjunct</i>   |     |         |
| Enjoy the experience   | 167 | 81.1    |
| Enjoy the students   | 145 | 70.4    |
| Need the extra money   | 126 | 61.2    |
| Plan to use this experience as a career ladder   | 65  | 31.6    |
| Other  | 45  | 21.8    |

### Adjunct Faculty Support

Increased numbers of adjunct faculty lead to conversations regarding how best to support adjunct faculty at community colleges. Many institutions provide support to adjunct faculty in a variety of ways including institutional support, classroom support, and

technology support. To address Research Question 2: *How do community college adjunct faculty rate the level of institutional support, classroom support, and technology support at the college?* a number of questions were asked on the Adjunct Faculty Survey to determine the level of satisfaction in each of those areas. Table 4.7 details the institutional resources provided by Midwestern faculty and the frequency with those resources are being used by adjunct faculty members.

Of the 205 adjunct faculty who responded to the question, marking all of the resources that were made available to them, the majority - 97.6 (n = 200) - noted that an email account was provided to them. This was followed by 69.3% (n=142) who had a shared office space, 55.6% (n=114) who were provided a phone/voice mail account, 42.9% (n=88) a faculty mentor, 38.5% (n=79) clerical support, and 34.6% (n=71) a personal computer. Use of a private office space and other responses rounded out the bottom two resources made available. Other responses included a mailbox, shared computers, access to a copy machine, online resources, professional development opportunities, library resources and assistance, and instructional design assistance.

Table 4.7. *Institutional resources available to adjunct faculty*

| Variable              | N   | Percent |
|-----------------------|-----|---------|
| An email account      | 200 | 97.6    |
| Shared office space   | 142 | 69.3    |
| A phone/voice mail    | 114 | 55.6    |
| Faculty mentor        | 88  | 42.9    |
| Clerical support      | 79  | 38.5    |
| A personal computer   | 71  | 34.6    |
| Other                 | 12  | 5.9     |
| Use of private office | 8   | 3.9     |

Seven statements addressing the level of satisfaction with support services were asked in survey question 38. The responses from those seven statements as well as the means for those statements are outlined in Table 4.8. Likert scale values assigned to the statements were: (4) very satisfied; (3) satisfied; (2) marginally satisfied; and (1) not satisfied. Adjunct faculty at Midwestern were the most satisfied with the equipment/facilities available for classroom instruction  $M = 3.07$ . This was followed by adjunct faculty communication pieces (website, handbook, newsletter)  $M = 2.94$ , support for teaching improvement and professional development  $M = 2.92$ , clerical/administrative support  $M = 2.73$ , and institutional support for implementing technology-based instructional activities  $M = 2.72$ . Adjunct faculty were least satisfied with office/lab space  $M = 2.45$ , and institutional funding of travel for professional development.

Table 4.8 *Level of satisfaction with institutional support services*

| Variable   | Very Satisfied | Satisfied | Marginally Satisfied | Not Satisfied | Responses | Mean |
|--|----------------|-----------|----------------------|---------------|-----------|------|
| Equipment/Facilities   | 57             | 103       | 30                   | 7             | 197       | 3.07 |
| Adjunct faculty communication pieces   | 46             | 102       | 34                   | 12            | 194       | 2.94 |
| Support for teaching improvement and professional development                    | 48             | 95        | 38                   | 13            | 194       | 2.92 |
| Clerical/administrative support  | 44             | 80        | 37                   | 29            | 190       | 2.73 |
| Institutional support for implementing technology-based instructional activities | 30             | 96        | 37                   | 23            | 186       | 2.72 |
| Office/lab space   | 19             | 80        | 61                   | 32            | 192       | 2.45 |
| Institutional funding of travel for professional development                     | 11             | 55        | 35                   | 68            | 169       | 2.05 |

Technology-based support resources were addressed with two statements on survey question 31. Two statements allowed faculty to provide input regarding technology support provided. Adjunct faculty at Midwestern agreed that they are provided technology support in the classroom  $M = 3.58$  and agreed that they are provided technology support outside the classroom  $M = 3.21$  (see table 4.9).

Table 4.9 *Agreement with statements regarding technology support*

| Variable  | Strongly Agree | Somewhat Agree | Somewhat Disagree | Strongly Disagree | Responses | Mean |
|---|----------------|----------------|-------------------|-------------------|-----------|------|
| Are provided technology support in the classroom      | 127            | 48             | 15                | 1                 | 191       | 3.58 |
| Are provided technology support outside the classroom | 76             | 74             | 20                | 9                 | 179       | 3.21 |

Further analysis was conducted to determine if there was any correlation between the level of perceived support in all the variables and overall job satisfaction. A Spearman rank order correlation was run with the six satisfaction variables related to institutional support and overall job satisfaction. Table 4.10 illustrates the Spearman correlation. The Spearman correlation was used since the variables being compared were on a ranking scale versus a nominal scale (Gravetter & Wallnau, 2007). The table shows high levels of correlations between the six variables and overall job satisfaction at the 0.01 level. The highest correlation of .517 was between the level of clerical support and overall job satisfaction. This was followed by a high correlation between adjunct faculty communication pieces and overall job satisfaction at .446. This would indicate that the satisfaction with the support

they are receiving from the institution regarding equipment/facilities and clerical support is significant according to their ranking of overall job satisfaction.

Table 4.10 *Correlation matrix for support variables and overall job satisfaction*

| Variable   |                         | Overall Job Satisfaction |
|--|-------------------------|--------------------------|
| Overall Job Satisfaction   | Correlation coefficient | 1.000                    |
|  | Sig. (2-tailed)         |                          |
|  | N                       | 197                      |
| Clerical/Administrative Support  | Correlation coefficient | .517**                   |
|  | Sig. (2-tailed)         | .000                     |
|  | N                       | 188                      |
| Adjunct faculty communication pieces   | Correlation coefficient | .446**                   |
|  | Sig. (2-tailed)         | .000                     |
|  | N                       | 192                      |
| Institutional support for teaching improvement and professional development      | Correlation coefficient | .398**                   |
|  | Sig. (2-tailed)         | .000                     |
|  | N                       | 190                      |
| Office Space   | Correlation coefficient | .388**                   |
|  | Sig. (2-tailed)         | .000                     |
|  | N                       | 189                      |
| Institutional support for implementing technology based instructional activities | Correlation coefficient | .338**                   |
|  | Sig. (2-tailed)         | .000                     |
|  | N                       | 182                      |
| Equipment and Facilities   | Correlation coefficient | .302**                   |
|  | Sig. (2-tailed)         | .000                     |
|  | N                       | 194                      |

\*\*Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

A Spearman correlation was also conducted with the two variables related to technology support inside and outside the classroom and overall job satisfaction. The correlations are outlined in Table 4.11. With significant correlations at the 0.01 level, both of the technology support statements were significant. Technology support in the classroom had a correlation of .259 with overall job satisfaction and technology support outside the classroom had a correlation of .254 with overall job satisfaction. There was an even higher



correlation of .404 between the agreement by adjunct faculty that technology support is provided in the classroom and that support is provided outside the classroom as well.

Table 4.11 *Spearman correlation of technology support*

| Variable                                    |                         | Overall job satisfaction | Provided technology support in the classroom | Provided technology support outside the classroom |
|---|-------------------------|--------------------------|--|---|
| Overall job satisfaction                    | Correlation coefficient | 1                        | .259**                                       | .254**  |
|   | Sig. (2-tailed)         |                          | .000   | .000  |
|   | N                       | 197                      | 195  | 193   |
| Provided tech support in the classroom      | Correlation coefficient | .259**                   | 1  | .404**  |
|   | Sig. (2-tailed)         | .000                     |  | .000  |
|   | N                       | 195                      | 197  | 193   |
| Provided tech support outside the classroom | Correlation coefficient | .254**                   | .404**                                       | 1   |
|   | Sig. (2-tailed)         | .000                     | .000   |   |
|   | N                       | 193                      | 193  | 195   |

\*\*Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

### Job Satisfaction

The heart of this research study was to build on previous research studies that focused on job satisfaction of community college adjunct faculty (Boord, 2010; Hagedorn, 2000; Schulz, 2009). The goal was to better understand the job satisfaction of community college adjunct faculty at a large Midwestern community college. In an attempt to answer Research Question 3: *How do adjunct faculty rate their overall level of job satisfaction at the community college? To what extent does job satisfaction differ by background characteristics (e.g., gender, race/ethnicity), academic discipline, and teaching method?* one entire section of the community college adjunct survey was devoted to job satisfaction. Participants were asked to determine how satisfied they were with 24 job satisfaction related statements including rating their overall job satisfaction. Likert values assigned to the responses were: (4) very satisfied; (3) satisfied; (2) marginally satisfied; and (1) not satisfied.

The overall mean score on the 23 variables related to job satisfaction was  $M = 2.70$ . On the single question of overall job satisfaction, the mean was 3.00. Table 4.12 shows the results in percentages related to those 24 items sorted by their mean scores.

Table 4.12 *Job satisfaction*

| Variable   | Very Satisfied | Satisfied | Marginally Satisfied | Not Satisfied | Responses | Mean | SD    |
|--|----------------|-----------|----------------------|---------------|-----------|------|-------|
| Autonomy and independence  | 48.7           | 41.1      | 7.6                  | 2.5           | 197       | 3.36 | .733  |
| Equipment & facilities available for classroom instruction                       | 28.9           | 52.3      | 15.2                 | 3.6           | 197       | 3.07 | .763  |
| Departmental leadership  | 32.1           | 47.7      | 9.8                  | 10.4          | 193       | 3.02 | .916  |
| Freedom to determine course content  | 26.9           | 51.8      | 16.8                 | 4.6           | 194       | 3.01 | .789  |
| Course assignments   | 22.2           | 58.6      | 15.7                 | 3.5           | 196       | 2.99 | .723  |
| Competency of colleagues   | 23.6           | 55.9      | 15.9                 | 4.6           | 195       | 2.98 | .763  |
| Adjunct faculty communication pieces   | 23.7           | 52.6      | 17.5                 | 6.2           | 194       | 2.94 | .812  |
| Institutional support for teaching improvement and professional development      | 24.7           | 49.0      | 19.6                 | 6.7           | 194       | 2.92 | .842  |
| Relationships with administrators  | 27.3           | 47.4      | 14.9                 | 10.3          | 195       | 2.92 | .912  |
| Quality of students  | 16.7           | 56.6      | 21.7                 | 5.1           | 198       | 2.85 | .752  |
| Professional relationships with full-time faculty                                | 27.1           | 37.2      | 21.3                 | 14.4          | 188       | 2.77 | 1.006 |
| Clerical/administrative support  | 23.2           | 42.1      | 19.5                 | 15.3          | 190       | 2.73 | .985  |
| Institutional support for implementing technology-based instructional activities | 16.1           | 51.6      | 19.9                 | 12.4          | 186       | 2.72 | .882  |
| Professional relationships with other adjunct faculty                            | 15.5           | 46.6      | 23.8                 | 14.0          | 193       | 2.64 | .909  |
| Job security   | 18.5           | 42.1      | 23.6                 | 15.9          | 195       | 2.63 | .962  |
| Teaching load  | 10.1           | 53.8      | 22.1                 | 14.1          | 199       | 2.60 | .852  |
| Salary   | 6.5            | 49.8      | 30.8                 | 12.9          | 201       | 2.50 | .801  |
| Social relationships with other adjunct faculty                                  | 10.9           | 42.9      | 27.7                 | 18.5          | 184       | 2.46 | .917  |
| Office/lab space   | 9.9            | 41.7      | 31.8                 | 16.7          | 192       | 2.45 | .885  |
| Social relationships with full-time faculty                                      | 14.8           | 36.1      | 27.9                 | 21.3          | 183       | 2.44 | .987  |
| Prospects for career advancement   | 6.6            | 37.4      | 25.3                 | 30.8          | 182       | 2.20 | .954  |

| Variable   | Very Satisfied | Satisfied | Marginally Satisfied | Not Satisfied | Responses | Mean | SD   |
|--|----------------|-----------|----------------------|---------------|-----------|------|------|
| Institutional funding of travel for professional development | 6.5            | 32.5      | 20.7                 | 40.2          | 169       | 2.05 | .996 |
| Benefits available   | 4.3            | 23.5      | 16.6                 | 55.6          | 187       | 1.76 | .955 |
| Overall job satisfaction                                     | 26.9           | 50.3      | 18.8                 | 4.1           | 197       | 3.00 | .789 |

Adjunct faculty were the most satisfied with autonomy and independence of their job  $M = 3.36$  followed by equipment and facilities available for classroom instruction  $M = 3.07$ , departmental leadership  $M = 3.02$ , freedom to determine course content  $M = 3.01$ , and course assignments  $M = 2.99$ . Adjunct faculty were least satisfied with the benefits available  $M = 1.76$  followed by institutional funding of travel for professional development  $M = 2.05$ , prospects for career advancement  $M = 2.20$ , social relationships with full-time faculty  $M = 2.44$ , and office/lab space  $M = 2.45$ .

The differences in job satisfaction according to background characteristics help to answer the second part of research question 3 and are outlined in Table 4.13. Cross tabulations were performed to determine the frequency distributions of overall job satisfaction by gender, age, race/ethnic background, marital status and academic area. In regard to gender, 78% of male faculty indicated that they were satisfied or very satisfied. The female faculty members were not far behind with 77% of female faculty indicating their overall job satisfaction as very satisfied or satisfied.

Adjunct faculty members in the 50 – 59 year old age group were the most satisfied overall with 89% of them indicating they were very satisfied or satisfied. This was followed by those 60 and older with 86% overall satisfaction, 30 – 39 at 78%, 40 – 49 at 57.9% while

the 22 – 29 age group had the lowest percentage with 53% indicating they were very satisfied or satisfied.

#### 4.13 Overall job satisfaction by demographics

| Overall job satisfaction by gender |                |           |                      |               |       |      |      |
|------------------------------------|----------------|-----------|----------------------|---------------|-------|------|------|
| Variable                           | Very Satisfied | Satisfied | Marginally Satisfied | Not Satisfied | Total | Mean | S.D. |
| Male                               | 23             | 44        | 12                   | 7             | 86    | 2.97 | .860 |
| Female                             | 28             | 51        | 23                   | 1             | 103   | 3.03 | .734 |
| Total                              |                |           |                      |               | 189   |      |      |

| Overall job satisfaction by age |                |           |                      |               |       |      |      |
|---------------------------------|----------------|-----------|----------------------|---------------|-------|------|------|
| Variable                        | Very Satisfied | Satisfied | Marginally Satisfied | Not Satisfied | Total | Mean | S.D. |
| 22-29                           | 3              | 6         | 7                    | 1             | 17    | 2.65 | .862 |
| 30-39                           | 6              | 12        | 5                    | 0             | 23    | 3.04 | .706 |
| 40-49                           | 5              | 17        | 13                   | 3             | 38    | 2.63 | .819 |
| 50-59                           | 17             | 33        | 5                    | 1             | 56    | 3.18 | .664 |
| 60 and older                    | 14             | 18        | 4                    | 1             | 37    | 3.22 | .750 |
| Total                           |                |           |                      |               | 171   |      |      |

| Overall job satisfaction by race/ethnic background |                |           |                      |               |       |      |       |
|--|----------------|-----------|----------------------|---------------|-------|------|-------|
| Variable   | Very Satisfied | Satisfied | Marginally Satisfied | Not Satisfied | Total | Mean | S.D.  |
| Asian  | 0              |           | 2                    | 0             | 5     | 2.60 | .548  |
| Black or African American                          | 3              | 3         | 4                    | 1             | 11    | 2.73 | 1.009 |
| Latino, Hispanic                                   | 1              | 3         | 1                    | 0             | 5     | 3.00 | .707  |
| Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander          | 0              | 0         | 0                    | 0             | 0     | -    | -     |
| White, Non Hispanic                                | 47             | 87        | 29                   | 7             | 170   | 3.02 | .784  |
| Other  | 1              | 3         | 1                    | 0             | 5     | 3.00 | .707  |
| Total  |                |           |                      |               | 196   |      |       |

Table 4.13 (continued)  
Overall job satisfaction by marital status

| Variable   | Very Satisfied | Satisfied | Marginally Satisfied | Not Satisfied | Total | Mean | S.D. |
|--|----------------|-----------|----------------------|---------------|-------|------|------|
| Single   | 3              | 15        | 8                    | 2             | 28    | 2.68 | .772 |
| Married/Living with partner or significant other | 39             | 72        | 28                   | 6             | 145   | 2.99 | .795 |
| Separated, divorced or widowed                   | 10             | 11        | 1                    | 0             | 22    | 3.41 | .590 |
| Total  |                |           |                      |               | 195   |      |      |

Overall job satisfaction by academic discipline

| Variable                    | Very Satisfied | Satisfied | Marginally Satisfied | Not Satisfied | Total | Mean | S.D.  |
|-----------------------------|----------------|-----------|----------------------|---------------|-------|------|-------|
| Applied Technology          | 3              | 5         | 1                    | 0             | 9     | 3.22 | .667  |
| Business                    | 6              | 5         | 2                    | 0             | 13    | 3.31 | .751  |
| Communications & Humanities | 5              | 13        | 8                    | 3             | 29    | 2.69 | .891  |
| Culinary/Horticulture       | 5              | 1         | 1                    | 1             | 8     | 3.25 | 1.165 |
| Health & Public Services    | 1              | 3         | 3                    | 0             | 7     | 2.71 | .756  |
| Information Technology      | 5              | 13        | 4                    | 0             | 22    | 3.05 | .653  |
| Languages & Visual Arts     | 4              | 8         | 3                    | 0             | 15    | 3.07 | .704  |
| Learning Support            | 2              | 4         | 1                    | 0             | 7     | 3.14 | .690  |
| Math & Science              | 4              | 20        | 4                    | 1             | 29    | 2.93 | .651  |
| Social Sciences             | 12             | 16        | 6                    | 1             | 35    | 3.11 | .796  |
| Total                       |                |           |                      |               | 174   |      |       |

Overall job satisfaction by teaching method

| Variable               | Very Satisfied | Satisfied | Marginally Satisfied | Not Satisfied | Total | Mean | S.D.  |
|------------------------|----------------|-----------|----------------------|---------------|-------|------|-------|
| Face-to-Face/Classroom | 42             | 78        | 30                   | 7             | 157   | 2.99 | .801  |
| Online                 | 12             | 29        | 12                   | 1             | 54    | 2.96 | .726  |
| Course Conferencing    | 2              | 0         | 3                    | 1             | 6     | 2.50 | 1.225 |
| Hybrid                 | 2              | 4         | 1                    | 0             | 7     | 3.14 | .690  |
| Other                  | 1              | 2         | 0                    | 0             | 3     | 3.33 | .577  |
| Total                  |                |           |                      |               | 227   |      |       |

Cross-tabulations were also conducted with regard to race/ethnic background. Data revealed that 79% of White, Non Hispanic faculty were very satisfied or satisfied with their overall job satisfaction. Comparably, all other races were combined to indicate 65% of all

other race/ethnic backgrounds were very satisfied or satisfied. Marital status was explored with Separated, divorced or widowed faculty reporting 95% were very satisfied or satisfied with overall job satisfaction. This is compared to 76% for those Married/living with partner or significant other and 64% of single adjunct faculty indicating their overall job satisfaction level.

Overall job satisfaction by academic discipline and teaching method was an area of interest. Results indicated that the Applied Technologies area had the highest percentage of faculty, 89%, indicating they were very satisfied or satisfied. This was followed by Learning Support with 86%, Business 85%, Math & Science 83%, Information Technology 82%, Languages & Visual Arts and Social Science at 80% each, Culinary/Horticulture 75%, Communications & Humanities 62%, and finally Health & Public Services at 57%. Cross-tabulation results within teaching method showed that 76% of adjunct faculty were very satisfied or satisfied with overall job satisfaction in both Face-to-Face/Classroom and Online teaching methods. Those teaching in a hybrid method indicated 86% positive overall job satisfaction. Adjunct faculty teaching via Course Conferencing were the least satisfied with 67% of them indicating they were either marginally satisfied or not satisfied.

#### Motivating and Hygiene Factors

To begin to answer Research Question 4, *How do adjunct faculty rate their satisfaction/dissatisfaction as it relates to Herzberg's Motivation/Hygiene theory?* an exploratory factor analysis was conducted using 23 survey items related to job satisfaction. The factor analysis was conducted using a varimax rotation method. The factor analysis was used to determine how job satisfaction variables loaded. Using the varimax rotation method allowed the researcher to determine constructs that were found in the job satisfaction

variables. As Comrey and Lee note in Tabachnick and Fidell (2007) the greater the loading, the more the variable is a pure measure of the factor. Comrey and Lee in Tabachnick and Fidell (2007) also suggest that loadings over .71 are considered excellent, and .63 are very good. Therefore, factor loadings of more than .611 were used in this study to conduct a more robust analysis. The results of the factor analysis is detailed in Table 4.14 by factor loading to assist in the interpretation and analysis.

Reliability of the analyses was determined by using Cronbach's alpha ( $\alpha$ ). Seven factors were removed from the analysis due to low loading factors. This resulted in 15 variables within the constructs with the lowest  $\alpha$  resulting from the Chronbach reliability of .734. The four constructs that were determined included (a) relationships, (b) benefits, (c) teaching, and (d) institutional support. These constructs were then used in a multiple regression analyses to examine the relationship with these constructs and job satisfaction. Based on the results of the exploratory factor analysis, it can be concluded that the null hypothesis for Research Question 4 was rejected due to the relationships discovered between both motivator and hygiene factors present in each construct. The exploratory factor analysis indicated a relationship in the constructs that leads the researcher to believe that both motivating and hygiene factors contribute to overall job satisfaction.

Table 4.14. *Summary of factor loadings (N = 181)*

| Variables   | Factor Loadings |
|---|-----------------|
| Relationships ( $\alpha = .912$ )   |                 |
| How satisfied are you with the following aspects of your job? – Social relationships with other adjunct faculty       | .858            |
| How satisfied are you with the following aspects of your job? – Professional relationships with other adjunct faculty | .850            |
| How satisfied are you with the following aspects of your job? – Social relationships with full-time faculty           | .834            |

Table 4.14 (continued)

| Variables  | Factor Loadings |
|--|-----------------|
| How satisfied are you with the following aspects of your job? – Professional relationships with full-time faculty                                | .778            |
| Benefits ( $\alpha = .787$ )   |                 |
| How satisfied are you with the following aspects of your job? – Salary   | .759            |
| How satisfied are you with the following aspects of your job? – Benefits available   | .705            |
| How satisfied are you with the following aspects of your job? – Teaching load  | .665            |
| How satisfied are you with the following aspects of your job? – Prospects for career advancement   | .638            |
| Teaching ( $\alpha = .738$ )   |                 |
| How satisfied are you with the following aspects of your job? – Autonomy and independence  | .732            |
| How satisfied are you with the following aspects of your job? – Departmental leadership  | .696            |
| How satisfied are you with the following aspects of your job? – Freedom to determine course content  | .672            |
| How satisfied are you with the following aspects of your job? – Quality of students  | .611            |
| Institutional Support ( $\alpha = .734$ )  |                 |
| How satisfied are you with the following aspects of your job? – Equipment and facilities available for classroom instruction                     | .771            |
| How satisfied are you with the following aspects of your job? – Institutional support for implementing technology-based instructional activities | .744            |
| How satisfied are you with the following aspects of your job? – Institutional support for teaching improvement and professional development      | .627            |

To answer Research Question 5, *To what extent do relationships, benefits, teaching, and institutional support predict overall job satisfaction?* a hierarchical multiple regression was conducted to determine if adjunct faculty job satisfaction can be predicted from their ratings on questions related to job satisfaction. The dependent variable for this regression is overall job satisfaction; while the independent variables are those constructs identified in the exploratory factor analysis along with gender and age. The constructs include relationships,



benefits, teaching, and institutional support. A  $p$ -value of  $<.05$  was established for statistical significance. The results are shown in Table 4.15

#### 4.15 Summary of regression analysis for variables predicting overall job satisfaction

( $N = 167$ )

| Variable Blocks       | Standard regression coefficients ( $\beta$ ) |         |         |         |         |
|-----------------------|--|---------|---------|---------|---------|
|                       | Model 1                                      | Model 2 | Model 3 | Model 4 | Model 5 |
| Gender                | 0.046*                                       | 0.079   | 0.091   | 0.092   | 0.089   |
| Age                   | 0.231  | 0.184   | 0.146   | 0.173   | 0.170   |
| Relationships         |  | 0.392   | 0.162   | 0.007** | 0.019   |
| Teaching              |  |         | 0.567   | 0.404   | 0.417   |
| Benefits              |  |         |         | 0.472   | 0.482   |
| Institutional Support |  |         |         |         | -0.046  |
| Adjusted R Squared    | 0.038  | 0.184   | 0.450   | 0.604   | 0.062   |

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

The results of Model 1, gender and age predicting overall job satisfaction showed the adjusted  $R^2 = .038$ , sum of squares ( $SS$ ) = 0.730, degrees of freedom ( $df$ ) = 1, the mean square ( $MS$ ) = 0.730,  $f$ -ratio ( $F$ ) = 1.156, and the statistical significance ( $p$ ) = .295. Because the  $p$ -value is more than .05, there is no statistically significant difference on how adjunct faculty at Midwestern Community College rate their level of job satisfaction when gender and age are considered.

The results of Model 2, gender, age, and relationships, showed the adjusted  $R^2 = .184$ , sum of squares ( $SS$ ) = 5.316, degrees of freedom ( $df$ ) = 2, the mean square ( $MS$ ) = 2.658,  $f$ -ratio ( $F$ ) = 6.121, and the statistical significance ( $p$ ) = .008. Because the  $p$ -value is less than .05, there is a statistically significant difference on how adjunct faculty at Midwestern

Community College rate their level of job satisfaction when relationship variables are considered.

The results of Model 3, gender, age, relationships, and teaching showed the adjusted  $R^2 = .450$ , sum of squares ( $SS$ ) = 8.109, degrees of freedom ( $df$ ) = 3, the mean square ( $MS$ ) = 2.703, f-ratio ( $F$ ) = 8.717, and the statistical significance ( $p$ ) = .001. Because the  $p$ -value is less than .05, there is a statistically significant difference on how adjunct faculty at Midwestern Community College rate their level of job satisfaction when teaching variables are considered.

The results of Model 4, age, gender, relationships, teaching, and benefits showed the adjusted  $R^2 = .604$ , sum of squares ( $SS$ ) = 9.747, degrees of freedom ( $df$ ) = 4, the mean square ( $MS$ ) = 2.437, f-ratio ( $F$ ) = 10.312, and the statistical significance ( $p$ ) = .000. Because the  $p$ -value is less than .05, there is a statistically significant difference on how adjunct faculty at Midwestern Community College rate their level of job satisfaction when benefits variables are considered.

The results of Model 5, age, gender, relationships, teaching, benefits, and institutional support showed the adjusted  $R^2 = .602$ , sum of squares ( $SS$ ) = 10.437, degrees of freedom ( $df$ ) = 5, the mean square ( $MS$ ) = 2.095, f-ratio ( $F$ ) = 10.096, and the statistical significance ( $p$ ) = .000. Because the  $p$ -value is less than .05, there is a statistically significant difference on how adjunct faculty at Midwestern Community College rate their level of job satisfaction when institutional support variables are considered.

Results of the hierarchical analysis is presented in Table 4.16 and shows the unstandardized ( $B$ ) coefficients, standardized ( $\beta$ ) coefficients, standard error ( $SE$ ), and probabilities ( $p$ ).

4.16 Regression analysis for variables predicting overall job satisfaction ( $N = 159$ )

| Independent Variable Blocks | $B$    | $SE$  | $\beta$ | $p$      |
|-----------------------------|--------|-------|---------|----------|
| Model 1                     |        |       |         |          |
| Gender                      | 0.075  | 0.138 | 0.046   | 0.586    |
| Age                         | 0.150  | 0.055 | 0.231   | 0.007**  |
| Model 2                     |        |       |         |          |
| Gender                      | 0.129  | 0.127 | 0.079   | 0.314    |
| Age                         | 0.119  | 0.051 | 0.184   | 0.021*   |
| Relationships               | 0.093  | 0.019 | 0.392   | 0.000*** |
| Model 3                     |        |       |         |          |
| Gender                      | 0.148  | 0.105 | 0.091   | 0.160    |
| Age                         | 0.094  | 0.042 | 0.146   | 0.026*   |
| Relationships               | 0.039  | 0.017 | 0.162   | 0.023*   |
| Teaching                    | 0.190  | 0.024 | 0.567   | 0.000*** |
| Model 4                     |        |       |         |          |
| Gender                      | 0.150  | 0.099 | 0.092   | 0.094    |
| Age                         | 0.112  | 0.036 | 0.173   | 0.002**  |
| Relationships               | 0.002  | 0.015 | 0.007   | 0.916    |
| Teaching                    | 0.136  | 0.021 | 0.404   | 0.000*** |
| Benefits                    | 0.137  | 0.019 | 0.472   | 0.000*** |
| Model 5                     |        |       |         |          |
| Gender                      | 0.144  | 0.089 | 0.089   | 0.110    |
| Age                         | 0.110  | 0.036 | 0.170   | 0.003**  |
| Relationships               | 0.005  | 0.016 | 0.019   | 0.770    |
| Teaching                    | 0.140  | 0.022 | 0.417   | 0.000*** |
| Benefits                    | 0.140  | 0.019 | 0.482   | 0.000*** |
| Institutional Support       | -0.018 | 0.027 | -0.046  | 0.509    |

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

In Model 5, four of the five variables had positive final betas. Three variables, age ( $\beta = .170, p < .003$ ) teaching ( $\beta = .417, p < .000$ ) and benefits ( $\beta = .482, p < .000$ ), revealed the

highest coefficients in the model. This can be interpreted to suggest that adjunct faculty members who are satisfied with teaching and benefits are more likely to experience overall job satisfaction. Results can also be interpreted to suggest that adjunct faculty who are older in age are more likely to experience overall job satisfaction. Relationships also present a positive coefficient, and could be interpreted to have a positive association with overall job satisfaction. When grouped in Model 5, institutional support is less significant at the .05 level.

In summary, the survey respondents' ratings on how job satisfaction was perceived were regressed on five different variables associated with job satisfaction. The six independent variables accounted for 60.2% of the variance explained in the regression model and were statistically significant in the last step. Based on the results presented, the researcher concluded that the null hypothesis for Research Question 5 was rejected. The findings show that age, relationships and institutional support are significant to adjunct faculty, but are overshadowed when benefits and teaching itself is added to the regression.

## CHAPTER 5: SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION

## Summary

The adjunct faculty survey that served as the foundation for this study was originally created by Boord (2010) and Schulz (2009) in the spring of 2009 in conjunction with the Iowa State University Office of Community College Research and Policy. Survey questions for this study were added and modified from the original survey to address the needs of this specific research topic and the culture of the institution being studied. The revised survey was sent to 700 adjunct faculty at Midwestern Community College to gain further insight into the current demographics of adjunct faculty along with perceptions of job satisfaction by community college adjunct faculty. This study also researched job satisfaction based on the level of institutional support given to adjunct faculty, how their levels of job satisfaction compare to Herzberg's motivation and hygiene theory, along with attempting to classify adjunct faculty. While the data collected were only representative of one community college in the Midwest, it will be used to paint a picture of adjunct faculty and their perceived levels of job satisfaction.

Invitations to participate in the study were originally sent to 800 adjunct faculty at Midwestern Community College. Following the first invitation, 100 bad email addresses were identified and removed from the original sample leaving 700 potential respondents. Following email reminders to adjunct faculty, 203 surveys were completed for a response rate of 29.0%.

Once collected, data from the respondents were cleaned and statistical analyses were conducted that included: descriptive statistics, correlations, exploratory factor analyses, and multiple regressions. These were conducted to gain insight into the variables affecting job

satisfaction amongst community college adjunct faculty. This included asking participants to respond to 24 questions related to job satisfaction as well as to rate their overall job satisfaction.

This research was attempting to determine job satisfaction of community college adjunct faculty. It also sought to identify whether job satisfaction variables identified by Midwestern Community College adjunct faculty compare with those presented by Herzberg's 1968 motivating and hygiene factor theory. This research builds on his work and those of others to provide a different perspective as it relates to institutional support for adjunct faculty and the teaching methods of adjunct faculty. This research also provides insights into the role of adjunct faculty members and how they are classified. This builds on the work of Roueche, Roueche, and Milliron (1995) and identifies additional classifications relevant to today's teaching environment.

These findings and conclusions are intended to inform policymakers, college administrators, and other individuals who work with adjunct faculty. The findings of this research provide insight into the demographics and classification of adjunct faculty at Midwestern Community College, their perceived levels of job satisfaction as it relates to Herzberg's theory, and levels of perceived satisfaction based on institutional support provided to adjunct faculty. This chapter is organized into five sections that include discussion, limitations, implications, future research, and final thoughts.

### Discussion

The beginning of this research was launched with basic demographic information related to adjunct faculty at Midwestern Community College. As it relates to gender, results from the survey show that 55% of adjunct faculty members at Midwestern during the 2009-

10 academic year were female. According to the National Statistics of Postsecondary Faculty (NSOPF, 2004), 47.8% of community college adjunct faculty were women and 52.2% were male. At Midwestern, overall job satisfaction by gender indicated that males rated their overall job satisfaction slightly higher than females with almost 78% of males indicating they were either very satisfied or satisfied with their overall job. Among females, 77% were satisfied. This does indicate that there is a slight difference of one percentage point but also suggests that there is not a decisive difference in the overall level of job satisfaction by gender in community college adjunct faculty.

The average age of adjunct faculty at Midwestern was 48.8 years old. The average of part-time instructors in the NSOPF study was 49.3 years (2004) indicating that adjunct faculty at Midwestern are slightly younger than the national average. While ages ranged from 22 to 84, the majority (31.9%) were in the 50 – 59 year old range. Overall job satisfaction in this age group was higher than that indicated in other age ranges. Just over 89% of respondents in the 50 – 59 year age range indicated that they were either very satisfied or satisfied with their overall job satisfaction. This finding, along with overall job satisfaction by marital status, contradicts findings by other researchers such as Hagedorn and Schulz. Hagedorn's (2000) job satisfaction framework noted that, on average, job satisfaction increases with advanced life stages and can be affected by family-related circumstances with married faculty reporting higher levels of job satisfaction than either their single or divorced counterparts (p. 14). Schulz (2009) supported that finding by reporting that in the state of Iowa, the highest percentage of job satisfaction was with adjunct faculty 60 years old and older and that 86.9% of those married/living with a partner were either satisfied or very satisfied (p. 61). Results from Midwestern indicate the opposite.

Faculty at Midwestern not only saw a decline in job satisfaction from the 50- 59 age group to the 60 and older group but also saw lower levels of job satisfaction amongst those adjunct faculty who were married/living with a partner. Adjunct faculty who were separated, widowed or divorced indicated that 95% (n = 21) of them were either very satisfied or satisfied with their job. This is compared to their married counterparts who indicated that 76.5% (n = 111) were either very satisfied or satisfied.

Race/ethnic background data showed that the majority (87.1%) were White, Non Hispanic, with 5.3% indicating they were Black or African American. National data report that 83.9% of adjunct faculty nationally are White/Non Hispanic while 7.0% indicated they were Black or African American (NSOPF, 2004). This comparison reveals Midwestern is above the national percentage in the number of adjunct faculty who are White, Non Hispanic is below the national percentage of adjunct faculty who are Black or African American; this difference is reflected in state demographics. With a small number of non-white participants, overall job satisfaction ratings many not accurately reflect the perception of the non-white population. White, Non Hispanic adjunct faculty reported that 78.8% (n=134) of them were either very satisfied or satisfied with their job. All other race/ethnic backgrounds combined (n=27) 62.9% indicated they were either very satisfied or satisfied. Participants reported that 94.7% speak English as their primary language while 5% indicated they spoke another language. In addition, 97% indicated that they were a U.S. Citizen.

Job satisfaction levels were also researched according to teaching methods and teaching areas. Adjunct faculty who were teaching in a face-to-face or online format indicated a high level of job satisfaction. Adjunct faculty teaching face-to-face or in the classroom responded that 76.4% were either very satisfied or satisfied with their overall job



satisfaction. Adjunct faculty teaching online indicated 75.9% were either very satisfied or satisfied. These findings show that no matter the teaching method utilized by adjunct faculty, they are overall satisfied with their job. Perceived levels of job satisfaction and the area the adjunct faculty teach in revealed that the highest percentage of overall job satisfaction was in the Applied Technology area with 89% indicating that they were either very satisfied or satisfied. The Health and Public Services area, which includes health related occupations (nursing, dental assisting, respiratory therapy, etc.) as well as criminal justice, recorded that 62% of adjunct faculty were either very satisfied or satisfied with their overall job.

Adjunct faculty were asked if they would have preferred working full-time during the 2009-10 academic year. Of the 201 respondents, 49.8% of adjunct faculty indicated that they would have preferred a full-time teaching position at Midwestern. This finding indicates that adjunct faculty at Midwestern have no clear preference regarding a full-time teaching position. This supports the work of Gappa (2000) who suggests that those adjunct faculty looking to pursue full-time positions represent only 16% of the total number of adjuncts. However, it should not be overlooked that the percentage of adjuncts wanting to teach full-time is nearly half of the population. A total of 100 faculty out of 201 respondents was interested in teaching in a full-time position.

A portion of this research study was designed to build on the work of Roueche, Roueche, and Milliron (1995). In their book *Strangers In Their Own Land*, Roueche, Roueche, and Milliron identified an extensive list of taxonomies used to describe the varying types of adjunct faculty. This research also created and included two new taxonomies as part of the survey question. Results found that the majority of adjunct faculty classified themselves as full-mooners (currently working 35 or more hours per week elsewhere).

Hopeful full-timers (currently would like to secure a full-time college teaching position) were next followed by semi-retired. The two new taxonomies, full-time part-timer (currently holding two or more adjunct teaching positions at two or more post-secondary institutions) and onliner (currently teaching strictly online courses at a post-secondary institution) were represented with 15.6% and 11.6% respectively. Results of the taxonomies presented no surprises, but response rates for the two new taxonomies were unexpectedly low.

Community colleges are now recognizing the importance of professional development and support for adjunct faculty. This research study also sought to determine how adjunct faculty rate the level of institutional, classroom, and technology support at Midwestern. Of the resources provided by Midwestern Community College, the majority of adjunct faculty indicated that an email account (97.6%) was the one they utilized the most. This was followed by shared office space (69.3%) and a phone/voice mail account (55.6%). Adjunct faculty at Midwestern rated their level of satisfaction on a number of support variables. Satisfaction levels were the highest for equipment/facilities available for classroom instruction with 81% of adjunct faculty indicating that they were either very satisfied or satisfied with Midwestern's equipment/facilities. Adjunct faculty were also very satisfied or satisfied (76%) with adjunct faculty communication pieces. Adjunct faculty who participated in the survey indicated that when it came to technology support in the classroom, 91.6% (n = 191) strongly agree or somewhat agree that they are provided technology support in the classroom. When asked whether they are provided technology support outside the classroom, 83.7% of faculty indicated they strongly agree or somewhat agree. Administrators and those that supervise adjunct faculty may want to further research ways in which adjunct faculty are supported in their use of technology outside of the classroom.

Midwestern administrators might want to share their ideas and support resources with other community colleges to show how support can be provided inside and outside of the classroom.

These two variables were also used in a Spearman rank correlation model to determine if there was any correlation between the perceived level of technology support inside and outside the classroom and overall job satisfaction among the adjunct faculty. Both statements proved to be significant at the 0.01 level, indicating that the technology support inside and outside the classroom does play a role in overall job satisfaction with adjunct faculty at Midwestern.

Demographics and background characteristics of adjunct faculty provide valuable information for the continued research of adjunct faculty. Job satisfaction levels as they relates to these background characteristics are also of value. Overall job satisfaction was a large component of this research study. Respondents to the survey were asked to rate 24 statements related to job satisfaction including overall job satisfaction. Those statements were rated on a Likert scale of (4) very satisfied; (3) satisfied, (2) marginally satisfied; and (1) not satisfied. The mean score for overall job satisfaction was 3.00 indicating that adjunct faculty are overall satisfied with their jobs at Midwestern, with a total of 77% indicating they were very satisfied or satisfied with their overall job.

A review of all 24 job satisfaction variables found that while there was a mean score of 3.00 for overall job satisfaction, only four other variables scored a mean above 3.00. Those included: autonomy and independence (M=3.36), equipment and facilities available for classroom instruction (M=3.07), departmental leadership (M=3.02), and freedom to determine course content (M=3.01). The four satisfaction variables with the lowest mean

scores included: benefits available (M=1.76), institutional funding of travel for professional development (M=2.05), prospects for career advancement (M=2.20), and social relationships with full-time faculty (M=2.44).

Herzberg (1968) found that there are motivating factors that can lead to job satisfaction and hygienes that can lead to job dissatisfaction. The previous paragraphs addressed eight variables that are representative of both of motivators and hygienes. The four variables with the highest mean scores - autonomy and independence, equipment and facilities available for classroom instruction, departmental leadership and freedom to determine course content - fit within Herzberg's motivating factors. Community college leaders can learn from this information. If motivating factors lead to job satisfaction, then community college leaders can build on the four variables listed to help to maintain satisfied adjunct faculty and can foster the development of programs and projects to motivate future adjunct faculty.

Those variables with the lowest mean scores - benefits available, institutional funding for professional development, prospects for career advancement, and social relationships with full-time faculty - could be categorized as hygienes that potentially lead to job dissatisfaction. This is also supported through Hagedorn's (2000) work in which she indicated that factors preventing job satisfaction include: company and policy administration, supervision, interpersonal relations, money, status, security, and working conditions. A further look shows that the four lowest mean scores fit within Hagedorn's job satisfaction framework. Community college leaders can gain knowledge from these hygienes that improving the benefits available, funding for professional development, career advancement,

and social relationships with full-time faculty will not fully satisfy all adjunct faculty, but will help in making them more satisfied than they currently are.

This research study also attempted to support the work of Herzberg (1968) and his theory of job satisfaction. Herzberg (1968) suggests that job satisfaction is defined by two factors, motivators and hygienes. Motivators (achievement, recognition, work itself, responsibility, and advancement) are the variables that assist in developing job satisfaction. Hygienes (company and policy administration, working conditions, supervision, interpersonal relationships, money, status, and security) are the variables that prevent job satisfaction. While Herzberg's work was originally applied in the business environment, this study attempted to show that it could also be applied to educational settings, specifically to adjunct faculty at Midwestern Community College.

The job satisfaction variables used in this study align with those of Herzberg's Motivation/Hygiene theory. The factor loadings used in the regression model identified relationships between both motivators and hygienes. This would indicate that both factors lead to overall job satisfaction of community college adjunct faculty. An exploratory factor analysis was conducted to determine how the job satisfaction variables loaded. Four constructs; relationships, teaching, benefits and institutional support were identified through the factor analysis.

These four constructs along with gender and age served as the independent variables and overall job satisfaction serves as the dependent variable in the regression model. The variables added increased in significance in each step. Age, relationships and institutional support were the only variables in Model 5 that had a significance level above  $p < .05$ , which was the established threshold for the study. This would indicate that age, relationships, and

institutional support cannot predict overall job satisfaction when coupled with gender, teaching, and benefits.

The adjusted  $R^2$  increased in steps two, three, and four and decreased in step five. In step three the adjusted  $R^2$  increased to .450 when teaching was added. These variables would be used to explain 45% of the variability in overall job satisfaction. Step four continued to increase to .604 and step five decreased to .602. This would indicate that in the final step all four constructs representing 15 job satisfaction variables along with gender and age can be used to explain 60.2% of the variability in overall job satisfaction. With the number of variables entered into the regression model, and being able to explain 60.2% of the variability in job satisfaction variables, the model indicates the strength of the relationships between the variables and the strength of the predictive model.

Community college administrators can use these findings to help improve job satisfaction of adjunct faculty and address issues related to job dissatisfaction. Overall, adjunct faculty at Midwestern are satisfied in the following ways:

- they are given the autonomy and independence to do their job
- they are provided with equipment and facilities for instruction
- they believe there is strong departmental leadership
- they are given the freedom to determine course content by the departmental leadership.

Those motivating factors that fell on the low end of the satisfaction scale should not be ignored. Particularly, job security, teaching load, and prospects for career advancement represent motivating factors to achieve job satisfaction. Adjunct faculty also identified motivating factors that they were least satisfied with such as job security, teaching loads, and

career advancement opportunities. Administrators should review these motivating factors and seek ways to improve the job security, teaching loads, and career advancement opportunities for adjunct faculty at Midwestern. This can be achieved by monitoring class cancellation rates, determining if teaching loads could be increased or decreased and researching the rates at which adjunct faculty are hired into full-time teaching positions.

A number of hygiene variables fell below the satisfied level for adjunct faculty at Midwestern and should not be dismissed. Those receiving the lowest rankings included benefits, institutional funding of travel for professional development, social relationships with full-time faculty and other adjunct faculty, office/lab space, and salary. Administrators can learn from these data that increasing the benefits available, salary and office/lab space would help decrease the level of job dissatisfaction. While many of those variables are difficult to remedy in tight budget times, what is important is that many adjuncts are looking for ways to better connect socially with full-time and other adjunct faculty. By addressing the hygiene factors listed above, adjunct faculty could experience less job dissatisfaction at Midwestern.

This survey research will be beneficial to not only administrators at Midwestern but also to administrators at all community colleges. This research demonstrates how adjunct faculty rate their overall job satisfaction. The research also shows the factors that motivate adjunct faculty and the factors that lead to their dissatisfaction. A summary of data will be provided to Midwestern along with the findings of this research so that the college can begin to work with its adjunct faculty in a different way than in the past. The summary will highlight the demographics, academic/professional backgrounds, teaching areas, current

employment, institutional resources utilized, job satisfaction, and opinions of current adjunct faculty at Midwestern.

#### Limitations and Delimitations

Limitations, as defined by Creswell (2008), are “potential weaknesses or problems with the study identified by the researcher” (p. 207) and are typically related to data collection and analysis. Several limitations were identified during this research process and should be taken into consideration when viewing the results of this study:

1. Electronic means were used to distribute and administer the survey. The reliability that all those contacted actually received the survey could not be determined by the researcher. This includes reminders to complete the survey and the ability of participants to access the survey.
2. The study is limited to adjunct faculty at one community college in the Midwest.
3. The study was a voluntary study and participants might not have participated for a variety of reasons that could have been overcome in a different setting.
4. Because of the nature of some survey questions, the researcher could not fully determine the number of adjunct faculty teaching developmental or remedial course work.

Delimitations identified for this study included:

1. The survey instrument only reached adjunct faculty at one Midwestern community college. While generalizations were made, the data set was not representative of all community college adjunct faculty throughout the United States.
2. Adjunct faculty in this study were delimited to a public, non-profit two-year institution in one state in the Midwest.



## Implications

Utilization of adjunct faculty continues to grow within community colleges (Mangan, 2009; Nevarez & Wood, 2010). Community colleges can learn from the research presented in this study how to better meet the needs of adjunct faculty and how to improve satisfaction levels. Results from this study raised a number of thoughts for the researcher and others to consider. Implications are presented at the state/federal policy level, institution level, and for future practice.

### *Implications for State and Federal Policy*

1. Funding for community colleges is expected to remain a challenge (AASCU, 2010).

This will force community colleges to continue to look for ways to cut costs.

Instructionally, that means hiring more adjunct faculty versus hiring full-time faculty.

At state and federal levels, community colleges should work to assure they educate policymakers of the current state of community colleges in this country. Funding will continue to be a challenge as states recover from billion dollar deficits and look for departments to cut spending. Higher education stands to face increasing budget cuts (AASCU, 2010). While many community colleges are seeing booming enrollments, the majority are also experiencing uncertain funding streams. This will require community colleges to pursue cost-cutting strategies to conduct business. One such strategy could be cutting the number of full-time teaching positions and relying even more on the use of adjunct faculty.

2. Research on community college full-time and adjunct faculty should continue to be conducted at both the state and federal level.

Policymakers at both the state and federal level could make informed decisions regarding community colleges and funding if they had a better idea of not only the students served but also the faculty that make up community colleges. Increased use of adjunct faculty could lead to additional state or federal policies related to the ratio of full-time to adjunct faculty. Adjunct faculty in larger numbers could also lead to more organizing of adjunct faculty unions to ensure that they are protected. Providing demographic information about minority faculty, those teaching in more than one institution, or which professions are represented would assist policymakers when making funding and policy decisions. At a state level, state policymakers should consider expanding the collection of statewide data on community college faculty. Conducting statewide surveys regarding faculty would give state governing and coordinating offices far greater insight into faculty across the state.

3. Concerns at state and federal levels over the credentialing of community college faculty could be addressed by collecting data on full-time and adjunct faculty.

Recently, federal and state policymakers have been making changes to wording surrounding the credentialing of faculty (Higher Learning Commission, 2010; Nebraska Department of Education, 2010). These recent policy changes made hiring faculty easier by loosening the educational attainment restrictions but have led to concerns amongst community college administrators and faculty. Knowing the current credentialing of faculty could be useful as policymakers consider changes. Understanding the educational attainment of community college faculty along with their current professions could shed light on how qualified adjunct faculty are for their teaching positions. It could also demonstrate the amount of work adjunct faculty are providing and the work they are doing to help support students at community colleges.

### ***Implications for Institutions like Midwestern***

1. Institutions of higher education should continually seek to understand adjunct faculty job satisfaction levels and areas for increased support.

Nevarez and Wood (2010) note that an emerging trend in community colleges is faculty satisfaction. They continue by stating that “leaders should strive to increase the satisfaction of these (adjunct) faculty members by communicating to them that they are a valued members of the institution” (p. 283). Many community college administrators automatically assume that adjunct faculty will be more satisfied in their jobs if given increased salaries and enhanced benefits. While that assumption can be accurate, some adjunct faculty are looking for the smaller pieces to make their job more satisfying. The data presented in this research study show that adjunct faculty at this particular institution are looking for additional ways to socialize with full-time faculty and other adjunct faculty. Social interactions with faculty can create a sense of community amongst the faculty and allow full-time and adjunct faculty to make connections outside of the classroom. The need for adjunct faculty to socialize with other faculty could also be facilitated by offering adjunct faculty certification programs or professional development opportunities. This would allow for discussion regarding curriculum issues with other faculty and provide adjunct faculty another opportunity to become integrated into the culture of the community college.

2. Providing and reviewing trend data related to community college adjunct faculty could be beneficial for institutions of higher education as budget and policy decisions are being made.

The data collected as part of this research is valuable to community college leaders by providing current demographics of adjunct faculty, identifying attitudes and feelings of

adjunct faculty related to support provided, and reporting adjunct faculty job satisfaction. But the data is only valuable if it is collected and reviewed on a regular basis. Annually collecting data – such as demographics, teaching loads, external commitments of adjunct faculty, satisfaction levels, time spent on teaching and learning activities – as well as general opinions of adjunct faculty would provide a wealth of information to enhance decision making by community college leaders. Trending this data over three to five years could also help community college leaders understand where improvements have been or are being made, where efforts need to continue, and also determine if changes being made based on this data are beneficial to adjunct faculty. The increased hiring of adjunct faculty that is expected to occur will have implications on budgets at community colleges. Hiring of adjunct faculty may reduce costs based on lack of benefits provided. However, there are budget implications for hiring adjunct faculty. While hiring of adjunct faculty can reduce costs based on lack of benefits provided, there are budget implications to hiring adjunct faculty in the form of salaries.

3. Community colleges should consider the role that institutional support for adjunct faculty can play in increasing job satisfaction.

Community college leaders should be made aware that supporting adjunct faculty in their quest to teach is just as important as salary and benefits. This research study was able to show that the majority of adjunct faculty are aware that support was made available to them. The most utilized support services included email accounts, shared office space, and phone/voicemail.

Adjunct faculty also responded that they were the most satisfied with the equipment/facilities available for classroom instruction followed by communication pieces

and support for teaching improvement and professional development. Adjunct faculty at Midwestern were also very satisfied with the technology support provided inside and outside the classroom. Creating inviting spaces for instructional purposes, opportunities for professional development and avenues for communication pieces (website, handbook, newsletter) for adjuncts are ways for institutions to improve job satisfaction amongst adjunct faculty.

### ***Implications for Practice in Community Colleges***

Findings in this research supported the work of Herzberg's Motivation Hygiene Theory. These findings also bring to light issues that can be put into practice by community college leaders and administrators.

1. Community college administrators should work to improve the current benefits for adjunct faculty including professional development opportunities, career advancement, and social relationships.

The research identified in this study supports the work of Herzberg who found that benefits and career advancement can affect the level of job dissatisfaction for employees. Findings presented in this research indicated that adjunct faculty were more dissatisfied with the benefits available versus the salary they were being paid. Institutions should investigate ways to make benefits available to community college adjunct faculty at a reduced cost or at least the option to be included in some kind of benefits. This could include offering some sort of benefits package with health, retirement, and sick leave options. Professional development opportunities such as workshops on teaching strategies or adjunct faculty certification programs should be researched and added to the benefits adjunct faculty receive. Career advancement for adjunct faculty should be researched to determine how many adjunct

faculty are hired into full-time faculty or administrative positions. Working to build opportunities for social interactions with adjunct faculty and full-time faculty would also help to increase the job satisfaction of adjunct faculty at community colleges.

2. Community colleges should monitor the current teaching loads of adjunct faculty to ensure they are being utilized effectively.

While teaching load could be considered a motivator, adjunct faculty at Midwestern rated their satisfaction with teaching load as somewhat low. What is not identified in the question is whether adjunct faculty think their teaching load is too high and should be decreased or whether adjunct faculty want to teach more classes but are limited by the institution.

Administrators should continue to research this issue at Midwestern to identify what the true dissatisfaction can be attributed to. Addressing this issue and increasing the satisfaction about teaching load could create a more satisfied work force for the institution.

3. Support services and professional development for adjunct faculty should continue to be researched and further developed.

Identifying ways to support adjunct faculty through professional development offerings, social interactions, communication pieces such as newsletters and announcements, orientations, and feedback sessions should continue to be at the forefront. Institutions should work with their adjunct faculty to determine the support systems that could be put into place to increase the satisfaction levels of adjunct faculty. What can be learned from the adjunct faculty at Midwestern is that they value support services. Technology support results indicated that adjunct faculty were very satisfied with the level of institutional and technological support available to them. Adjunct faculty at Midwestern also indicated that communication pieces are important by indicating that they were very satisfied with what

Midwestern is providing such as an adjunct faculty handbook, quarterly newsletter and website devoted to adjunct faculty.

#### Future Research

Adjunct faculty continue to be highly visible in community colleges across the United States. With looming budget deficits at both the state and federal level and with continuing increasing enrollments at community colleges, the use of adjunct faculty will only continue to grow. This research study provided an opportunity not only to continue the study of adjunct faculty but also to determine the current level of job satisfaction among adjunct faculty at a large Midwestern community college. This particular study did not utilize all of the data collected during the online data collection process. Beyond job satisfaction of community college adjunct faculty, other areas for future research were identified throughout the research process. These areas include: job satisfaction of health occupations adjunct faculty, use of adjunct faculty in foundation courses and dual credit courses, pay for adjunct faculty, external activities of adjunct faculty, and communication with adjunct faculty.

Recommendations would be made to administrators to conduct further research regarding the job satisfaction of the Health and Public Service adjunct faculty at this institution to determine ways to improve their experiences. Further research could also be conducted to determine if the role of clinical sites and the demands not only on health care workers but also on health care faculty play a role in their overall job satisfaction.

Results from these data highlighted issues about the current use of adjunct faculty. Adjunct faculty are being utilized to teach courses on-campus and online, but further research should be conducted to look at how adjunct faculty are being used in the area of developmental education and in dual credit roles. Of particular interest to the researcher

would be an in-depth look at the role adjunct faculty play in the delivery of dual credit courses and the job satisfaction of adjunct faculty teaching in that arena.

While salary issues with adjunct faculty at Midwestern did not seem to come through strongly, future research should be conducted related to pay for adjunct faculty.

Determinations about how adjunct faculty are paid (by credit hour, by course), teaching loads for adjunct faculty and paying adjunct faculty for attending professional development activities should be researched and addressed by administrators in community colleges.

Credentialing of faculty has led to issues regarding the minimum and maximum credentialing levels amongst all faculty. This issue is compounded when states that are facing financial burdens are cutting budgets in secondary schools as well. Secondary schools look to post-secondary institutions to provide educational opportunities to students in the form of dual credit or concurrent enrollment. This puts post-secondary institutions in a bind on how to staff those classes accordingly. Community colleges are leaning more on adjunct faculty to fulfill dual credit commitments. Adjunct faculty in those situations are now faced with an additional set of challenges that community colleges need to address.

This research also did not address how job satisfaction levels may change based on the external activities of adjunct faculty. Continued research based on the data collected in this study could determine if holding a full-time position outside of the organization increases or decreases job satisfaction and if individuals' levels of overall job satisfaction in their full-time positions play a role in their overall job satisfaction in their adjunct faculty positions. Data collected as part of this study also asked adjunct faculty how many hours a week they spend on activities inside and outside the classroom. These activities could be



compared with overall job satisfaction to determine what types of activities or the hours spent on certain activities affect overall job satisfaction.

Communication issues with adjunct faculty should also be addressed. This could include a revised survey to explore specific questions regarding communication with adjunct faculty. Particularly, what are the best methods for an institution to communicate with adjunct faculty, and what information do adjunct faculty want to obtain? Midwestern provides a number of avenues including an adjunct faculty website, handbook, roundtable discussions, and quarterly newsletter. Further research could determine which of those are most utilized or how they could be improved to better communicate with adjunct faculty.

Data presented in this research that could be explored more in-depth is the correlation between adjunct faculty teaching loads and job satisfaction. Adjunct faculty noted that they were not satisfied with their teaching load, but what specifically are adjuncts not satisfied with. Is there teaching load too large or are they wishing to take on more teaching responsibilities? Finally, this researcher would recommend that a qualitative study regarding adjunct faculty be conducted. This would not only reach a different audience but also would allow researchers and academic administrators to truly hear the stories and perspectives of community college adjunct faculty in a manner other than a survey and in the words of adjunct faculty themselves. This study allowed adjunct faculty to provide comments which were enlightening. Following up those comments with conversations with adjunct faculty would provide a more in-depth look into the life of an adjunct faculty member.

#### Final Thoughts and Reflections

The results presented in this research study show that adjunct faculty are a very complex group of educators. Not only does this research shed some light on who adjunct

faculty are and what adjunct faculty do on a daily basis but also provides much needed insight into adjunct faculty as a group of employees.

To the knowledge of the researcher, this type of data has not been collected at any institution in the state that Midwestern represents. However, data are being collected at a national level and in states surrounding Midwestern's home state. Data from Midwestern shows that adjunct faculty are overall satisfied with their role, support services, and freedom and autonomy. However, the data also indicate that there are areas that could be addressed to improve satisfaction levels. This is important data for Midwestern, but looking to see how the data from Midwestern compares to other community colleges in their state would be beneficial. This particular state could benefit from a statewide survey of not only adjunct faculty but also full-time faculty. While funding discussions could be informed by the data, discussion of statewide benefits or professional development could help improve satisfaction levels of adjunct faculty statewide.

Data collected from this survey are beneficial, but as noted in an earlier section, data are only valuable when it is reviewed, analyzed, and used to make decisions. The hope is that college administrators at Midwestern will review this data, take the recommendations into consideration and look at ways to improve job satisfaction amongst their adjunct faculty. Community college leaders should use these recommendations to review college support services for adjunct faculty and improve communications with this large population of educators. Administrators at Midwestern should be proud of the support services they have developed for adjunct faculty and should be encouraged to be more proactive in sharing those ideas with other community colleges and continuing to build on what exists. The research presented could potentially affect the way that adjunct faculty are viewed, show how

valuable adjunct faculty are to an institution, and reveal that attention needs to be paid to the concerns and issues of community college adjunct faculty.

## REFERENCES

- AACC Fast Facts. (2008). Retrieved August 20, 2010, from <http://www.aacc.nche.edu/AboutCC/Pages/fastfacts.aspx>
- American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU) (2010, January). *Top 10 higher education state policy issues for 2010*. Washington, DC.
- Babbie, E. (1990). *Survey research methods*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing.
- Baldwin, R.G. & Chronister, J.L. (2001). *Teaching without tenure: Policies and practices for a new era*. Baltimore, M.D.: The John Hopkins University Press.
- Bianco-Mathis, V. & Chalofsky, N. (1996). *The adjunct faculty handbook*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Boord, M.A. (2010). *Analysis of adjunct faculty at Des Moines area community college: Use and application of Herzberg's motivation – hygiene theory to predict job satisfaction and interest in professional development*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Iowa State University.
- Burnstad, H. (2002). Part-time faculty development at Johnson County Community College. In G.E. Watts (Ed.), *Enhancing community colleges through professional development (pp. 17-25)*. *New Directions for Higher Education, 120*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Inc.
- Castro, C.R., (2000). Community college faculty satisfaction and the faculty union. In L. Hagedorn (Ed.), *What contributes to job satisfaction among faculty and staff (pp. 45-56)*. *New Directions for Institutional Research, 105*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Cohen, A.M. & Associates (1975). *College responses to community demands*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

- Cohen, A.M. & Brawer, F.B. (2003). *The American community college*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Creswell, J.W. (2009). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.
- Creswell, J.W. (2008). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education.
- Gappa, J.M., (2000). The new faculty majority: Somewhat satisfied by not eligible for tenure. In L. Hagedorn (Ed.), *What contributes to job satisfaction among faculty and staff (pp77-86)*. *New Directions for Institutional Research, 105*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Gappa, J.M., & Leslie, D.W. (1993). *The invisible faculty: Improving the status of part-timers in higher education*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Gibson-Harman, K, Rodriguez, S. & Haworth, J.G. (2002). Community college faculty and professional staff: The human resource challenge. In T. Byers & H. Calhoun (Eds.), *Next steps for the community college (pp 77 – 90)*. *New Directions for Community Colleges, 117*, San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Gravetter, F.J. & Wallnau, L.B. (2007). *Statistics for the behavioral sciences*. Belmont, CA: Thomson Wadsworth.
- Grieve, D. (2001). *A handbook for adjunct/part-time faculty and teachers of adults*. Cleveland, OH: Info-Tec.
- Hagedorn, L.S., (2000). Conceptualizing faculty job satisfaction: Components, theories, and outcomes. In L. Hagedorn (Ed.), *What contributes to job satisfaction among faculty*

- and staff (pp. 5-20). *New Directions for Institutional Research*, 105. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Hagedorn, L.S. & Laden, B.V. (2002). Exploring the climate for women as community college faculty. In C. Outcalt (Ed.), *Community college faculty: Characteristics, practices, and challenges* (pp. 69 – 78). *New Directions for Community Colleges*, 118. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Herzberg, F., (1968). *One more time: How do you motivate employees?* *Harvard Business Review*, 46(1), 53-62.
- Higher Learning Commission (2010). *Commission guidance on determining qualified faculty*. Accessed August 5, 2010. Available from <http://www.ncahlc.org/information-for-institutions/publications.html>
- Howell, S.L. & Hoyt, J.E. (2007). *Part-time faculty job satisfaction in higher education: A literature review*. Provo, UT: Brigham Young University. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED499387)
- Hoyt, J. E., Howell, S.L., Glines, L.J, Johnson, C., Spackman, J.S., Thompson, C., et al. (2008). *Assessing part-time faculty job satisfaction in continuing higher education: Implications for the profession*. *The Journal of Continuing Higher Education*, 56(1), 27-38.
- Jacobs, F. (1998). Using part-time faculty more effectively. In D. Leslie (Ed.), *The growing use of part-time faculty: Understanding causes and effects* (pp. 9-18). *New Directions for Higher Education*, 104. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Inc.

- Jaschik, S. (2008, July 14). California raises ceiling on part timers' work [Electronic version]. Inside Higher Education. Retrieved August 25, 2010, from <http://www.insidehighered.com/layout/set/print/news/2008/07/14/cap>
- Kozeracki, C.A., (2002). Faculty attitudes about students. In C. Outcalt (Ed.), *Community college faculty: Characteristics, practices, and challenges* (pp. 47 – 55). *New Directions for Community Colleges*, 118. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Landrum, R.E. (2009). Are there instructional differences between full-time and part-time faculty? *College Teaching*, p. 23 – 26.
- Leslie, D.W. & Gappa, J.M. (2002). Part-time faculty: Competent and committed. In C. Outcalt (Ed.), *Community college faculty: Characteristics, practices, and challenges* (pp. 59 – 67). *New Directions for Community Colleges*, 118. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Linehan, P. (2007). *Win them over. Dynamic teaching for college adjuncts and new faculty*. Madison, WI: Atwood Publishing.
- Mangan, K. (2009, March 27). Adjunct inspiration: As community colleges rely more heavily on part-timers, some try new strategies to improve teaching. *The Chronicle for Higher Education*, p. B1 – B4.
- Marits, E.L. (1996). Professional development of adjunct faculty. In V. Bianco-Mathis & N. Chalofsky (Eds.), *The adjunct faculty handbook* (pp. 220 – 226). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- National Center for Educational Statistics (2004). *National study of postsecondary faculty design report*. (NSOPF: 04) Washington, D.C.

Nebraska Department of Education (2010). Title 92, Nebraska Administrative Code.

Available from

[http://www.education.ne.gov/legal/documents/CLEANRule21\\_2010.pdf](http://www.education.ne.gov/legal/documents/CLEANRule21_2010.pdf)

Nevarez, C. & Wood, J.L. (2010). *Community college leadership and administration:*

*Theory, practice, and change.* New York, NY: Peter Lang.

Nutting, M.M. (2003). Part-time faculty: Why should we care? In E. Benjamin (Ed.),

*Exploring the role of contingent instructional staff in undergraduate learning (pp. 33-39).* *New Directions for Higher Education, 123.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Paulsen, M.B. & Smart, J.C. (2001). *The finance of higher education: theory, research, policy & practice.* New York, NY: Agathon Press

Ridenour, R.E. (1985). *An investigation of the relationship between characteristics of self-actualization and of job satisfaction of selected faculty in higher education.*

Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Iowa State University. (UMI No. 8524688)

Rossi, L. (2009, February 9). An army of adjuncts: More part-time instruction renews debate over quality. *Community College Week*, pp. 6 – 7.

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

Schmidt, P. (2008, November 6). Studies link use of part-time instructors to lower student success. *The Chronicle of Higher Education.*

Schuetz, P. (2002). Instructional practices of part-time and full-time faculty. In C.L. Outcalt (Ed.), *Community college faculty: Characteristics, practices, and challenges (pp. 39*



- 46). *New Directions for Community Colleges, 118*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Schulz, S.D. (2009). Predicting job satisfaction among Iowa community college adjunct faculty members: Use and application of Herzberg's motivation-hygiene theory. (UMI No. 8524688).
- Seybert, J.A. (2002). Assessing student learning outcomes. In T.H. Beyers and H.D. Calhoun (Eds.), *Next steps for the community college (pp. 55 – 66)*. *New Directions for Community Colleges, 117*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Tabachnick, B.G. & Fidell, L.S. (2007). *Using multivariate statistics*. Boston, MA: Pearson Education.
- Tack, M.W. & Patitu, C.L., (1992). *Faculty job satisfaction: Women and minorities in peril*. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report No. 4. Washington, D.C.: The George Washington University, School of Education and Human Development.
- Townsend, B.K. & Twombly, S.B. (2007). Community college faculty: Overlooked and undervalued. *ASHE Higher Education Report, 32(6)*.
- Wallin, D.L. (2005). *Adjunct faculty in community colleges: an academic administrator's guide to recruiting, supporting, and retaining great teachers*. Bolton, MA: Anker Publishing
- Watts, G. (2002). Enhancing community colleges through professional development. *New Directions for Community Colleges, 120*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Wilson, R. (2009, October 18). At one 2-year college, adjuncts feel left out. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*.

Wyles, B.A., (1998). Adjunct faculty in community college: Realities and challenges. In D. Leslie (Ed.), *The growing use of part-time faculty: Understanding causes and effects* (pp. 89-94). *New Directions for Higher Education*, 104. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Inc.

## APPENDIX A: SURVEY INSTRUMENT

**Adjunct Faculty Job Satisfaction Survey****Background Characteristics**

1. Please select your gender.
  - Male
  - Female
  
2. Please select your age as of September 1, 2009
  
  
3. Please select one or more of the following choices to best describe your racial/ethnic background.
  - Alaska Native
  - Asian
  - Black or African American
  - Latino, Hispanic
  - Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
  - White, Non Hispanic
  - Other (please indicate)
  
4. What is your primary language? Please be specific.
  
  
5. During the 2009-10 Academic year, your marital status was?
  - Single
  - Married/Living with partner or significant other
  - Separated, divorced or widowed
  
6. Are you a U.S. Citizen?
  - Yes
  - No

**Academic/Professional Background**

7. Were you ever enrolled in a community college as a student?
- Yes  
 No
8. Indicate if you have completed any of the following degrees at a community college.
- Associate of Arts (AA)  
 Associate of Science (AS)  
 Associate of Applied Science (AAS)  
 Other
9. What is the highest degree you have completed? Do not include honorary degrees. (If you have none of the degrees or awards, select "Not Applicable.")
- Doctorate (Ph.D., M.D., Ed.D., J.D., etc.)  
 Education Specialist (Ed.S.)  
 Master's Degree (M.A., M.S., M.Ed., etc.)  
 Bachelor's Degree  
 Associate's Degree  
 Diploma  
 Certificate  
 High School Diploma/GED  
 Less than High School Diploma/GED  
 Other  
 Not applicable
10. In what field or discipline is your most advanced degree? (Sociology, Information Technology, Education, Management, Nursing, etc.)
11. Indicate the number of years of teaching experience you have in each of the following educational environments.

|                                   | Number of years |
|-----------------------------------|-----------------|
| K-12 Public and/or Private        |                 |
| 2-Year Public Community College   |                 |
| 2-year Private Community College  |                 |
| 4-Year Public College/University  |                 |
| 4-Year Private College/University |                 |

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

### **Instructional Responsibilities and Workload**

13. What is your principal field or discipline at this institution? (I.E., HIST, BSAD, ENGL, MATH, etc.)

14. Which methods of delivery are you teaching in during the fall 2009 term at this institution? Check all that apply.

- Face-to-Face/In Classroom
- Online
- Course Conferencing
- Hybrid
- Other (please specify)
- Did not teach in the Fall
- Did not teach in the Winter

15. If you indicated that you are teaching in two or more delivery methods, please indicate the percentage of your teaching load devoted to each.

| <b>Teaching method</b>    | <b>% of teaching load</b> |
|---------------------------|---------------------------|
| Face-to-Face/In Classroom |                           |
| Online                    |                           |
| Course Conferencing       |                           |
| Hybrid                    |                           |
| Other                     |                           |

### **Current Employment**

16. While employed at this institution, during the 2009-10 Academic Year, how many other jobs did you hold?

- 0
- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5 or more

17. How many of these other jobs involved instruction at another postsecondary institution during the 2009-10 Academic Year?
- 0
  - 1
  - 2
  - 3
  - 4
  - 5 or more
18. If you indicated that you have taught at one or more postsecondary institution, was the institution located:
- In the state you reside in
  - Outside the state you reside in
  - Both
19. Were you employed full-time at any of these other jobs during the year?
- Yes
  - No
20. In which career area (e.g., Business, Education, Information Technology, Arts, Health Sciences, etc.) were you employed full-time?
21. Would you have preferred a full-time teaching position for the 2009-10 Academic Year at this institution?
- Yes
  - No
22. During the 2009-10 Academic Year did you do any adjunct teaching at any other community college?
- Yes
  - No
23. At how many other community colleges did you teach at during the 2009-10 Academic Year?
- 0
  - 1
  - 2

- 3
- 4
- 5 or more

24. If you indicated that you have taught at one or more community colleges, were the institutions located:

- In the state you reside in
- Outside the state you reside in
- Both

25. What is the primary reason you choose to teach at this community college? Check all that apply.

- Need the extra money
- Enjoy the students
- Enjoy the experience
- Plan to use this experience as a career ladder
- Other (please describe below)

### **Institutional Resources**

26. Mark all institutional resources available to you during the 2009-10 Academic Year as an adjunct faculty member at this institution.

- Use of private office
- Shared office space
- A personal computer
- An email account
- A phone/voice mail
- Clerical support
- Faculty mentor
- Other

27. How often do you spend time with the following members of this institution?

|                   | Hardly Ever | Sometimes | Often | Very Often |
|-------------------|-------------|-----------|-------|------------|
| Part-time Faculty |             |           |       |            |
| Full-time Faculty |             |           |       |            |
| Department Reps   |             |           |       |            |
| Administrators    |             |           |       |            |
| Students          |             |           |       |            |

28. In which ways do you communicate with students outside of the classroom? Check all that apply.

- Phone
- Email
- Office hours
- Before/After class
- Online venues (chat, Skype, twitter, facebook, etc.)
- Other

### Activities

29. During the 2009-10 Academic Year, on average, how many hours per week do you actually spend on each of the following activities in relation to your position as an adjunct instructor at this institution. Mark on response for each activity.

|   | 0<br>hours<br>per<br>week | 1-4<br>hours<br>per<br>week | 5-8<br>hours<br>per<br>week | 9-12<br>hours<br>per<br>week | 13-16<br>hours<br>per<br>week | 17-20<br>hours<br>per<br>week | 21-34<br>hours<br>per<br>week | 35-45<br>hours<br>per<br>week |
|---|---------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Scheduled teaching (give actual, not credit hours)                    |                           |                             |                             |                              |                               |                               |                               |                               |
| Preparing for teaching (including reading student papers and grading) |                           |                             |                             |                              |                               |                               |                               |                               |
| Advising & Counseling of students                                     |                           |                             |                             |                              |                               |                               |                               |                               |
| Committee work and meetings   |                           |                             |                             |                              |                               |                               |                               |                               |
| Other administration  |                           |                             |                             |                              |                               |                               |                               |                               |
| Consultation with clients/patients                                    |                           |                             |                             |                              |                               |                               |                               |                               |
| Community or public service   |                           |                             |                             |                              |                               |                               |                               |                               |
| Outside consulting/freelance work                                     |                           |                             |                             |                              |                               |                               |                               |                               |
| Household/childcare duties  |                           |                             |                             |                              |                               |                               |                               |                               |
| Communicating via email   |                           |                             |                             |                              |                               |                               |                               |                               |
| Commuting to campus   |                           |                             |                             |                              |                               |                               |                               |                               |
| Other employment, outside academia                                    |                           |                             |                             |                              |                               |                               |                               |                               |
| Research and scholarly writing  |                           |                             |                             |                              |                               |                               |                               |                               |
| Other creative products/performances related to teaching discipline   |                           |                             |                             |                              |                               |                               |                               |                               |



**Job Satisfaction**

30. How satisfied are you with the following aspects of your adjunct teaching job at this institution? Mark one response for each item.

|  | Very satisfied | Satisfied | Marginally satisfied | Not satisfied |
|--|----------------|-----------|----------------------|---------------|
| Salary   |                |           |                      |               |
| Benefits available   |                |           |                      |               |
| Teaching load  |                |           |                      |               |
| Quality of students  |                |           |                      |               |
| Office/lab space   |                |           |                      |               |
| Equipment and facilities available for classroom instruction   |                |           |                      |               |
| Institutional support for teaching improvement and professional development                              |                |           |                      |               |
| Institutional funding of travel for professional development   |                |           |                      |               |
| Institutional support for implementing technology-based instructional activities                         |                |           |                      |               |
| Autonomy and independence  |                |           |                      |               |
| Professional relationships with full-time faculty  |                |           |                      |               |
| Professional relationships with other adjunct faculty  |                |           |                      |               |
| Social relationships with full-time faculty  |                |           |                      |               |
| Social relationships with other adjunct faculty  |                |           |                      |               |
| Competency of colleagues   |                |           |                      |               |
| Job security   |                |           |                      |               |
| Relationship with administrators   |                |           |                      |               |
| Departmental leadership  |                |           |                      |               |
| Course assignments   |                |           |                      |               |
| Adjunct faculty communication pieces such as quarterly newsletter, adjunct handbook, and adjunct website |                |           |                      |               |
| Freedom to determine course content  |                |           |                      |               |
| Prospects for career advancement   |                |           |                      |               |
| Clerical/administrative support  |                |           |                      |               |
| Overall job satisfaction   |                |           |                      |               |

**Opinion**

31. Please indicate your agreement with the following statements. Mark one for each item.

Adjunct instructors at this institution:

|   | Agree Strongly | Somewhat Agree | Somewhat Disagree | Strongly Disagree | Don't Know |
|---|----------------|----------------|-------------------|-------------------|------------|
| Are given specific training before teaching                                   |                |                |                   |                   |            |
| Are encouraged to attend orientation  |                |                |                   |                   |            |
| Are provided course competencies/standards                                    |                |                |                   |                   |            |
| Are given opportunities to participate in professional development activities |                |                |                   |                   |            |
| Rarely get hired into full-time positions                                     |                |                |                   |                   |            |
| Receive respect from students   |                |                |                   |                   |            |
| Are primarily responsible for introductory classes                            |                |                |                   |                   |            |
| Have no guarantee of employment   |                |                |                   |                   |            |
| Are provided technology support in the classroom                              |                |                |                   |                   |            |
| Are provided technology support outside the classroom                         |                |                |                   |                   |            |
| Are required to attend meetings   |                |                |                   |                   |            |
| Have good working relationships with administration                           |                |                |                   |                   |            |
| Are respected by full-time faculty  |                |                |                   |                   |            |

32. Below are some statements about your adjunct experience at this institution. Indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each of the following statements. Mark one response for each item.

|  | Agree Strongly | Somewhat Agree | Somewhat Disagree | Strongly Disagree | Don't Know |
|--|----------------|----------------|-------------------|-------------------|------------|
| It is easy for students to see adjunct faculty outside of regular office hours     |                |                |                   |                   |            |
| There is a great deal of conformity among students                                 |                |                |                   |                   |            |
| Adjunct faculty and administration work together to achieve common goals           |                |                |                   |                   |            |
| Students are provided individual attention and support                             |                |                |                   |                   |            |
| Social activities are overemphasized   |                |                |                   |                   |            |
| Adjunct faculty are regarded as good teachers                                      |                |                |                   |                   |            |
| There is respect for the expression of diverse values and beliefs                  |                |                |                   |                   |            |
| Adjunct faculty are rewarded for their effort to use instructional technology      |                |                |                   |                   |            |
| Adjunct faculty are rewarded for their efforts to work with underprepared students |                |                |                   |                   |            |
| Administration consider adjunct faculty concerns when making policy                |                |                |                   |                   |            |
| The administration is open about its policies                                      |                |                |                   |                   |            |

33. Rouche, Rouche, & Milliron (1995), published a taxonomy of part-time faculty. Please classify yourself. Choose all that apply.

- Semi-Retired
- Student (currently working part-time while pursuing further education)
- Hopeful Full-timer (currently would like to secure a full-time college teaching position)
- Full Mooner (currently working 35 or more hours per week elsewhere)
- Part-Mooner (currently holding two or more part-time jobs of less than 35 hours per week)

- Full-Time Part-Timer (currently holding two or more adjunct teaching positions at two or more post-secondary institutions)
- Onliner (currently teaching strictly online courses at a post-secondary institution)
- Homeworker (working part-time to allow time to care for children and/or other relatives)

**Open Ended**

34. If you were given the opportunity to provide advice to the administration at this college, what advice would you give for improving experiences of adjunct faculty?
35. If there was one thing you could change regarding your adjunct faculty experience, what would it be?
36. What do you most value most about your teaching experience at this institution?

APPENDIX B: INTRODUCTORY AND DUPLICATE LETTER EMAILED TO PARTICIPANTS

December, 2009

Dear Survey Participant,

I would like to start by introducing myself. My name is Jody Tomanek and I am a current doctoral student at Iowa State University. My focus is on community college leadership and I am in the process of conducting research for dissertation. My research emphasis is on adjunct faculty job satisfaction.

I am conducting research to gain a better understanding of adjunct faculty job satisfaction at community colleges. I want to explore the factors that lead to adjunct faculty job satisfaction and factors that deter job satisfaction.

Your participation in this survey is appreciated, but completely voluntary. If you feel that there is a question you are uncomfortable answering you may skip that question. This survey is confidential and no names are asked for. While there are no associated risks with this survey, by clicking on the "Start Survey" button in the survey, you are consenting for your responses to be compiled with others. Although the survey is coded to allow for follow-up with non-respondents, you will not be individually identified with your questionnaire or responses. Please understand that the use of this data will be limited to this research, as authorized by Iowa State University, although results may ultimately be presented in formats other than the dissertation, such as journal articles or conference presentations. If you have questions regarding this research study, please contact Jody Tomanek at [jtomanek@iastate.edu](mailto:jtomanek@iastate.edu) or Dr. Larry Ebberts at [lebberts@iastate.edu](mailto:lebberts@iastate.edu). If you have any questions about the rights of research subjects or research-related injury, please contact the IRB Administrator, (515) 294-4566, [IRB@iastate.edu](mailto:IRB@iastate.edu), or Director, (515) 294-3115, Office of Research Assurances, Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa 50011.

I greatly appreciate your participation in this research. The survey will take approximately 15 minutes to complete. The link to the online survey is provided below. If you would prefer to fill out the survey via a paper copy, you may contact me and a hard copy of the survey will be sent to you.

Thank you in advance for completing this survey.  
Jody Tomanek  
Graduate Student  
Iowa State University

## APPENDIX C: FOLLOW-UP LETTER EMAILED TO PARTICIPANTS

January 11, 2010

Dear Adjunct Faculty member,

A few weeks ago, you received an email invitation to participate in a dissertation research project. This specific research topic is focused on the job satisfaction of community college adjunct faculty and your input is greatly desired. I would like to invite you again to visit the survey link below and provide data concerning your experience as an adjunct faculty member.

Your participation in this survey is appreciated, but completely voluntary. If you feel that there is a question you are uncomfortable answering you may skip that question. This survey is confidential and no names are asked for. While there are no associated risks with this survey, by clicking on the “Start Survey” button in the survey, you are consenting for your responses to be compiled with others. Although the survey is coded to allow for follow-up with non-respondents, you will not be individually identified with your questionnaire or responses. Please understand that the use of this data will be limited to this research, as authorized by Iowa State University, although results may ultimately be presented in formats other than the dissertation, such as journal articles or conference presentations. If you have questions regarding this research study, please contact Jody Tomanek at [jtomanek@iastate.edu](mailto:jtomanek@iastate.edu) or Dr. Larry Ebberts at [lebberts@iastate.edu](mailto:lebberts@iastate.edu) . If you have any questions about the rights of research subjects or research-related injury, please contact the IRB Administrator, (515) 294-4566, [IRB@iastate.edu](mailto:IRB@iastate.edu), or Director, (515) 294-3115, Office of Research Assurances, Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa 50011.

I greatly appreciate your participation in this research. The survey will take approximately 15 minutes to complete. The link to the online survey is provided below. If you would prefer to fill out the survey via a paper copy, you may contact me and a hard copy of the survey will be sent to you.

Thank you in advance for completing this survey.  
Jody Tomanek  
Graduate Student  
Iowa State University

## APPENDIX D: FOLLOW-UP LETTER TWO EMAILED TO PARTICIPANTS

February 8, 2010

Dear Adjunct Faculty member,

A few weeks ago, you received an reminder to participate in a dissertation research project. This specific research topic is focused on the job satisfaction of community college adjunct faculty and your input is greatly desired. I would like to invite you again to visit the survey link below and provide data concerning your experience as an adjunct faculty member. If you could please complete the survey by **Friday, February 19th**, it would be greatly appreciated.

Your participation in this survey is appreciated, but completely voluntary. If you feel that there is a question you are uncomfortable answering you may skip that question. This survey is confidential and no names are asked for. While there are no associated risks with this survey, by clicking on the “Start Survey” button in the survey, you are consenting for your responses to be compiled with others. Although the survey is coded to allow for follow-up with non-respondents, you will not be individually identified with your questionnaire or responses. Please understand that the use of this data will be limited to this research, as authorized by Iowa State University, although results may ultimately be presented in formats other than the dissertation, such as journal articles or conference presentations. If you have questions regarding this research study, please contact Jody Tomanek at [jtomanek@iastate.edu](mailto:jtomanek@iastate.edu) or Dr. Larry Ebbbers at [lebbbers@iastate.edu](mailto:lebbbers@iastate.edu) . If you have any questions about the rights of research subjects or research-related injury, please contact the IRB Administrator, (515) 294-4566, [IRB@iastate.edu](mailto:IRB@iastate.edu), or Director, (515) 294-3115, Office of Research Assurances, Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa 50011.

I greatly appreciate your participation in this research. The survey will take approximately 15 minutes to complete. The link to the online survey is provided below. If you would prefer to fill out the survey via a paper copy, you may contact me and a hard copy of the survey will be sent to you.

Thank you in advance for completing this survey.  
Jody Tomanek  
Graduate Student  
Iowa State University

## APPENDIX E: HUMAN SUBJECTS APPROVAL

**IOWA STATE UNIVERSITY**

OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

**DATE:** November 25, 2009**TO:** Jody Tomanek  
15923 Martha Circle  
Omaha, NE 68130**CC:** Dr. Larry Ebbers  
N226 Lagomarcino**FROM:** Office for Responsible Research**TITLE:** Job Satisfaction of Community College Adjunct Faculty**IRB ID:** 09-477**Approval Date:** 24 November 2009**Date for Continuing Review:** 23 November 2010**Submission Type:** New**Review Type:** Expedited

The project referenced above has received approval from the Institutional Review Board (IRB) at Iowa State University. Please refer to the IRB ID number shown above in all correspondence regarding this study.

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

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

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

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

ORR 09/09



## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The journey to obtain my doctoral degree has been one of the best experiences of my life. I never thought that this is where my life would take me, but I am glad that it did. There are so many people to thank for their assistance in this amazing journey. I must start with my major professor, Dr. Larry Ebbers. I contacted Dr. Ebbers a number of times prior to my final determination on a Ph.D. in Community College Leadership and Iowa State University. It was his kindness and dedication to answering my questions that eventually persuaded me to enroll at Iowa State University. I am forever indebted to him for his guidance and patience through this process. Thanks also to my committee members for their support and guidance through the community college leadership program. Drs. Frankie Santos Laanan, Linda Serra Hagedorn, Margaret Torrie, and Christopher Duree have been instrumental in the completion of this doctoral degree.

I must thank my co-hort mates who made this experience one that I will never forget. While they may never understand how they assisted me through a very difficult time in my professional life, I owe them so much for their friendship. They are friends and colleagues that I will have forever. There are two other people who are responsible for my journey beginning at Iowa State University. Previous co-hort students, Lyn Brodersen and Lynn Bradman were continually discussing with me the program at Iowa State and encouraging me to pursue my doctoral degree. Without their persuasion, I may never have ended up where I did.

Thank you to Metropolitan Community College for allowing me the opportunity to pursue a doctoral degree while also working full-time. The support of the administration, faculty, and staff was incredible. Thank you also to the administration at Mid-Plains

Community College for pushing me to finish my dissertation and understanding the pressures of finishing my Ph.D. and taking on a new job at the same time. Both of these institutions are remarkable institutions of higher education and their support of employees completing higher education is commendable.

Thank you to my editor, Pat Smith, who was willing to edit my dissertation from the first day I started the Ph.D. program and did edits on a short timeline. Her comments and suggestions are greatly appreciated. Thank you also again to Lynn Bradman who graciously assisted me with all my statistical questions and was still willing to take my phone calls in last hours of completion.

Most importantly, I must thank my family and friends. My parents Jim and Judy, and my siblings, Jim and John, have been an amazing support system for me during this journey. They knew when I need to focus and be left alone and yet they knew when I needed a break and they were there to make sure that happened. I could not have done this without them. My extended family and close friends have also been very supportive and thank you to them for their understanding when I could not always be everywhere. A special thanks to my mentor Dr. Randall VanWagoner. His friendship and belief that I could do anything I set my mind to put me on this journey many years ago. I would not be where I am today without his coaching, guidance, and support.